

City Council Regular Meeting Session Transcript – 03/28/2019

Title: City of Austin

Description: 24/7

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 3/28/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 3/28/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[10:11:07 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, I think we have everybody we need. But before we begin the meeting today, we have invocation is reverend Tom grevos of shepherd of the hills lutheran church. Everybody please stand. >> Thank you, mayor and city council for the invitation. God of all creation, as we see and experience the beauty of the Texas wildflowers and the grace of spring time, may we remember how you gifted us with this beautiful world giving us responsibility to care for our Earth and to care for one another. We are grateful for the men and women of different cultures, colors and creeds who devote themselves to the care and responsibility of your creation, including those serving on the city council and those who serve our city in a variety of vocations. May the conversations, debates, disagreements and decisions made by this elected body reflect your will for the betterment of your creation and specifically the city of Austin. May the marginalized, powerless and forgotten ones, those who voices are too often greeted by apathy and greed be heard and given attention. May there be a spirit of gentleness and humility so that arrogance will not find its way but kindness and

[10:13:08 AM]

shalom, peace may be reflected in the heart of our great city of Austin. May we as a community amidst all our diversity reflect the words of the prophet Micah to walk humbly with your god. Thank you for this moment in time and may this moment give birth to a future bright with possibility for all our citizens. And thank you for the dedication and servant leadership of our mayor, councilmembers and all those serving this place. May all be unified in the care and responsibility of stewarding your creation. Amen. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So before -- mayor? Since we're still had the ceremonial part of the meeting, I think an elected official had their birthday this weekend and got away with not being embarrassed at a work session. >> Mayor Adler: Noted. [Laughter] Probably not the reaction that you wanted to that. >> Are we not going to sing happy birthday? >> Do you want to get it started? [Singing] >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. [Applause] It's amazing we have a whole room of people who are in absolute disbelief that

we would actually sing by choice that we would do that. Thank you all. I think before we start the meeting, also I think that

[10:15:10 AM]

we have -- I think we might have in the room with us some journalism students at university of Texas. Do we? Welcome. [Applause] You know, we live in a day when many of the institutions that are so important to this country are being challenged and I for one and I'm sure speak for my colleagues on the dais, the importance of journalism and press to safeguard freedoms and our democracy can't be overstated. So thanks for choosing this as a direction to go on. And if you write about today's meeting, please be very kind. [Laughter] Let's go ahead and convene the meeting. Today is March 28, 2019. This is the city council chamber here in Austin. We're in city council chambers here. It is 10:16. And we are in 301 west second street, Austin, Texas. Council, as I look at changes and corrections for today, some things that should be noted, item number 6 postponed until may 9th. Items 11 and 81 postponed until April 25th. It should be noted items 16 and 17 are related items. Item number 29 has been withdrawn. Item number 32 postponed to may 23, 2019. Item number 39, councilmember Garza -- mayor pro tem Garza should be shown as sponsor. Item 42, councilmember Ellis

[10:17:12 AM]

should be shown as sponsor. Item number 45, Theresa wisely's last name -- spelling has been corrected. It should be noted on item number 80, a valid petition has been filed in opposition to the zoning request. We don't have anything that was set for time certain matters, but, colleagues, there's some confusion as to what we intended to with respect to the Austin strategic mobility plan. Someone had requested a time certain toward the end of the day, and at work session what we said we wouldn't set it for a time certain, so if we have the time and there are people here who want to talk about it, we can take it up earlier. On the record we didn't make clear as to whether or not we would be coming back after dinner if that was the only thing that we would be coming back from dinner for. So do we want to decide that question here? Again, we're talking about the strategic mobility plan and the question before us is if we finish all our work and we exhaust all the speakers that have signed up and then we break for dinner, will we be coming back. Mayor pro tem. >> Garza: Who requested a time certain? I missed that. >> Mayor Adler: I don't remember who it was that requested that on the dais. At the work session. Someone had raised that. >> Garza: I just don't remember anybody asking that, but personally I thought the agreement -- yes? >> Kitchen: I didn't ask for a time certain, but I thought we should let people know. That's all I said. >> Mayor Adler: That's probably why it was unclear. >> Garza: I thought the discussion as work session we would basically take public testimony and then either my preference would be to not take a vote at all, just take public testimony. I think councilmember tovo

[10:19:13 AM]

suggested leaving the public hearing open for the next time we hear this and discuss amendments. >> Mayor Adler: So I think the answer to the question for the public then, unless there's objection, is we're going to meet here and take speakers, and if we don't have any speakers here and if we break for dinner and we've finished all our work, we will not be coming back. But as we discussed earlier, we're not going to be closing the public comment opportunity, so when it comes back to us we won't take final action on it and when it comes back to us it will be open again. Okay? All right. So items have been pulled on the consent agenda for us today. Items 10 pulled to determine -- actually there's a blank on that.

Councilmember Renteria, did you want to propose how that blank should be filled in? >> Renteria: Yes, mayor, I would. You know, I want to -- this is a very exciting time for me especially on this resolution here because we're actually going to create a board to administer the homestead preservation tif money that we're getting there so that we can reinvest this into affordable housing. And I would request that -- to my colleagues that we would make and recognize the mayor as chair of the committee -- of the board who is going to have oversight of this funding so that we can invest it into our affordable housing projects that we have in our district, in district a. And this -- this has been in the works for almost ten years. Eddie, state rep Eddie Rodriguez, introduced legislation about ten years -- 11 years ago to

[10:21:13 AM]

create a home spread preservation district in a rapid gentrifying area of east Austin. And because of his legislation, we were able to create a tif there where we are going to be taking money that -- tax money that we're going to be able to reinvest into build affordable housing and retain our low-income people and especially our workforce people there in east Austin. So I would -- I would hope that we can recognize you as the chair of this board. And I make that nomination. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. And thanks for your leadership on this for a really long period of time. With that, then, that would stay on the consent agenda. Item number 12 will stay on the -- I mean -- item number 12 has three people that are signed up for it. All are speaking in favor of this item. There are four people now signed up for this all speaking in favor of this. Do we want to pull this item, do four people want to speak or should we just let it proceed on consent? Is anyone signed up for number 12 that wants to speak on number 12? That would be Mr. Peña, Hirsch and Rodriguez. Three people. That being the case, I see people weighing off. Keep that on consent. 12 stays on consent. The next item that we have pulled is item number 14. That's been pulled by councilmember alter. Item number 23 pulled by councilmember tovo. Item number 30 pulled by councilmember tovo. Item number 34 has been pulled by speakers. Item number 37 has been

