

City Council Work Session Transcript – 02/19/2019

Title: City of Austin

Description: 24/7

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 2/19/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 2/19/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:38:13 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right, we have a quorum. Today is February 19th, 2019. It is 9:35. So we're going -- we have a quorum, so we're going to go ahead and begin this meeting here in the boards and commissions room of city hall. Colleagues, we have community survey results that I think we'll start with those and get those. We have three items that have been pulled, two of them were pulled by Jimmy. He's not here, so we're really only going to discuss one item. Which is item number 27. When we're done with that we'll then go back into executive session. We have several items to consider back in executive session. So hopefully I think this will go relatively quick this morning. So manager, I'm going to turn it over to you if you want to introduce the 2018 community survey results. >> Sure. Mayor, council, we are excited to talk about this morning the results from the 2018 community survey. We've been doing the survey for a number of years. The intent this morning is not to go through it in-depth, but to give you some high level feedback from what we learned and then also to equip both you and the public with information on how to dive deeper into the data and information so that we can be better informed in the discussions we have as a community. I'm going to pass it over to Kim Al very as who will walk us through the survey this morning. >> Mayor Adler: And before we go to into we have on agenda to talk about planning commission appointments. I want to talk about the status of that so that council can choose ultimately to discuss this or not. Sorry, go ahead. >> Good morning, mayor, mayor pro tem and council. I'm Kim Oliveros. It seems like I've been spending a lot of time with you lately. I'm happy to be here this morning to present the results of the 2018 community survey.

[9:40:15 AM]

Fortunately it's a good story. We had an excellent response from the community and I'm happy to give you some details on that. So first a very quick presentation, like Spencer noted, just some highlights about the purpose of the survey and the methodology. A couple of slides about major findings. And then we'll do a demonstration of the dashboard and I have Jimmy [indiscernible] Here from my team to help with that who has been instrumental in helping us with our ability to better communicate the data and make it more accessible to the community and council and staff. So the purpose of the survey is first and foremost to objectively assess residents satisfaction with city services. We actually contracted the

company called etc that . Handles the survey for us, so it removes us from the equation considerably which also AIDS that objectivity. We have been working with etc since 2012 so -- we did a survey for several years before that, but once we started working with etc it expanded our capabilities in terms of benchmarking and national information. And we've been working with them for quite a few years now. The information from the survey is absolutely utilized to help inform budget prioritization, and it also gives us the ability to compare our performance with other large cities. The methodology for the survey. Again, we have administered it since 2012, but this year we did a significant redesign of the survey to orient it around the six strategic outcomes. On your -- in front of your work spaces you have a copy of the presentation, but you also have a copy of the survey instrument that was sent out within the community. And we've highlighted those questions that were new to the survey this year. Many of those were coming from performance metrics that were adopted as part of sd 23. -- Sb 23. The redesign of the survey

[9:42:16 AM]

around six outcomes actually was very helpful in not only helping us with the -- addressing things from an outcome perspective, but also helped us streamline the survey better and eliminate duplicative questions and things like that. So the survey was administered late summer, early fall this year. It's given to a randomly selected sample of households and it's administered in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and mandarin. The survey is initially sent through mail, but individuals have an option of completing either the paper form or completing it over the phone or through the web. The survey is -- we take the survey length into consideration and make sure we're not making it too cumbersome for individuals. The sample size for this year's survey ended at 2,261 completed surveys. Our goal is to have a minimum of 200 surveys per council district, and the confidence level was 95% with a plus or minus error of two percent, which is excellent in surveys. So a little bit of information about the sample of the survey responses versus our census information. Median income, according to census, is around \$61,000. And our survey sample ended up being -- our median ended up being around 60 to 80,000 so we were in line there. And you can see some of the demographic information on this table also demonstrates the close relationship we have of the survey sample versus our census results. That's something that the etc takes -- puts a lot of effort into to make sure that we're matching up our census information with our responses. We also put a lot of effort into the location of the respondents. We worked actively with them at the very beginning for

[9:44:16 AM]

them to understand where our population is centered around the community. And make sure that the responses when we overlay the responses, respondent's locations versus our population, that we are getting excellent coverage. So some of the results, again, I noted when we first started this conversation that it's a good story. So you'll see here on this slide that the satisfaction with city services was going up generally across the board. You also see that for the majority of services that we're actually ranking

above the national average. Cities can populations over 500,000 people. I wanted to point out in particular the overall quality of city services where we are 21% above the national average and overall quality of customer service where we are 22% above the national average. That speaks highly of the employees of this entire organization, the services they provide and the manner of which they provide them. . Satisfaction with the over all satisfaction with the over all quality of services increased significantly endmaterials at the library was over 14%, you also see over all quality of city libraries is over 13% and I think a lot of that had to do with the opening of our new central library. When you look at the satisfaction, location of the responses with satisfied or very satisfied, this year verses last year, you see that shift, particularly in the core of the city, folks that live nearby the central library but I see it across the entire cities, not just in that one area. You also see the effectiveness of the communication by the city

[9:46:18 AM]

increase 13% and satisfaction with a with our efforts promoted small, minority or women-owned businesses increased 5%. The bottom line is satisfaction with city services grew considerablum this year, and I look forward to the coming years where you we can continue to increase those numbers. So, like Spencer said, we were going to keep the presentation brief so we can show you the dashboard that has been created. You will remember last year we had a dashboard to electoral college around with the results and also had a separate deal within gis to look at the location of responses, but one of the challenges is that that dashboard was only available inside the city's network so we couldn't make it available to the public. Since then, we have a tool available to us where ware able to make this availability to public. Not only council and staff can dig through the results but community can understand them and really dig into it. No I will have my team do a quick demo of a Kim of the questions asked on the survey and also briefly walk you draw what you see here in this dashboard. >> Thank you so much. Good morning council and may I don't remember and main I don't mayor and mayor pro tem. I'm going to orient to you whatir 55 seeing. This dashboard is public facing, and that means we can share it with with the commonnette. It is something they are able to dive into the data and take a deeper look at the information coming from the community and historical data. Over to the left, you will see a bar that says annual community survey dashboard which hens orient the user to getting started and how to use the dashboard. To the right, you will see the daschle board. Let me go ahead and make it