[10:23:15 AM]

pulled by councilmember Flannigan. And item number 40 has been pulled by councilmember tovo. With respect to item number 15, I've handed out an item on the dais, it's the same thing that I handed out to my colleagues at the work session on Tuesday. It's just a direction to the manager with respect to the brush square creek master plan to ask that he take a look at now what it's going to take and where we might move the fire station as called for in that plan. If there's no objection, we would add that direction. And with that, then, 15 stays on the consent agenda. >> Casar: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Casar: As well on 15 on consent, there is an art area designated in the master plan and we've been talking to public places and parks and others to add in art and play. And just added these words to make sure it's successful art pieces in this downtown historic square, welcome exploration and play by children and the city of Austin should explore potential for more engaging play area on the site as isn't stated in the plan, there's just not enough areas for kids to play downtown and I think this is a key opportunity. >> Mayor Adler: Any objection to including the and play component? Hearing no objection, that's also added and this item stays on consent. Yes, councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: I hope when we get to the point we are creating an art place for that site, it does reflect that it was the fire station here in Austin and it should sort of reflect the historic part of that fire station that we have there when it comes to the art design. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. The consent items are items 1 through 44 and also 83 and

[10:25:17 AM]

84 as they appeared on the addendum. So far the items we have pulled are 14, 23, 30, 34, 37, and 40. Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I would also like to discuss 32. >> Mayor Adler: So let's pull 32. Do you want to pull it or just -- >> Flannigan: I want to discuss postponement. >> Mayor Adler: Let's pull item number 32. Okay. We have some people that have signed up to speak on the consent agenda. Any comment before we go to the public? Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Mayor, the document that was distributed this morning on the dais for number 40 actually includes the amendment I was prepared to make which was to add the wastewater protection department and development services as part of that work group, so I have no need to pull that to add that. I would just note that the copy distributed on the dais actually doesn't reflect those as changes, but they are exactly the amendment I was intending to make. 40 can go back on the council agenda -- I mean back on the consent agenda. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you for that. The other change as evidenced by what's handed out sidewalks has also been added to the priority items. With that item number 40 will stay on the consent agenda. Let's talk to the folks speaking on consent here. Mr. Peña, do you want to come on up? >> Mayor, give me the number of the items again. >> Mayor Adler: 6, 9, 16, 17. >> Thank you very much. Good morning, mayor and councilmembers, Gus Peña, president of veterans for progress. I'm going to speak to 6, 9

[10:27:17 AM]

and as the mayor alluded to 16 and 17. Number 6 is having to do with support of commissioning a -- I'm sorry, that's -- you did say 16, right? Oh, 16, okay. To address food accessibility. It's a very important

issue that we even started with food banks back when Bruce Todd was mayor. We're highly supportive of number 6. Number 9, it's, you know, I know it's a litigation issue, but I wanted to let you know that I as a bailiff I met Robert ice even-hour, he's a good attorney and these going against a friend of my former judge Bob Perkins and regarding the naming of a certain street. I'll leave it at that. It's kind of sad we have to do battle legalwise. Number 16 is having to do with an agreement with payer alliance for pay for success, and 17 also. We're highly supportive of that. And I wanted to just add a little bit addition and a little bit of comments on that. Mayor Bruce Todd was mayor at the time. We started doing affordable housing and the verbiage started then, not after the -- anyway, I wanted to let you know mayor Bruce Todd was instrumental in helping bring around transitional housing. We started that issue also and before mayor Bruce Todd started, Gus Garcia, may he rest in peace, transitional housing and wrap-around services which is the verbiage starting to be used again. Kudos to everyone on this funding. I've been homeless myself as a Marine Corps veteran and I didn't have anybody to help out. That's why we're working with the hud, the secretary of hud and also secretary of

[10:29:19 AM]

veterans affairs and they have been very supportive in getting veterans housed. You all did a good job in counting the homeless people, but I still legal you know it's a under count. Job well done. I want to let you all know we're highly supportive of that, but we need especially number 16 and 17, the supportive housing. We support it. Now we're 6,455 members. We're supportive and thanks for everything everybody does for housing because there are a lot of homeless people out there. I don't agree with the latest count. It's getting better, but I still don't agree with it. It's not on target. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. Have a good day. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Koo-hyun Kim? Is he here? You wanted to speak on number 9, which is the legal agreement for legal services for representation related to Perkins versus city of Austin. >> Thank you, honorable city mayor and councilmembers. My name is koo-hyun Kim. You have a case, that case was already in federal court case. And how could you -- that case moved here to the side? It's a law. They said it's a law. What is the law? The city has a federal court case, they have already won this. No documentation at all. Just moved here. You decided here. What is the law? How can you remove the case, a federal court case right

[10:31:20 AM]

here, city council? I have so many cases, city council and the federal court cases, all of you dismissed it without hearing at all. And I asked the Austin city police decided to investigate Austin community college case of terrorism to me. Austin community college, I was a college professor over there. They killed my professor job two months and 15 days, they used the police officers, kidnapped me outside up until today. I have a case here. I came here cements. I asked you -- so many times. I asked you to investigate, to decide. You didn't. Instead your police officers threatened me to arrest here if we come back here. This police, Austin city police, especially. Mr. Green. I have a case, I asked Mr. Green to investigate. That green, Mr. Green, gave me a bible. That was it. And I went to the city council, Austin city police

department -- [buzzer sounding] -- Do you know what they do? It's not a citizen communication. I have a question. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. >> That was it? No answer? >> Mayor Adler: No answer because this item is about increasing attorneys fees in a case, and I think that's the action that's before us. Thanks for coming down. The next speaker is Scott Johnson. Is Scott Johnson here? Do you want to speak on item number 40?

[10:33:22 AM]

How about ray Collins? Why don't you come on down. >> May I have my first slide? My name is ray Collins. I'm here today to speak in support of item 40, and specifically acceleration of the tier 1 Bergstrom spur urban trail, which is the only nonvehicular route to the airport. This slide from the February 28th mobility committee meeting shows that this trail is in the planning phase. Let's talk acceleration. Last January 14th campo executive director Johnson told the campo transportation policy board that the planning phase of the project had been moved up to this year. It was previously scheduled for 2021. Moving back in time to the spring of 2017, councilmember kitchen put her hand up for some 2016 mobility bond money to buy the U.P. Right-of-way. She reminded the mobility committee of this on February 28th, and thank you again, councilmember kitchen. The most recent effort began as a result of a January 20th, 2017, meeting between councilmember kitchen, her senior policy adviser Ken Craig, Southwood district 3 residents, Kate mason, Peggy Dunn, Tara Connally, Larry Murphy and yours truly from Southwood district 5. In Southwood district 3, the Bergstrom spur connects up to [inaudible] 31. Vincent drive is a substandard road and this section of route 31 is so dangerous that back when I was commuting by bike, I