[9:48:19 AM]

slightly bigger. So what this dashboard shows is in the middle it shows other level of satisfies or very satisfied responses, neutral, dissatisfied and very dissatisfied. To the left users are able to drill down specific questions or years or demographic or ethnicities, any sort of demographic information they may be interested in by council district, age, gender, he et cetera. To the right, there is a map that is interactive. You will see as I go through and narrow down and click on survey questions, the information will all change die dynamically. The over all quality of city services has gone up from last year. If you click

on the drop down of the survey question, you have the ability to do direct surge being circumstance know that quality of services is kind of the key words that I'm particularly interested in looking at. Here you can see it is 64.8% this yearing be as compared to last year, which was 50.5% satisfaction. You having the ability to drill down to particular council districts, if you're interested in seeing, for example, how council district 1 particularly felt about city services, and you will see that the map then drills down to district one, 2018, had 67.3% opposed to district 2, it goes to 63.4 and so on. It allows that interactive information. >> Is this live right now? How do you look at that time on the website in. >> This is live, and so we will be posting the final report, the presentation and lick to the

[9:50:20 AM]

survey dashboards online today and I will make sure it is send to all council members shy was curious if I could follow along on my computer. >> I don't have the ability to send you the link, but we will sediment it to you directly. >> How would someone find it without a line it's not an easily found link but we will promote the site through the stig's website and what not. >> Okay, so if someone just goes on the west of the cascades. >> Yes, this isn't something you would have to hunt around for, we will make it very obvious. Yes, sir. >> Great questions another area we saw a significant improvement is the level of communication. The O'er all effective communication by the city of extent. In 2018, we were at 48.6% compared to last year, which was 35.6%. And so it is one of those things where now, if I'm interested in saying, I am really only interested in seeing the folks who were satisfied or very satisfied, you know can see it is relatively evenly distributed throughout the city. And so if you're interested in looking at particular council districts, once again, you could then drill down and see how each council district feels about the level of satisfaction with the over all effectiveness of the city. So, as Kim had mentioned, the library was one that we noticed to be an area that we saw growth, so O'er all quality of city libraries within 2018 went up to 85.6 compared to 73%. What is really interesting is, as she mentioned that part of it could be due to the location of

[9:52:23 AM]

the sen travel library. If you look -- the central library. If you look at the satisfied and dissat satisfied responses, you will see in 20178 you will see a cluster around downtown Austin here. When you change that to 2018, it pulls back and you can see there's less little bubbles of dissatisfaction, which then leads us to believe that that could be due to the building of the central library and increased accessibility to these resources. >> Something that is also very helpful with the pure number is utilization of qualitative data. In the report that will be posted online, there are many hundreds of pages of open-ended comments from the community so historically, we've always had at least one question where individuals were able to put it just kind of anything they wanted to share with the city, but this year we added six more oppourtunities for folks to do that where the end of each section of the questions for each out of bounds we asked for eye -- each item we asked if you are satisfied or dissatisfied and why. We wanted to dig into that information what was going on, the mindset opposed to knowing they were just

dissatisfied. We also askedaphobes about their willingness to participate in on lane panels, unrising tools that Austin energy has been utilizing with its customers, they're opening that up to us to ask additional questions to folks that are willing to peat with you bet better context on their continues around different city services. So, at this point, open it up for any questions you may have. >> Comments, questions? At an over all level, I will make the observation, these are

[9:54:24 AM]

really good results. The numbers look real good. They are consistent with what we saw with the vote, the election if November, which is happening about the same period of time all the bonds were approved 70, 75, 80%, that is also an indication that people are trysting of what is happening here with the city, the city government and this is consistent with that, so it is good to see. Around. >> Kitchen: To see. Ann. >> You did knows anything statistical around parts of town. >> That is something they look at us, the opinion of equalest of services, satisfaction with them is solid across the entire geographic area of the city. If you were to dig into certain questions, you're going to see variations there, but over all it the satisfaction is level across the entire community. >> The reason ski is, it is helpful, this is great, I want to say thank you-for-all of this, I will just ask those questions because it helps us pinpoint where there may be additional needs. >> Right. >> So I would be curious about what it showed from a cross section, both in terms of geography and demographics. >> Right. >> You did all do that and did anything come up that indicates areas of further work? >> There's -- give me one second here. We do, in the report, one of the pieces of analysis that the surv, the etc does for us, is an analysis of importance verses satisfaction, and they're able to indicate areas

[9:56:24 AM]

that, if we were to make investments, not in terms of purely resources but maybe perhaps improvement of quality of service, things like that, they're able to break that down. So for economic title, affordability -- opportunity, affordability, they plan out growth and access to quality housing, health and environment, cleanliness of city streets and public areas came out on top of importance for satisfaction, and safety. There wasn't anything that just rose to the top as technically, there was a particular challenge of satisfaction, not equating with the importance but immobility, traffic flow and, which one of our challenges in terms of assessing traffic flow is people's awareness of things that are city streets, verses state streets and so on, so there are some challenges there but they noted transportation challenges to get around Austin, which is important. For culture and life-long learning, Austin is a please that preverves my personal heritage rose. Around the value received for city tax dollars and fees. These are all tables posted on the website. >> 66 a follow-up question. When you say important, you mean areas that showed a need for improvement or just areas people said were important. >> At the end of each section of the survey, one question is to rank the first top three or four items they feel are most important, soy're able to do analysis of those responses verses satisfaction. >> City manager, thing is

really good and I'm really pleased with the improvement. I'm just ask, those questions because what is really helpful to us is the drill down so we can understand -- so we can just