[10:35:24 AM]

routinely advised anyone and everyone to avoid by carrying their bikes across the U.P. Railroad where it cuts Lansing drive. That's the lower left of the slide. Slide off, please. The same Southwood residents have also spoken to councilmember kitchen as mobility chair and councilmember Renteria as the Southwood district 3 representative about the dangers of walking, biking and driving on Vincent drive. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. What about Gilbert Rivera? Mr. Rivera, do you want to speak to number 11? This item is to be postponed at the staff's request. >> Yes. Thank you, mayor, and city council. Good morning. I was here necessarily to request that this item not be postponed, but since it has been, I would like to talk a little about red bluff. Red bluff is about 57 acres of pristine property land that is owned by or controlled by several city departments at this time, and we as a community have been working almost four years doing major remediation in respect to dumping of oil, of mattresses, of all types of debris in that area and had been pretty much neglected by the city. And the community began to organize around that. We have had major cleanups. We have had a minimum of 200 volunteers clean up large areas of this property. And in the -- and at the same time we had been working on getting -- there's three pieces of land that are -- and I use the

[10:37:26 AM]

word owned, but I know that's not the right term, owned by the departments of the city of Austin. We have been working diligently with all of them. They have all agreed to and pard has agreed to take that property and have it designated parkland as a wilderness preserve, and so we would like to see the council approve the whole 59 -- 56.9 acres as parkland. One of the things you all are discussing is probably using some of that land as for housing. We are very concerned about that because a couple of points, the nearest bus stops to this property are at least three-quarters of a mile and you are going deeper into east Austin. Park lane and Ledesma. If we build housing back in there, it's going to take that long and it's close to to -- Ed Bluestein boulevard. The other thing important for us is the six acres that is being considered is also the majority of it is on a flood plain. We need to remind ourselves and remember our history about flood plains and houses being built on floodplains. So I'm here to say we would like on the 25th of April, we'll be here for you all to support dedicating all of this area as parkland. And I'd like to take the opportunity also to thank councilmember Renteria for he took the lead in helping us coordinate with the different departments and get the equipment needed out there -- [buzzer sounding] -- To eliminate and remediate all of the destruction. Appreciate your time. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[10:39:26 AM]

[Applause] Is Mike Rodriguez here? Did you want to speak? On 12? >> I was under the impression we couldn't speak because it had been pulled. >> Mayor Adler: 12 hasn't been pulled. We're keeping it on consent. But if you had wanted to speak on it, you can. >> Okay. Good morning, mayor, city manager and councilmembers. Mike Rodriguez, president of the onion creek homeowners association. The -- the homes that we're talking about in item 12 we support the buyout funds and grateful the city is willing to commit financial support to that effort. The neighborhood started in 1973 and we have today over 1470 homes. So these 146, 147 homes represent 10% of the neighborhoods. Our concern is it be done right and the city remember flood mitigation is needed for houses that surround these so we don't come back at future date and visit buyouts as well. We think the neighborhood is largely safe, but, of course, watershed protection department in their atlas 14 realize some homes still are at risk. The last thing is for the demolition following the buyouts. We want to make sure they are done well and that the greenbelt is resoared as it should be because -- restored because they've done an excellent job but left in the driveway stems of all these houses that they've already demolished, which is about 19 to date, which makes it look a little like a tornado had gone through there rather than we have normal removal. I think they will get to that, but I want to make sure we continue to follow up and we thank you again for your support. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Those are all the people I had signed up to speak on

[10:41:27 AM]

the consent agenda. Again, the items that have been pulled are items 14, 23, 30, 32, 34, 37. Those are the pulled items. Any discussion on the consent agenda on the dais? Councilmember Pool. >> Pool: I just wanted to make a really brief community about item 41, and then -- but not pull it. So I just wanted to take a moment to express my gratitude to prief Gina Hinojosa for carrying this bill. This is the inclusionary bill that she filed earlier this month. And I also want to thank my co-sponsors on this resolution here for joining together in support. We've got an opportunity with this legislation to regain the use of inclusionary zoning as a tool for affordable housing, and I'm optimistic of its chances with our Progressive cities. We just need to keep pushing this conversation forward, and I think that this bill filed by representative Hinojosa helps us with that, so thank you very much. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I want to thank my colleagues. This is a 30-year-old law that no longer applies to current conditions and I'm hopeful we can get that through the legislature. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: For those that came down on item 11, I just want to reassure you guys it is to be parkland, but we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of Austin that wants to -- that supported us on the affordable housing bond, 250, to look at all city

[10:43:28 AM]

properties and see what's available. What I've seen so far, I don't think that's going to -- that piece -- five acres is going to be in the running for housing. I just don't see it, but we have to go ahead and investigate and do the research whether it's -- it's an attractive, desirable place to build affordable housing. And that's the only reason why we pulled this item, to have it looked at so that we could make that determination. And what I've done so far, I don't -- I just don't see that it's going to be able to -- we're going to be able to build anything there because it's just one way in and one way out. But we do have a responsibility to look into that. >> Mayor Adler: Further comments on the dais? Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Yes, I have a clarification, some comments and actually a question on that same item that councilmember Renteria was talking about. It's actually a standing council policy I think that any public sites -- any city-owned sites be assessed first for affordable housing use and I wasn't sure if that -- if that was part of why it was being postponed at the time. Because that assessment is part of standard city policy. I just wanted to make a couple comments -- well, one, a clarification, mayor, I requested that item -- let's see, not 40. Item 30, that we do pull it, but I have a couple quick questions that I think are best in executive session and so I would ask that we have an opportunity to ask those questions in executive session and then take it up when we get back. >> Mayor Adler: We'll do that. >> Tovo: Thank you. I wanted to make a couple quick comments. First about the brush square master plan. This is exciting to see this moving forward. Our council back in 2016 on a resolution I brought forward asked that there be some more comprehensive planning. We knew at that time about cap metro's downtown metro

[10:45:29 AM]

rail station plan, and it seemed clear with all of the development and the conversations going on there needed to be more comprehensive planning. So some stakeholders came together as a result of that resolution and that process really didn't achieve, I think, what it needed to. I'm so grateful to the parks department for continuing this effort and to do the master plan for brush square. I think it set very strong directions for us moving forward, and I would just call your attention to the piece in the plan, think comprehensively about the brush square district about the importance of planning, of district based planning, especially in areas such as that one where you will see lots of development and redevelopment to make sure that that planning is happening in a comprehensive fashion. And including lots of different departments. Again, kudos to our staff for that. I think they've done a terrific job on that brush square plan appreciate the way you've worked with all the stakeholders and compiling it. Thanks to my colleagues, I think the mayor's amendment I'm very supportive of and that articulation, councilmember Casar for play elements. It's a good opportunity just to mention there is also a standing council policy that came -- that became part of standing council policy as a result of a resolution from 2012 that I had brought forward stating that all new city facilities and city sponsored projects oriented to the public should include family-friendly features such as creative play spaces, neutral based play areas and arts. I would remind our staff that should always be a component of our public space planning and including in areas such as the airport, which I think continues to have lots of opportunities for that and I'm not sure that that has been -- that that standing council policy to integrate creative play spaces has been fully realized at that