[9:58:25 AM]

understand the areas that may need improvement. Because we're doing very well, but I'm sure we're not perfect, and so I would just appreciate that kind of information for us so we don't have to cell down and find it -- don't have to drill down and find it ourselves. >> Thanks, as always, for the hard work on this and the open data portal is great. He would note, potentially for next year's survey, to have our mobility questions more tailors to what it that we're setting up as mobility outcomes would be helpful so a better question might be do you have options to reliably get to where you need to go, or whatever the question mite being which best reflect what is we are adopting. >> That's something we actually took into account ahead of time, anticipating the need to answer some of those types of questions. So some of the new questions we asked about my travel time is predictable, and then also a question about feeling safe traveling with other drivers on the roads. So some of that is in there but there is definitely opportunities to is more based on the conversation we had with all of you this past week. >> Okay, Leslie. >> I think that Alison had her light on first. I would be happy to go after her. >> Go ahead. >> Okay. I wanted to follow-up similarly to what Ann was talking about and get a sense of what may be the top two complaints were by district, because they're going to be different, I think, across the city and also the top two wins and for the same reason Ann was talking about, we can kind of target those and see, individually, in our districts, what specifically our residents are telling us. >> We will put that information together. >> Okay. Alison. >> Thank you.

[10:00:25 AM]

I'm really pleased to sees thee results and I lake the way you have' incorporated the strategic outcomes. I did wonder a little bit if you can speak to how you navigated how you navigated shifting toes the outcomes. >> There is not a specific discussion about how the survey was designed but the vast majority of the questions are the same questions as we've had historically, we were just able to reorganize them around the outcomes. For the most part, they all fit into a tech outcome pretty easily, so again I noted at the beginning it also opened our eyes to the fact we had some questions throughout that were asked in the prior format that were asked a couple different ways so we were able to thick them more clear and eliminate some of that redundancy. Utilizing existing questions, maintaining the act to do the benchmarking and analysis. And because of the clean up with allowed more space to put the met treks you approve -- metrics you approved, so we were able to add. >> Will we get a copy of all that? >> Yes. >> I had the pleasure of doing the survey in 2016 and it was really, really long I thank everyone who took the time answer the questions. It is really important information we get, but it takes people's time and they have to be willing to stick with it, because it is long. I appreciate that. One of the things I recall distinctly in previous years was the ratings on planning for development, and I don't see that in your snapshot.

[10:02:28 AM]

We weren't doing real well on that. >> I'm going to have them pull that up on the Daesh board quickly. The question is how well are we planning for growth. >> Okay. So how well the city planning for growth. In 2018, we were at 20.54% 20.4% satisfaction, compared to 2017 which was 15.6%. It looks like we went up a little under 5% on the level of satisfaction, and we can do further break downs by district, as well. >> That will be helpful to add, if you do district break downs, thank you. >> Absolutely. >> Anyone else? Great. Thank you very much. One last question. Of the 2200 completed surveys, how many were solicited? >> Well, they were all mailed directly to -- mailed directly to the individuals. >> How many were mailed out? >> Approximately 10,000. The response, the rate of around 25% or just a little bit under is absolutely fantastic, according to the survey experts. And then that 10,000 gives us the opportunity to reach that number, so there's some work on the numbers in terms to ensure we get bare minimum. >> One out of four people respond, are they generally happier or generally more upset? This is a survey, opposed for a poll, which would not allow for a self-selected group. >> I'm not able to speak to bias built in bias in

[10:04:31 AM]

that term, but they're monitoring the demographic of the responses so as we move forward along the timeline being IBM officered, if we're seeing numbers of folks that are a certain age group or race ethnicity, not following along with what we have in terms of census numbers, they will make sure to target individuals throughout the community to be able to boost those numbers. What the responses will be, they don't know in the end but we want, our first and foremost goal is make sure we're representative of the community with the response. >> The question I have, perhaps don't know the answer to, if 60% of our people are happy it could be 60% of the people in each demographic that responds are happy, but it could be there are a lot of unhappy people that don't respond and they were equally apportioned in each demographic group, we wouldn't know that from this. But what this does do, since the methodology is the same as the year comparison would be accurate within that group and they be the comparison to other cities with a bias, if existed work exist in each of those. >> Thanks. >> As we conclude this portion of the discussion, again, the survey is only useful if we do something with it so what I appreciated about this year is organizing around the strategic initiatives that allows the city manager's office and champions to dive deeper into those areas and departments that would be able to follow up on the work around the questions that were asked. We look forward to working with your districts if there are areas you want to dive in and learn about thank you for this. There is a lot to be proud of with our city and how our city feels about our city services. We have more work to do, but this is a great data point for us to work from, so thank you. >> Thank you.

[10:06:31 AM]

All right that gets us to pulled-by items. Let me hand out this. So, I'm handing out a latest version of the resolution. There's a version of the resolution in back up that is similar to what we laid out at work session, and this version on the message board alongside the powerpoint presentation from last work session. This version takes into account some of the conversation from last work session along with some of the comments that council member pool Meade Meade on the message board and I've done my best to incourt reporting rate as much of that feedback as I. Can I will walk through the red line, if folks don't mind. On the first page there is a red line, whereas that acknowledges past work. There have been some folks who have raised questions about can we better monitor units created by this program can we better monitor the units created by this program and I decided to include this whereas to recognize what council has done for all of the affordable housing programs. I think we should be committed to improving monitoring and efficiency and right to return across programs, whether or not they take vac of this progress. I wanted to recognize this continued work. And the "Be it resolved" sections, page four, you will see an he had et to ask the planning commission to not only approve the work but ask the manager to provide the work in this program, that is something the staff already needs to be do to comply with what we have way

[10:08:32 AM]

asked for in the strategic housing blue print so I was happy to add that in. If you look at her message board programs, that is the next page, page 5 of 8, the first red lean is a clarification of previous intent, but I had gotten enough questions, people have to come and ask for a change from council to access. And the intent and prior lines, the point is we hope that people building affordable housing can build those units without having to hire a lawyer without the months long process to comply with this. I tried to lay out at last work session, you should be able to access this program without further discessionary votes. The next red line is trying to be responsive to council member pool's point number two, which is really what our intent is with trying to disincentivize the demolition of existing affordable rental ion ets, so this is really trying to give the staff intent so they can craft the ordinance language so we don't utilize this. We try to utilize this program in places other than existing affordable rental. The next red line is really in response to council member pool'ssition number five, which I thought was very useful, we is that we don't want to reduce the number of affordable bedrooms and we want people to go back to comparable units. This section here as it relates to redevelopment is all trying to mirror and be tailors to what folks like the housing authority ever already doing in projects like if there is older affordable housing stock in those cases, some of the oldest public housing stock in the

[10:10:32 AM]

country, it is important for us to be able to renovate it but using these practices the housing authority uses, it can take care of existing tenants. The final red like on page five is a clarification of original intent,

but council member pool did point this out and I appreciate her pointing it out in her point number one is that the goal is for the program to exist in residential and commercial Zones, so the word residential is included. I always expected it to be implied but it is good to have it explicit so thank you for that suggestion. Then, if you turn the page, at the top of page 6 this is a peanut butter that was raised by council member as later and may have been by tovo and council member pool, number six, asks how we would manage mixed use developments, so that somebody wouldn't, for example, provide 3 or 4 affordable units and take -- affordable units and take advantage of the floors of retail space. So if much in consultation with staff and the law department we came down to this definition that developments accessing this program can't have more than 25% of their space be nonresidential use. That floor space, for example, he even an entirely affordable housing complex has computer lab, has nonresidential use and a health clinic on the bottom floor, that is nonresidential use so it is typical to be nonresidential use so this lays out a four story complex wouldn't have more than an entire floor dedicated to nonresidential use. Age usage. This number 8, red line it clearly states what it is we

[10:12:36 AM]

really mean. When people talk about waving site plan, they often times are referring to not going through the big multifamily and commercial site process by having more residential site planning. So number 8 is better worded as to not having, not about having consolidated review or waving review but for the site plan to more closely mirror the site plan for the small, multi family affordable housing complexes. Really that doesn't change the outcome. The last work session, it is just better worded. The last bit, which is the largest change. At the end of page 6, it is all of page 7, council member pool raised in her point number three we want to try to create more than 30% mfi units, and I agree. Both council members kitchen raised how can we incentivize being raised near transit and council member tovo, how can we raise it to be not just 50% affordable but to be 60% or more. There is a challenge there because on the one hand we don't want to exclude projects that are closer to 30% mfi, I think it was 2 or 3-years ago, we lost the tax credits in Austin so in that given year we had few to no affordable housing projects that year, but we had others. I didn't want to exclude folks that aren't able to make it there because it is so challenging. And same thing, we had had good affordable housing projects that aren't on transit. Get them more towards transit what this red line does is saying you can access the program if you are doing affordable housing to our

[10:14:36 AM]

standards. You go above and beyond, 75 to 100% affordable units, if have you 10% of your units at mfi, the tax credits, if you are within a quarter mile of one of our Austin city corridors, if you immediate one of those extra criteria, we would give a little extra height and extra density on top of what we are giving that way we aren't excluding any of the affordable housing developments that we're already supporting. If you are going above and beyond and meeting an even higher standard, we would grant a little bit more waiver on top of that. And I'm happy to walk through that and explain that further, but I just

wanted to lay it out simply like that and hear people's thoughts so those are the red line changes. These -- line changes. These speak to a lot of what I heard at last work session, they speak to six of council member pool's seven-points. The last point that isn't directly addressed here is her point number four, which I think I agree entirely, I haven't had time to run it by -- maybe I did put it in there. >> The second line, 25%, must be 2 or more bedrooms, unless the units. >> The permanent supportive housing for single adults. >> Than question, I think permanent supportive housing listed here is intended to be traditionally for single adults. What I haven't had a chance to run down is whether or not, when people provide permanent supportive housing for small families, if they ever do one bedrooms for a single mom and child, the point here is to get those multi bedroom units, unless they are psh and I just don't know, I think single adults is traditionally what

[10:16:36 AM]

those are made forism haven't had time since that message board post to get back. >> I think the broader application is better. If we have situations with families who need permanent supportive housing, he would be all for that, as well. I think this is good the way it is written. >> Thank you. We are trying to cover all of that and happy to take questions on that and/or other issues. Thanks. >> Thank you, and I apologize, I didn't get you my suggested changes so I will raise them again, or not raise them again, I will raise them and perhaps we can work on some language. So some of them are questions, more in the nature of information asking the city manager be back to us at the point at which we vote. So I think this is -- this is good. So first, on the waving of the design standards and this is something I just don't have enough information about and maybe it would be in the order of just asking for a report back when we get this back. And my question really concerned the kind of design we have that related to accessibility for seniors and for people with disabilities. So I wouldn't want to be able to wave those in all circumstances, so maybe you know the answer to that senate intent behind -- so my understanding is that residence shall design standards subchapter F are the mcmansion rules to reduce the over all numbers of bedrooms and foot print, the intent is not for get raised of any design rules it as relates to accessibility.