[10:47:30 AM]

facility. So that's it on brush square. I did want to say about the pay for success, as I mentioned Tuesday, this was a super complicated process and I thank echo and social impact financing for sticking with it through years of planning and envisioning and to the community members who served on an early task force that looked at the possibility. This is a really innovative financial strategy. It will be the first-of-its-kind in the state of Texas and I think it's a model we should consider for other projects as well. This is a really good way to get that assistance with the upfront costs of providing permanent supportive housing for some of our most vulnerable neighbors who are experiencing homelessness and also provide them with the services they need to be successful in that housing. Thank you to our legal department. There were a lot of times -- it would have been very easy to walk away from something that is so complicated, especially for a municipality to take on. I appreciate Sandra Kim and Stephanie Hayden and Bella and others from city staff working through. I think councilmember alter said we're finding a way to say yes and working through the challenges this presented. I think it's a really good moment for our community to be undertaking not just such an important project but also doing it in a way that brings in new partners and we're very much if we're going to end homelessness in this community, we really need those additional partners to participate, and this is a great way to do that. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Garza: I have a question about 12. I don't have to pull it. To ask that question. Or would you prefer -- >> Mayor Adler: If it's a quick question. >> Garza: It's quick. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >>. >> Garza: For real estate, the buyouts that happened in my district, if there were people that didn't like the offer they received from the city, they would end up renting the property. I just want to make sure if

[10:49:31 AM]

that occurs in these buyouts, first ask will they be required to disclose to any renters that the property has flooded? And if not, is there a way to -- I would like to provide some direction on in that process if you see one of the buyouts going in that direction where it sounds like they are not going to accept the buyout offer and decide to rent the property, they be told it's best to disclose to the future tenants they are renting from a place that's flooded in the past. >> Michael Gates. It's a question regarding if they stay in the house if they have to disclose to future buyers that the house has been flooded? >> Garza: No, in my district they would not accept the offer and decide to rent it. They would continue owning it and rent it. >> Like a lease-back situation. >> Garza: Yes. >> We stopped doing that -- >> Garza: No, no, they would rent it to somebody else. >> We can't prohibit that. >> Garza: That's okay. Are they required to disclose that the property has flooded in the past to future tenants? >> As a matter of law, I do not believe so. >> Garza: Can I provide direction that if you guys see a situation heading in that direction that you strongly encourage them to disclose to any future tenants that the property has flooded? >> I think we can disclose -- urge and stress that they do. >> Garza: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: I want to make a quick comment on the pay for success as well. Real happy to see that on here. I want to thank councilmember tovo for her work on this. I think you and I have been meeting with these people from echo the last four or five years trying to make this happen. They were complicated meetings and in part complicated because we're

[10:51:31 AM]

doing something here that, quite frankly, the world is watching in trying to make a new model work. This is real exciting. Not only for what it does for homelessness, but as you indicated this is a model that going into the future may be the only real way that municipalities, cities are able to deal with their social challenges by finding ways to bring in the private sector. But the other mention I want to make on this while there is a room full of people is a real important something that has to be noted with respect to our ability to put something like this on our agenda to be able to join with four other entities in our region to really do something about homelessness, which is something that is top of line for virtually everyone in our community. As we see this challenge becoming more visible. There were two things that happened last night at the legislature. The first one of those is the legislature adopted house bill 1, the house adopted house bill 1, which put almost \$3 billion toward tax relief associated with school finance. And I applaud that. I think we all do. Property taxes are going up too much in our area, and it's important to note that 74% of the property tax increase in our area over the last five years has been the result of the school finance system. If you look at your tax bills today and your tax bills five years ago, and most of us don't do that, we just look at property tax as one number. If you look at your bill and see what's changed over the last year, it was the school taxes that went up much more significantly than anything else went up. So we're not going to have any property tax relief unless the legislature deals with that and house bill 1

[10:53:32 AM]

takes a step in that direction by putting about \$3 billion towards property tax relief. The other thing that happened at the legislature yesterday was that the house ways and means committee passed out from their committee on the revenue with a 2.5% cap. I want to talk about that for a second because if that were ever to be able to be something that was passed by the legislature, it would have a profound and significantly prejudicial and horrible impact on our city in how we operate and manage our city. If we take our existing budget as it exists today and we add no new programs to that budget, not a single new program, but we just continued our existing budget into next year, there are certain costs that are going to rise, they are cost drivers. Health insurance costs are projected to go up next year. We have to pay for those. We have wage increases that we pay to our employees. We have wage increases that are built into our contracts with our police and our fire and our ems. When you look at all the cost drivers that are built in to our existing budget, it requires us to increase spending, revenue, spending by 3.8%. 3.8%. That's changing nothing about the existing budget. If we get capped at 2.5%, we can't get to that 3.8%. Which means not changing anything in our existing budget, if we get capped at 2.5%, we have to start making cuts. And not only that, but when we make cuts in the budget

[10:55:33 AM]

and pass another budget at 2.5%, we know that the following year we're going to have to cut things again because our cost drivers will rise faster on any size budget, will rise faster than that cap will rise. The other challenge that we have in our city and other cities around the state is every city is different. Only half of our revenue comes from property tax. The other half of our revenue comes from other sources. If the legislature were to pass a 5%, say a 6% property tax cap, that means that half of our revenue would go up by 6%, but the other half of our revenue, which is sales taxes and the transfers from Austin energy, are forecast to only go up 2%. If we have a 6% cap for half of our revenue, the other part of our revenue goes up by 2%, collectively then our revenue would only go up a total of 4%. Which would barely capture just the cost drivers in our budget. I mention this because our community wants us to continue to pay our police officers more than anybody else pays. One of the reasons why we're one of the safest communities in the country. Our community wants us to do something about the homelessness challenge that we see in our street. This budget reflects this on more than one item. But if this legislature actually follows through with a 2.5% cap, then we're in trouble. We're going to have to start cutting things that are core to our values. I hope that as that bill goes through the legislature, the legislature considers things like maybe passing a 2.5% cap, but excluding from that public safety and roads, things that are shared values with the state. I understand and I believe that there was an amendment

[10:57:34 AM]

yesterday in the house committee that would have excluded public safety from that 2.5% cap, and that the committee voted it down. Voted it down. Would not create an exception for public safety or for roads. I think that would be horrific for our city. And since that passed last night and it passed out of the house, it's now working its way and will be set on calendars, I imagine, to be considered on the floor of the house. It would fundamentally impact how we preserve the quality of life and our economy in this city. And I think it's important that everybody know what's happening. Any more comments on the consent agenda? Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: On 35 I want to add another \$2,500. >> Mayor Adler: So noted. >> Kitchen: I want to thank you, mayor, for your work on the revenue caps and thank you for keeping that in front of us and reminding the community about the impacts. It's something that people need to understand and weigh in on. So thank you. >> Casar: I want to thank you on that same point as well. Sometimes when I talk about this issue, I said we might have to start cutting library hours. When I saw projections from our budget staff about what the deficit could be over the course of just three years, it would be more than the entire budget of the entire library system in the city of Austin. So these are small cuts and the tax savings that would accrue to people would be so minimal, but the affordability impact in our city and quality of life impact and the public safety impact would be so dire. I do want to point out two

[10:59:34 AM]

other great items going on consent. Talking about the good things that we do and the hope that we can provide. Item 2 is a wind contract that raises the amount of Austin energy's portfolio to 56% and our carbon neutral energy sources would be 80%. That's a huge feat considering we're the third largest owned municipality in the country. It's a big testament to just our city staff's work, the dais' work and so much activism and organizing in the community over time. And then I also want to point I also want to point out item 18, a contract with the safe alliance. We worked on this during the budget. We know a major driver of violent crime in this community is relationship violence and a recent review of violent crime in a police sector in north Austin in my area, A.P.D. Found that the largest piece of violent crime in that area was actually indeed relationship and domestic violence. While there's really good reason as you just articulated, mayor, to properly staff our police, fire, and emails departments, we can't prevent things like relationship violence just by patrolling the streets. We can intervene after violence has taken place, but this is a great way to improve public safety by intervening and trying to prevent domestic violence. This item does exactly that. It's a partnership between the police department and safe and public health and it creates an early intervention in crisis response fund so that when people call in to the domestic violence hotline, they can get financial assistance to get a hotel voucher or housing stability or transportation to get them to a family member and get them outside of a dangerous situation, and so again, I'm excited that we're moving this forward. It's something that we worked on during the budget, and I think it's part of how we can think about public safety more holistically and prevent the real drivers of harm and violee in

[11:01:36 AM]

this community before bad things really happen. So thanks dais to safe and working with the departments on this. >> Mayor Adler: Thanks for pointing those things out. Now that you mention it, I want to give one last number for my soliloquy because I want people to notice. Because it emphasizes how, if we're going to do something about property taxes, it's not capping cities or counties, it's doing the work on school finance. The savings for the average homestead in our city, if we were capped at 2.5%, if we were over \$50 million upside down in our existing budget, if we carry it forward for three years, the savings from our taxpayers, \$2.70 a month. The question ultimately is, is that a trade off that we want to make as a community or quite frankly, cities all across the state. Yes, councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I wanted to also thank you, mayor, for leading on addressing the revenue caps and to remind us that this is not just Austin that is impacted. And one of the things that I've learned through this process is how much we cannot approach the property tax reform as a one-size-fits-all. Part of what makes Texas great is the fact that we have cities that have very diverse economies and that fund their services in lots of different ways. And the impacts of this approach have just dramatically different effects across the board and really cripple so many of our cities. The other thing that I wanted to raise, since you talked about school finance, is that the school finance reform is not just about property tax reform, it's about the kind of investments we need to make in our future, in

[11:03:38 AM]

our children, and while I applaud the house for putting forward a \$9 billion reform in finances for that, I think we need to keep that in perspective. We are 43rd among all of the states in per-person spending. I don't know about you, but I wouldn't be really happy if my kid came back and said they were 43rd out of 50, and I don't know any Texans who would be. To get to be average, which is West Virginia, it would take \$44 billion over the biennium. While we're not going to get to that, to be average, we need a plan to get there. At this point there is no plan to get there. This 9 billion alone in this one shot this year is not going to get us the investment we need if we want our children to thrive in the future. So I hope you'll join me in asking the legislature to think about the plan moving forward for school finance. >> Mayor Adler: All right. Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda? Moved by mayor pro tem, seconded by councilmember kitchen. Any discussion? The pulled items, one last time are 14, 23, 30, 32, 34, and 37. Let's take a vote. The vote to end the agenda, raise your hand. Opposed, passes on the dais. Everybody can leave quietly. We're going to continue oth the agenda, those that are leaving. No one has to leave. I know this is just riveting stuff that we do here. All right. Let's go through now the items that have been pulled. I'm going to pass on the strategic plan. We have several amendments on that. Let's see how much of this other stuff we can clear out and let people go. Councilmember tovo, you pulled item number 23? Do you want to speak to that? It's the janitorial services

[11:05:39 AM]

contract. >> Tovo: Yes. Mayor, as we talked about before, there's a small work group of councilmembers, councilmember Flannigan, Casar, kitchen and I have been meeting to look at contract labor versus bringing some of those services in-house. And so when we met earlier this week, we agreed that the best plan of action would be to postpone this contract -- postpone this item for about a month, if staff are agreeable. I think the contract expires in July, so it's coming in months earlier than -- it does give us several months to move forward after that point. So I would request that it be postponed until April 25th. >> Mayor Adler: Is staff okay with this being postponed till April 25th? Yes? Yes? Okay. There's been a motion to postpone item number 23 to April 25th. Is there a second to that motion? Mayor pro tem seconds that. Any discussion? Those in favor of postponement, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Passes unanimously on the dais with councilmember alter off. Thank you, by the way, to the four of you. That was the question I had about this when it came up on our agenda, when I read the answer to the questions from council. We need help on this one, so thanks for looking at it. All right. That takes care of then item number 23. Item number 30 we're going to pull in executive session. Item number 32. Councilmember Flannigan, you pulled this one. >> Flannigan: Yeah. It's not entirely clear to me why we're postponing this item. I feel like the community is really asking us to take action on these micro mobility devices. I feel like I do interviews and have meetings about it seemingly every single and I'm ready to move forward. I think we did a great thing as a