[10:18:37 AM]

The idea being that those -- I frankly believe it would be good for us to have when we're developing market rate single family homes to try to incentivize smaller ones than what we are getting now. But it is 50% affordable or more, then doesn't make sense to me to get rid of floor space because you're getting affordable floor space. We will double check subchapter F but that is floor space, not about access ability. >> I have a few more. Do you want to take others first? With regard to, we had so ever had some conversation with modeling and what I would like to ask is, when this comes back to us that we have some information that relates to how it's -- what kind of impacts we expect. I like what you've added in terms of the one year look back, not the look back but the annual report that's great. I would just like to understand better at the point at which we vote what our hopes are with regard to where we think it

might be helpful. >> And what would be helpful to me is that usually, when we're doing density bone nut modeling, there is complicated financial formula to see how many market rate developers we get to buy into the bonus. This, the affordable house regular requirements are set so high that there isn't a really financial modeling because generally people aren't going to just buy, if you are a for-profit developer, you are going to plug into this all the sudden, it really, this is really for projects that are

[10:20:40 AM]

specifically nonprofit, mission driven folks and there is going to be such a shift in how much of that is done because of the housing bond, that really, I mean, my expectations is, and I will get to your question in a seconds, my expectations is as we spend those dollars we're going to get more units than we anticipated before, if this weren't in effect tomorrow me, the interesting question is asking people, how many how much more do you think you can do. The question left still in my head from the last work session is which questions are we trying to answer, because this begs different questions than the traditional density programs do. What we can anticipate from this is, that, yes, we will likely get more units of affordable housing on pieces of land where affordable housing is chosen to be done, and that is in flux because we're implementing the housing bond in a way we've never done before with the implementation plan that is still in final stages of development, so I just don't know, so for me to answering the modeling question, I would want to land on which questions are we asking to be answered. >> I will try put some thought around that. So okay, I have a comment related to the -- it is actually related to the parking and/or the bus transit. I think that it would be helpful to -- I don't have a concern with waving parking but I think it is important for these developments to have some kind of tdm plan, so and just being located next to -- I mean, being located next to the bus or transit line is help 68 for the last part of what you put in, but in waving the parking

[10:22:41 AM]

requirements I think it would be help 68 for the complexes to have a transit -- I forget what it stands for. Just a plan, basically, when I say a tdm, I'm talking about some kind of plan so that may mean allow regular cycle on their lot, car to go on their lot, it could be, hey, we're close enough that we don't need to do something like that. Basically the development gives some thought to that. That is something they tend to do already anyway but that is something they should have to do if they're going to wave. And take advantage of any of this. >> Cool. >> I'll understand, I'll take that back to the transportation and see how that might interact and how it might interact with different sized developments because the larger ones tend to be doing what you're -- >> I don't think it is a warrior in terms of taking advantage of it. And then my last question, you have language in here already about the impervious cover, so I think I would like to understand better things like green space buffers and things like that. So that may already be inherent but I would like to understand that a little bit better. So I'll give some thought to that. >> Just a quick question and this is probably already included, it goes through the process, public hearings on this, the recommendation comes back from the planning commission and you recognize that, they

can recommend modifications. I think it goes probably without saying the manager and staff make recommendations. Since you called that out, probably something that makes it

[10:24:43 AM]

expolicesive to acknowledge the manager and planning commission can make recommendations back. >> And it is definitely implied and always that the staff should tell the planning commission and tell us places they think they can make changes. This is between last work session and this, the staff legal and dsd in particular saying if you meant residential site plan, this is the way you should do it. What I want to make sure and what I would love to have for the manager is make sure we are putting on you to make policy, when we initiate a councilretion solution, often times that you taking policy direction from us and I don't want to put new a spot you feel like you're having to do something outside of your lane either, so whatever the normal way is this goes, he I'm not trying to negate the normal way, I'm not trying to grant you additional responsibility to have to work through these policy issues yourself because this is a policy condition from the council. At the same time, I'm not trying to take away what is already your responsibility, helping us figure out how this works, based on your goals and your plan. So whatever that is, whatever it is saying the manager should do, treat this like the manager treats other policy issues, that's what I mean and that's why I didn't include anything. I did include the line about the planning commission because folks had asked the question, does this go into effect now and I wanted to put it on paper that this has to go to planning commission. >> I'm going to take a look at that language and see. Yeses, Natasha. >> Nothing because it -- oh, it is working. I just wanted to say, I really appreciate the effort your office is taking on this initiative. I'm feeling optimistic about the potential, also, I would like to say, looking through the questions and concerns, one thing I want to make certain my colleagues and I continue to do is remember the over all mission, and it is to facility

[10:26:45 AM]

the ability for the city of Austin to create affordable housing for more people and parts of the city, and to be careful not to jeopardize the opportunity by way of striving for perfection and not progress. So I just want us to be very careful there. I had the opportunity to take a really amazing tour with Bo MC mccarveer from the blackland community development corporation for all the land they've acquired there and edging over to Davis Thompson neighborhood, and district one, and some of the things that said to me that really resonated with me were how they had identified and were able to take advantage of opportunities, but how so frequently they just got lucky. You know, so I don't want us to miss out on opportunities because we're not going to get lucky. They've been, like he said, buying that dirt for 30-years, so it is a new Kay in terms of creating affordable housing, so I'm watching very carefully and looking forward to continuing this resolution, I think we're really going to make some headway here. Thank you. >> Sounds good. Alison. >> Thank you. I appreciate the new version and the recommendations of council member pool and how you incorporated them, look at them more carefully. I did, one question that I had in the prior version there was no site plan and now seeing a

residential site plan. The things I'm trying to understand is how we address drainage and driveway placement in this framework. Can you speak a little bit to how you are considering we would address those issues? >> Yes, and again, to clarify, when we said no site plan, we were in the common paratlantic ocean of no of the complicated site plan and question to what