[11:07:39 AM]

council when we started this process by allowing staff to it rate the regulations, specifically because we didn't want to allow the regulatory process to be interrupted by a political process. I fear that's what we're doing now. So I don't support postponement, and I'll be voting against postponement. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I appreciate the concerns that councilmember Flannigan is raising. We have been trying to move quickly on this, which I think it's important. I think what I'm hearing from -- I'll want to ask staff to speak to us about it, but I am hearing about some concerns, because of the way this ordinance is written, it's written to expand an ordinance that's been applied for to bicycles in the past, and so what I'm hearing, some concerns from the bicycle community, is that some aspects of it appear to perhaps inadvertently be impacting bicycles, and that there hasn't been an opportunity to address that. I know we have a recommendation from our bicycle advisory committee and I've also heard from bike Texas, I believe. There may be people here that can speak to that. But I think first we need to talk -- I have a question for staff. So could we do that? >> Mayor Adler: Is staff here to speak to these postponement question and why it's being postponed and the issues raised by councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Perhaps you could speak to that and also just talk about if there's a way to shorten and quickly get to this while still addressing those concerns. >> Certainly. Jason John Michael, assistant director, Austin transportation department. So the concerns that we know of are related to the definition of

[11:09:41 AM]

a dismount zone. It is -- and that is an area where we would look to use engineering analysis to determine what is -- what would be a safe control measure to be put into place in areas where there's high pedestrian activity, where we may look to address where certain micro mobility devices could or could not be in operation. And so, in other words, where they can ride. What we want to do and the reason for the pulling is that it became evident to us that there would be an opportunity for more community involvement related to this. We saw some -- some comments come back from BAC that -- it looked like there was a misunderstanding of what the ordinance is supposed to do, which is really apply a safe and reasonable and prudent set of guidance and rules around what would be safe and reasonable riding. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Harper-madison: Mayor, if I may, I appreciate that you pointed out the stakeholder input component because that's why I would encourage that we postpone it. I feel like there wasn't enough in the way of input, primarily because when you talk about guidelines and guidance, the other end of that is punitive action; right? And so one of the things that really concerns me is the assessment of fines and how much stakeholder input was taken into consideration there, how much input was taken into consideration with our collaboration with P. D., how do they enforce it. There was one particular item that really concerns me, like the doubling of fines. I'm not certain why that's necessary and what the, sort of, inadvertent complications of that would be, you know, for people who already can't afford fines as it pertains to traffic incidents.

[11:11:44 AM]

And then the other thing that concerns me and why I would encourage that we postpone had to do with taking into consideration how -- there's a \$500 fine, essentially, for parking in a bicycle lane. Has that deterred people from parking in bike lanes? If that's the case -- just I have more questions and I'm certain stakeholders have more questions, and I would encourage that we do postpone. And thank you for speaking on the item. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember alter, did you raise your hand? Articles yeah, I was just wondering what the rationale was for the may date for the postponement. I wasn't hearing something that necessarily required two months' postponement. >> We -- the pac meeting is one of the meetings that we'd like to make sure that we get on the agenda for our next round of public engagement, and we're -- that agenda is already, I think, set for the 4th of April, coming up, so we might miss that one. And also, may 23rd is when we're bringing to council the other ordinances that are related to dockless, so that would be an opportunity for council to address all things dockless at once. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think -- go ahead, councilmember. >> I just had a couple of quick comments, I was just echoing what councilmember Natasha harper-madison was saying. I also am concerned about the doubling of fines. I'm not sure there was equity in that. I wanted to make sure we had a little more information on the educational process, about how people getting on dockless mobility scooters were going to be able to understand the new rules, and so I appreciate everyone kind of wanting to come around and discuss these things fully, and definitely appreciate councilmember Flannigan's enthusiasm with wanting to get to work on it, and want to make sure they're all working together. >> Mayor Adler: I think we need

[11:13:44 AM]

to be doing everything we can to keep people safe on our streets. We also have to make sure that we get it right. I'm going to support the postponement as requested by staff to help us get there. I'd also point out, just by way of thought, that in a world right now where half the people I run into have had near-death experiences with scooters or bikes, and half the people that I run into can't imagine the city without scooters and bikes, there's probably no set of rules you're going to come up with that's going to make everybody happy. And we recognize that. So we need people's involvement. There are people that are real committed and involved in these discussions. You know, we'll come back to the best recommendations of what we need to do to keep the city safe. Further comments? Yes, councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: So if stakeholder engagement is the reason that we are considering our postponement, then I would ask that the urban transportation commission be added to this process because that's the only one of these groups we've discussed that is actually appointed by the council. The bicycle advisory and pedestrian advisory committees, I'm not even sure what the C stands for, is kind of self-appointed, is my understanding. If we're going to set a regulation, I think it needs to be reviewed by a commission created and appointed by the council. And I will say, you know, councilmember Ellis, it's not just my enthusiasm. This is enthusiasm I hear from the community about wanting us to take swift action on this situation. And, you know, I am enthusiastic about a lot of things. It reflects the enthusiasm of the community that speaks to me, and, you know, half the people I run into don't care about the scooters. It's a small universe of folks, and when I talk to people in my district, they care about affordability, they care about traffic, the things we spend 90% of our time on, accordingly, and

[11:15:46 AM]

a lot of the folks I hear who talk about near-death experiences, when you really start talking about it, it wasn't a near-death experience, and I think it's just important that we be clear the scope and the scale of the -- of what micro mobility devices are actually impacting. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to postpone this till may 23rd? Councilmember kitchen makes that motion. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember Renteria seconds that. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Yeah, I just wanted to say I think it's really important that we get this ordinance completed, along with the other -- the other related regulations, and so I'm supportive of postponing this, in part, because we didn't even have an opportunity to talk about it on Tuesday, and I've gotten so much feedback and so many suggested amendments from constituents and others that we haven't even -- may even be in the ordinance at this point, may be points that are already within the ordinance, but we haven't had an opportunity to really address them with staff and with -- as a full council. So I'm supportive of delaying it. That is a long delay and that gives me some pause, but, you know, in light of what you said about getting that additional stake holder input, I think that's important. Please know, though, that -- and we are doing our best to forward on the concerns and the suggestions and the ideas, as well as the enthusiastic emails that we're receiving to staff, but many of those people who we're hearing from are not going to come to one of the commission meetings, and their input is also important to is process. So I look forward to moving

forward on this just as soon as possible, and I hope we won't delay beyond may. >> Mayor Adler: So as to not be affected, my staff has urged me to say it's not exactly 50% and 50%, just lots of people on both sides. [Laughter] Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I had a question about -- so we have a mobility meeting come up. Is dockless on our agenda tull?