[10:28:45 AM]

you would use in a single family home with aaadu. What we've asked the staff, the regulations don't go away because the process changes so those regulations, because we have them for residential construction, would still apply and the staff would still have to review, you know, Austin energy would still have to look at it and the fire department would have to look at it but they would look at it more leak they do single family in-fill that has the same amount of building cover and impervious cover, so we're not trying to prescribe how the staff utilized that process, but the same building cover and same amount of space a house would be built, we're asking for that site planning process to be more akin of the single family home to be built because they have similar shape and space. On the Aldridge and the front, the drainage qualities would be the same, admittedly there are differences between hooking up 8 units on a site opposed to two or four, so that's why we're sort of leaving to staff to come up with something that better mirrors the residential process, knowing it can't be identical. There is no additional drainage impact but there could be additional need for review when you're talking about, say, electric or water hook up. Make sense? >> I heard what you said, I'm not sure you or I is a technical expert enough to know what the implications are for the drainage. >> [Inaudible] >> No, I just don't have much of a voice. I'm not sure either of us are experts on this enough to be able to state clearly what the impacts are, and I would like to maybe hear from staff a little

[10:30:46 AM]

bit on that particular issue. I understand the need for the broader reduction in site plan obstacles, what I recall from the people's plan and what we are hearing from earlier points in time that when he folks are involved like that med with watershed, their real concern was the drainage issues were not being addressed in their communities so I don't want to create another problem because we didn't understand. That I don't know if staff with speak to what we mate need to have to address the drainage issue or not. >> Thank you. Housing and development services. Council member, we reached out to council member Casar. The process, the Riles don't go away, we had a way to do a coordinated review with this what I anticipate staff meet come back, with I've not spoken to waiter shed but our previous experience when we worked on codenext, doing residential heavy, you this is what this is akin to, we talked about processes at and different scale so I anticipate we would do that. That's why we've got it as a modified process so I think we would still be able to work with watershed to address the Kerns. I will know they were concerned about the 45% cover limit and that doesn't change under the guidance that we're being given. I don't have a specific able answer for you, but with a modified process we would incorporating rate drainage review on an appropriate scale. >> You're understanding the direction in here of

coming back with an ordinance that would have some kind of modified process that would take into conversation the drainage needs that would be there.

[10:32:48 AM]

>> Yes. >> Are there other areas staff has remaining questions we ought to know about he was reek at this resolution. >> I can only represent what dsd would look at. We would have to reach out to the other review partners, Austin energy, fire and other partners. I think that's what you're directing us as staff to could go back and take a comprehensive look at ordinance changes. The immediate one dsd, as a coordinator of the review what surfaced for me was site plan, maybe a big, complicated site plan is not the right answer for this intent but let us come up with a process and come back to you with that. I think that's what we would do. I don't have any other Kerns. I'm sure we will yet to hear from the stakeholders and incorporate that feedback, as well. Again, I haven't reached out to any other partner departments for this, would be me catching it saying, let's chat a little and bring something back to meet your goals, hopefully. >> I don't know, the city manager is not here now, but so is it the understanding that staff would be going out and coming back with something that was modified but is still, you know, when there is a health and safety issue it would still be addressed in an appropriate way. There are differences in scale here we need to address. Is it your understanding that you would be coming back with us and addressing all of those issues in an appropriate way when it comes back to us? >> Absolutely. That I believe's our direction is to provide our judgment as staff to make sure we are able to capture all the code requirements and come back with something that might be easier for these types to navigate, the cumbersome process do all the health, safety welfare review for sure. This doesn't change any codes other than the modifications of

[10:34:50 AM]

density requirements I see. We would still be assessing what we do for all the requirements. >> City manager, you were out of the room, is it our understanding you will be coming back to us with a modified process that staff would address the health and safety issues that our normal site plan addresses. >> Yes. >> Is it unclear, and it makes sense that at this point in the stage that other departments haven't evaluated, I want to make sure what we're providing policy guidance for, since we went from no site plan to a modified site plan, if we provide that blanket direction, I want to understand what we're giving direction for that my understanding is correct. >> Yes. >> And were there any other areas that staff had concerns about that we might need to address at this point in the resolution? >> Like I said, not at this point, council member. We just took high-level look, I think as we go through this and get stakeholder feedback, we will be able to be responsive and address those concerns. These types of, even those developments will impact a lot of departments and I can't speak for all of them so we will certainly reach out and have those conversations and we will come back with a comprehensive approach that captures everybody's concerns. >> So I had a question on the no parking, as well, going back to an issue that council member kitchen raised earlier. If question have no parking requirements,

what happens to handicapped parking, for multi family and single family, you have a parking spot so how are you imagining that would play out. >> I keep thinking of it as it goes through the process, I read of it and talked to folks in the world of rights for folks with

[10:36:50 AM]

disabilities and I will get to that, to answer your factual question, this does not wave any state or federal requirements it as related to Ada parking and my understanding is that Ada parking, you start adding that Ada parking as you build parking and the vast majority of these cases, I expect that parking will still be provided and that will then bring Ada parking along with it. The issue is, but essentially waving parking, we allow the flexibility for the housing builders to only build the parking they think they need and not over build parking. The capital studio developments downtown sud serve does serve a significant number of low income people with disabilities because there is no parking requirement. I think they have avenue worked with organizations there to not provide resident parking and instead metro access. So I think it is a complicated issue you can one that, from my understanding this won't change any of our Ada rules and I'm happy to continue having conversations about it. There are folks the Ada parking space that really helps, they really want it, and there are arguments from disability rights folks they might utilize cars less so they will pay for housing or parking they don't need. That's why we need to continue to comply with the federal and state rules it as relates to Ada parking and folks have ideas how we can best make sure this is most accessible. It is a complicated issue. I'm happy to continue conversations and work with people on that. >> The perspective and complexity there that is helpful to better understand. Broadly speaking, I think the resolution goes in a positive direction. I think it builds off of conversations we were having in