[11:17:48 AM]

And I don't know if we have two before the 23rd or just one. So that may be an opportunity to -- I'm trying to figure out a way to service some of these issues so we can have more conversation as council as well so that we can actually resolve it whenever it comes back, so maybe you could speak to the agenda for the mobility. >> Tovo: It's not at the moment, but we can certainly add it. I'm looking to my -- >> Mayor Adler: It would be helpful for the council guys would do that. >> Tovo: Yeah, all right. >> Alter: And I don't know if there's two between the 23rd -- >> Pool: I don't think there's two, I think there's just one. >> Flannigan: I think it's been on our agenda almost as a standing item. I would assume it's going to be on it till we get to a satisfactory conclusion. >> Kitchen: All right. >> Alter: The other question I had is if we move to postpone it to the may date, then we can't take it up before, but it sounds like there's still a possibility that the concerns could be addressed if it's a misunderstanding, and so I would assume, since they're clamoring for us to get this on their advisory committee, that they still have plenty of time to adjust that agenda. So I'm just wondering if it could be, you know -- if there's -- I don't know what the language would be, maybe Ms. Morgan can suggest language that would postpone it to, you know, when staff feels like they've got the appropriate thing, or on that date in may so that should we have it resolved more quickly, if it is simply a misunderstanding, that we would be able to have the opportunity to move more quickly, if appropriate. >> May I offer a suggestion? Perhaps Austin transportation department could go back, look at all schedules of different community-based organizations,

[11:19:51 AM]

and we can propose. >> Mayor Adler: I think that in this instance, because there's not a notice that goes out, it's not like a zoning case where we have to send out notices, we can postpone this without having a date certain. We can postpone this with a direction for staff to take a look at schedules and let us all know when it is appropriate for it to come back, but the expectation is, it's not going to be any later than may 23rd. But if it's possible to bring it back sooner than that, just let us know. So without objection then, the motion to postpone won't say may 23rd, it'll just be, this item is postponed from our agenda with that direction as I just indicated. Okay? No objection, that's then the motion. Let's take a vote. Those in favor, raise your hand. Those opposed, Mr. Flannigan votes no, the others vote aye, that passes on the dais. Thank you. Okay. Item number 34 has 13 people on it. Item number 37 -- let's go back then. I think those are the items. Let's pick up item number 14. This is the strategic direction on mobility strategies. Colleagues, we have two people that have signed up to speak. I'm going to call them, and then we'll come up to the dais where we have amendments. Is senobia Joseph here? Ms. Joseph? Is Gus

peña here? Mr. Peña. Those are the two people that we had signed up to speak. Neither are here, so that brings us back up to the dais. We have item number 14.

[11:21:53 AM]

Does someone want to make a motion on some amendments? Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I would like to move to mend Austin strategic direction 2023 to include the mobility outcome strategies and metrics as in our backup with the following additions. There's a motion sheet that has two metrics to add to system efficiency and congestion, group a, so for a-9 would be adding a metric average time to clear crashes from major roadways and a-10, number of transportation projects, programs, and initiatives that are coordinated with partner agencies. We worked with staff to pull out the measures that are currently in the draft SNP that were addressing the concerns that I had about how we were going to look at regional incident management and the need for intergovernmental cooperation. And then the second part of my motion is some direction. As you recall from our conversation during work session, staff has indicated that clean air metrics are not included in the mobility outcome because they're already present in the health and environment outcomes. Austin, though, is close to non-attainment so I want to ensure that we are connecting the air quality metrics and health and environment to the mobility outcomes goals. So I worked with staff and they've provided language in the Q and a, so I'd like to move to direct staff to add the text from the Q and a about congestion and air quality to the system efficiency and congestion indicator category and listing of related metrics. Thuage is in the Q and a but I will read it. There's like a little asterisk, scientific research has found a direct link between traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and air quality. The region's efforts to improve system efficiency and congestion, therefore, has the potential to positively impact air quality. While air quality metrics are not listed within the mobility outcome, they can be found under the health and environment outcomes environmental quality indicator. The city is committed to

[11:23:53 AM]

collaboration between the two outcomes to address these challenges. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter moves to bring forward the addition of the mobility metrics, as was originally contained with two additional changes. I want to see if there are any objections to those two changes, to what would otherwise be the motion. First change is the adding of items a-9 and a-10. Any objection to that? >> I have a clarification question. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Garza: I'm curious if you talked to our public safety about that, and the reason I ask is because my assumption is, we have it as a metric because we want to improve on it, so we want -- this is my assumption, the assumption that I'm making for your motivation to have this here, is to want that average time to go down. But when there are accidents on the highway, in fact, the highway is the most dangerous place for public safety to be out there, they're not just hanging out out there; it's based on what's best for the scene. And many times it's public safety waiting for a tow truck to come. And so I'm just -- I guess I'm concerned if we're -- if the motive is, do this faster, I'm concerned if we're taking safety issues into account. >> Alter: So what I had

asked the staff to look into is, we have -- with campo, we just passed a regional incident management plan. That contains a lot of different metrics that relate to this system efficiency and congestion area that fall under this regional incident management part, and I wanted us to be able to capture a measure from there that they thought would be the most relevant to get at that kind of management. The management plan takes into consideration a lot of the

[11:25:54 AM]

nuances that you are talking about, but it is a -- an important factor for understanding the congestion and understanding that data, what is happening on our major road a roadways in terms of how these incidents are cleared. That does not mean that you want to take anyone's safety in vain, but it is a measure where we, as a region, are not doing comparatively as well as, say, Houston, by huge margins. So it's something where we have an opportunity to change things. But part of the way that you get there in terms of the strategies is doing things like expanding the hero program that helps to get the tow trucks there faster, so public safety is not waiting there. But staff can speak to it more -- >> Garza: But here, the program is not a tow truck. That's a whole different thing. >> Alter: The part of the whole hero setup is getting those crashes off faster. >> Garza: Okay. I'm just saying that it's separate from a tow truck. They don't tow people, they assist people that have, like, vehicle issues. >> Alter: There's a broader project and I don't want to go into the whole details which provides towing services in a fast way, which I think is under the hero umbrella, but I may have the name of the program wrong. >> Garza: Okay. Well, just I'm just curious if public safety has been part of the discussion. >> Alter: I think maybe staff can speak to that. >> Kim, chief performance officer. The intent -- the source data that we would utilize for this metric would actually be coming from a.p.d.'s contract for the towing services. They receive reports from the different towing companies that take part in that program. It outlines accident locations