[10:38:50 AM]

the housing committee in the last two-years is folks in the community what they need and many things they raised are addressed in this resolution and I'm happy to see that. I would like to second the call for remodeling, what I've heard from some builders, once they get to the point of understanding, it is aimed for affordable house builders and our bond is a question of, how does this interact with the time of building that gets built and how does that affect costs. Our assumption is if you get more units, it is better you get more but one of the realities of real estate economics is that as you change building type it gets more expensive I have to build it so you don't end up with more units at more cost effective point, so I would like to have a little bit of understanding on that because it might be, for instance, what we just added on the 10% of 30% below won't do it because it changes the type of construction on X, Y and Z cases and something else we need to be icing as our lever and the models will help us get to a better point of how we do that how the realities of construction react with the rule that we're putting forward. >> Leslie. >> Thanks. Along those lines, what Ann and Alison were talking about, parking requirements. If parking can be part of the Ada management plan that would help what I like to focus on. A friend of mine with a disability, she has a car but doesn't have a parking spot because other people

in her apartment complex have a disability, too, have used up the three spots available and there is more than three people

[10:40:51 AM]

who drive cars and have a disability. And how close to your unit is the parking spot so those are other things for the chainette folks with disabilities I would like us to be sensitive. If that's what we're targeting, we can lift them up in ways we've never done before. I would like us to look at that he would one additional thought to consider, the comment about the Cray tier I can't changes at tdhca, the community housing at the state level, think changed the criteria for scoring the tax credits annually, so it makes it difficult-for-developers in the affordable housing community to target their programs. Sage brook is one of those situations back couple years ago, we were trying to get them some tax credit money and they qualified for the 9% but didn't win it so they came back next year and the tax credit criteria on the qap, which is the qualified allocation plan, at the state level had changed. So there was a boom rack boomerang effect. So what I would like to do is see if working with our housing office with Rosie and her great staff, maybe we can find a way to quickly respond to qap or scoring criteria changes so we can, for example, boost funding in an area with a project we think is really great but they're not going to qualify because of the changes to the criteria, maybe that's what we focus some of our bound monies so that is a nuance we can work on when we get the program up and running but it would allow us to more quickly respond to the scoring changes and allow good projects to proceed. >> Anything else before we move on? Ann. >> Just a question about the

[10:42:53 AM]

length of the 40 areas length for the rental housing. Was the thinking that that really that if we asked for anything more, it would be too much of a barrier. Is that what the thinking was? Okay. >> The goal of the resolution is to really mirror what it is we're currently requiring for our subsidy. And, I actually have a "Be it further resolved" on page 7 of 8 which says the amendments initiated by this resolution should be it aligned with a goal to future changes in the housing program. Currently, there is a stakeholder process on going about changing the length of affordability, if you get city dollars. My expectation is, if at the end of that process which should go from 40 areas to 50-years, we should change this to go from 40-years to 50-years. What I don't want to do is have sort of a very separate requirement over here, preempting, you know, if we want to get more 30% mfi units, we should fund more and require more for city dollars. Or do it for the whole package. >> Okay, I assume that process you're referring to also, or the conversations that are happening, I think this do, just let me double check with you, part of the concern is the enforcement processing, so I would -- it's not just extending the affordability period, it's our processes and methods for ensuring or enforcing affordability. I think that is part of the process, right? >> Yes, and in that first whereas and red like it is the fourth whereas but the first in red line, it responds to those

[10:44:55 AM]

questions where folks have said can we better monitor income restrictions there. >> I see it. >> Again, instead of better monitor it for folks in this program, we've been working on contracts to better monitor all. I think that is critical and I think that's why we add understand dollars to expand the monitoring contract. If it is important here, it is important everywhere. Now that I have' heard council member alter's question it brainstorms for me what might be useful is through this process, planning commission and others for us to see more examples of will use this on tips, which is if it weren't for, the sort of "But for" so we can look at affordable housing developments we have approved and if this had been in phase what they would have look -- in place, what they would have looked like. If this goes into effect how they can improve those and change those, and to me that seems to potentially answer some of those model questions of late so people can see what the difference with a look like on the ground. >> Sounds good. Kathie. >> Calm of a couple of quick questions and maybe a suggested amountment. Thank you for addressing the concerns I raised at the last work session about how we are careful not to incentivize the redevelopment the naturally occurring affordable units. I think the language on page five assists in that effort. With regard to number one, we've had some conversations about that language, and I think, I would suggest than I would be happy to make it as a formal amendment but suggest it is an easy one to incorporate, I would suggest removing aging or dilapidated. I think aging creates an issue. Dip lap dated gets to the point

[10:46:56 AM]

if it is dilapidated and in need of redevelopment, its aging pretty much coverses anything on the ground because everything is aging. >> Exactly. What I'm trying to do is create space for the professional staff to sort of create be, right, we're all aging, isn't what we're trying to do here, it is -- the needle we're trying to thread so you get a sense of the challenge has been, if a, you know, some of our public house regular mains up to code, and we tried our best to keep it from becoming in dilapidated condition but it is so expense I have to keep it up, the question is how do we make sure it can happen without us having to find Chalmers as dilapidated. >> I think we have other language in the context of his store I can preservation that -- historic preservation that may help. >> We're trying to get to the same goal and want to make sure the staff have a our intend but they would write things out longer. >> Page 4 of 8, there isal line I don't understand and several people have quite to me. Would be available for development or redevelopment irrespective if it it need as zoning change, et cetera. I see the clarification line but the question raised is are you suggesting,. What to the discretionary globing change is this impacting that in any way? >> I think really the intend is the line in red. The line prior to it was written by the law department in response to the line in red but I ended up leaving it in because

[10:48:58 AM]

I think the line prior to the line in red, that you read out loud, would this extra entitlement be able to be achieved by affordable housing builder who is asking for a zoning change, and I think the intent here is to say yes this would always be on top of whatever the zoning change that was brought us to. But I'm happy to be flexible on that point. Really the intent of the lean was supposed to be -- >> Second one. Yeah . And then the third, you know, the third line in that section, the property owner would be allowed to use this in addition to any other. That also gets to the model issue. I want to understand how this works with others. I am reminded here and I think we discussed one density program iced ice iced in conjunction with another, so some units have both programs so I doubt we want to reduce the housing requirements of developers. See how that works in practice. We don't want this to result in fewer units than two different programs. >> Of course. The intent would be to try to make sure the entire building, no matter how tall or dense is 50 per cent or more or taking advantage of the extra 75% or more. >> I will note because somebody will ask me, this is the smart outside and uno, I don't think it was clear to most people involved the same units are qualifying developers under the smart housing program and the uno program, so we're getting half as many affordable units as we would have had the requirements for both held true. >> Okay. Leslie. >> And we're hoping to fix it. >> I wanted just to return to

[10:50:58 AM]

the qualified legal qualify allocation plan because I wanted to make sure we respond nimbly to the changes and to help the city goals adopted fill the funding gap, the boomerang effect, the changing criteria at state level. I'm suggest we tackle the problem with this two pronged approach, communicate with the changing gap and allow the staff to put gap funding together quickly for those affordable housing projects that may need it, when we see this is not a part of the resolution at all -- from Greg's resolution at all this would be separatism wanted to make sure the city manager heard this and give us response back on whether you think that would be a good move forward so we can understand what the changing criteria would be in advance and do what we can nimbly as city to follow our goals and offer some of our bond funds to help promote a project that is really good but mass has fallen off because of the -- fallen off because of the changing criteria criteria. >> We will talk to staff and get back to you about it. >> Thank you, Paige. >> En annual report about some of the metrics that help us identify how successful we're being on the housing supply. I would be curious to see a table on how we're utilizing the specific wafers wavers and allowances to see how success of this is to gauge it going forward. >> Sounds good. Are we ready to move on? All right, thank you very much. Those are all the pulled items

[10:53:00 AM]

we have. We've had the briefing. Colleagues on planning commission, I wanted to touch base with you. There is a landout that has come us to, our clerks handed it out, last year we had that lawsuit that was

file the, it challenged, it suggested that 8 members of the then planning commission commission were related to, sufficiently related to real estate and development so as to count against the allowed for folks. Of those 8 people, six of them still serve on the planning commission at this point. The ones that are still serving are Patricia sequer, Karen McGraw, fiaz James shay, James Kesler and Greg Anderson. Two that came off were Trinity white and Tom knuckles. We will know from the posting that Natasha put up that you're contemplating Patrick Howard as your nominee. At this point, I would point out that there are six people still on here with Patrick Howard that would potentially give us seven people. If whoever it was the attorney general, whoever it was who filed the lawsuit would consider Patrick Howard to be in the same boat as gregs and Greg Anderson. Greg Sanders with the habitat for humidity. If we leave the habitat for

[10:55:01 AM]

humidity and the how housing authority did not count against that number, if Alison's nominee who is retired but was a real estate agent also would not count against that number that would be three people out of the seven, which would leave four. 88 just point this out to the body, if we were to keep the people that we have, approve the person that was nominated at this point and everybody else stayed the same, it would appear as if we would have seven people that the attorney general filed that light, he would still say we have three people too many. May suggestion at this point is we ask council to set this for executive session to talk to us about that lawsuit and talk to us about the people that appear on this list at this point. So that we can discuss that in executive session. Okay. I don't know if there is a chance to do that only Thursday or not, related to boards and commissions. Yes, Leslie. >> Thank you, you asked us last session for offer up potential nominees for conversation and I haven't posted this yet but I wanted to brick attention to indicate yay haloran. She has a masters from UT. And she was planner for other cities before that and she has been pie appointee on the design commission for the last several years. She is currently working as a freelance writer, she is not a land use professional so she may be a potential appointee that folks may want to look at and we will be sure to get her -- I think she is up on the boards and commissions website because she son the design commission at this time. So she worked for miami-dade

[10:57:02 AM]

county, was in metropolitan planning section in Florida. Ship worked with a consulting firm managing that county's post disaster redevelopment plan in the past. She was a neighborhood planner for the city when she worked for the city. She was a lead planner, so she has the planning chops. She managed a bilingual public out reach strategy with meet fashion siltation with graphic terms with gif software has done land use coordination. I will put this on to the message board for you all to look but Katie would be a really good prospect for our conversation for one of these planning commission spots. >> Okay, thank you. So you go ahead and check and see if you can get that on your executive session. Does anybody else have anything else? Manager. >> Just a note to council and the public, we will be withdrawing item

19, a purchasing item for the disparity study. Back in December we talked about process to really get more everyone gaugement and we will be issuing a solicit -- more engagement and we will be issuing a solicitation but we had to put it on the agenda but we will be withdrawing that, so I wanted to note that. >> Sounds good. >> If I may. >> Natasha supply understand the issue is problem regoing evolve into a conversation that we have in executive session, I would be remiss not to point out that we very carefully considered our candidate pool, and we did our due diligence and spoke with the clerk he is office and legal prior to moving forward with presenting this particular candidate. And something else I would like to point out I want to make certain nobody forgets is district one has a very specific and very nuanced need in the city of Austin when it comes to who our representation is. I would also like to point out there are no black representatives on the planning

[10:59:02 AM]

commission. While I understand we are generally risk averse, I want to make sure we are taking every possible opportunity to have really accurate, thorough, fair, equitable representation on our planning commission. So I look forward to the dialogue in executive session. >> Sounds good. All right, with that said, then, we're going to go into closed session to take up three items opportunity to the government code, we will discuss competitive matters related to e-2, which is Austin generation resource planning and opportunity to 5551.071 we will discuss items related to e-3, which is the petition and e-4 which is distribution policies for low to moderate income housing. Without objection, at 10:58, we will go into executive session. We will not be returning back here except for me just to close us out.

[02:02:15 PM]

>>Mayor Adler: We are out of closed session. In closed session we discussed competitiv matters related to item: E2 and legal matters related to items: E3 & E4. It is 2:02 p.m. and our meeting is adjourned.