[11:27:55 AM]

and time of arrival and clearing and everything like that, so we'd be able -- pardon me -- we'd attract the measure using that contract. In terms of setting a target, it is reasonable to have metrics that are used just purely for monitoring purposes, as opposed to setting a specific target. >> Garza: Okay. Well, I could support this if the understanding is for monitoring purpose and not to -- and not to -- just -- if it's just for monitoring purposes. Do you think that's what your metric does? >> Alter: Yeah. I wanted to make sure that we had that data as we were trying to assess how we were addressing congestion and mobility in terms of monitoring as a data feed that would help us to guide the strategies and the investments that we make. >> Garza: Okay. >> Alter: It's not -- whether it's ten minutes or fifteen minutes, the important thing is that we're reducing congestion and it's one way to measure our strategies. >> Garza: Okay. Thanks for that classification. >> Mayor Adler: A-9 and 10, doesn't appear there's any objection to those. The second was the language that referenced kind of the cross-referencing of things that are metrics of more than one area. Any objection to that also being added? Hearing none then, that would be then our

base motion. Is there a second to that base motion? Councilmember pool seconds that. We are now up to the dais. We have a motion in front of us. Does anyone want to bring forth amendments? >> Harper-madison: Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison. Go ahead. >> Harper-madison: Still includes the language that would measure the percent of population within half a mile of high frequency. Transit stops, the consensus in the credit world is that most riders will only walk a quarter mile to transit. This metric as it stands will

[11:29:57 AM]

provide more comfortable numbers but will functionally be meaningless. In the discussion we had about changing the language, I would move to amount c1 be changed to read percent of population, units and employment, including commercial square footage, within a quarter mile of high frequency transit stop, within a half mile of the all ages and abilities bicycle network, so that would be my -- >> Mayor Adler: There's an amendment to move from one-half mile to one quarter mile. >> Harper-madison: Correct. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember Casar seconds it. Discussion on the dais? Mayor pro tem. >> Garza: I guess would you be open to getting both numbers, quarter mile and half mile? >> How do you mean? >> Garza: So this would say we're not going to ask about the half mile. I'm just curious if it's okay to say we want quarter mile and we want half mile, just for information purposes. >> Harper-madison: I see what you're saying. I'm not opposed to that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So it adds quarter mile, doesn't delete half mile. Is there any objection to that amendment being added? Councilmember alter? >> Alter: I just -- I think it's fine if we can measure it. I just wanted to hear from staff if that was a measure that we had or if that was going to create any measurement challenges that we might want to be aware of. >> Mayor Adler: The question is adding a quarter mile. >> Councilmember, Leanne Miller, Austin transportation. Yes, that is a measure that we can use. We typically look at half mile for high capacity transit as being the measure that we would use just because that high capacity transit is very desirable and so people would maybe be willing to walk up to a half mile to get there, but we do not oppose to including a quarter of a mile for a transit stop. >> Alter: And that's data that's relatively easy to -- >> Yes. >> Alter: Okay. Great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: I hear no objection, quarter mile is added.

[11:31:57 AM]

Half mile also stays in. Other amendment? Councilmember Ellis? >> Ellis: Yes. I would like to speak on mine. These have also been posted to the message board, so I hope that people have had a little bit of heads-up to kind of review them. I look forward to any discussion that you may want to have about these, and I want to thank Kim and Leanne and anicue for going through these. We had extensive consultations with staff to make sure we were on target with metrics that date --that could be gathered and were useful to us. For a brief rundown, strategy 3 to add onto the end of it, being doing business with the city and people participating in public input opportunities, we wanted to make sure there was a little more comprehensive understanding of sustainable modes and the types of things that people

would be using. I know that internally, just as Q anecdote, we're not talking about people taking sustainable transportation, I wanted to make sure that was captured in this. The second point is, amending strategy 5 to add the capital area council of governments into the entities that we are collaborating with, adding strategy 14, identify and implement land use policies that support a shift towards a more sustainable mode share, I thought it was really important as we are identifying how our new land code revisions are going to be moving forward that we really commit to tying land use and transportation options together in more solid ways. Sometimes we talk about them in different spectrums, and I wanted to try to bring them together. Number 4 is amendment metric 3 to read as follows: Number of mobility projects initiated and successfully completed in innovation Zones. I wanted to add some language that included that we wanted these projects to be completed,

[11:34:00 AM]

not just administratively taken off the to-do list. 7, percent of people working in Austin that commute in for work, understanding that we have regional collaborations and affordability makes people kind of move further and further out of denser environments, because of affordability, and that we wanted to create a metric that was able to monitor this and identify ways that we can do better to bring people more into the neighborhoods they want to live in. Number 6 is amendment metric d3 to adjust the language from "As a result of" to "Following street design infrastructure projects on the highway injury network," so as not to imply a causation but just to gauge a metric in a way to try to be more successful. Then the last two are new metrics, d5 would be the number percent of customer service requests of blockages, before, vegetation, vehicular and bicycle Laredo and sidewalks within 72 hours. This might be something 311 is already monitoring. I know they have their own internal goals but I thought that might be helpful as we're looking through mobility outcomes to make sure that people can use more sustainable modes. And the last one is adding metric d-6, number and percent of safe routes to school, infrastructure projects at each of the following stages, recommended high or very high benefit, planned, funded, design, construction, and completed. I know especially in district 8, there are a lot of areas where we still are lacking basic sidewalk infrastructure and people are trying to utilize some very dangerous routes to try to get to school, and I know, in particular, in my district, some of these places are embankments or places that flood. So I wanted to bring this metric that is already, you know, being looked at elsewhere into our mobility outcomes to make sure it's fully comprehensive.

[11:36:03 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: We have a series of amendments that are made. Is there a second to the amendments collectively? It's been seconded by councilmember kitchen. Does anybody have any objection to any of these? Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Not necessarily objection, but question. On your number 5, which talks about commuting in for work, I'm concerned about how we measure -- if we are in that way equally measuring someone that lives just on the cedar park side and drives one block into the city of Austin to work, as opposed to an austinite that lives just on the city of Austin side and drives

downtown to work. And so I want to understand how we balance that, and maybe staff can address if there's another metric that helps us, you know, lengths of commute as an example, being maybe more important than that, or ensuring that we're also talking about mode share for the people that are commuting into the city, which I think also may be covered in another metric, but -- I love the idea of counting -- doing this regional, because I think that's really important, but I want to make sure we're counting this in a way that's substantive to what we're trying to accomplish. Maybe staff can help me hand understand where other metrics might capture that. >> We believe we'll be able to use data from the survey. Until we dig into that data more, I can't give you a concrete answer, but that would be one of the factors that we can look at to see how it tracks distance, if it's just literally a block away or if it's many miles away. So I'm not able to answer the question at this moment. >> Flannigan: Yeah. I think I'm just giving my concern about that as a measurement because I don't want to get into a place where the metrics are incentivizing staff

[11:38:04 AM]

to concentrate jobs in certain areas or not allow job centers to be built according to imagine Austin, I'm just trying to think through the piece on that. On number 8, just to be clear, safe routes to schools, not just the projects in the most recent bond but more generally projects that are designated safe routes to schools, and is there already a metric that we use to applies to other planning activities like the bicycle plan and the sidewalk plan where there's a long-term ranking of future projects and our progress towards getting those done? >> Yes, councilmember. For instance, the sidewalk plan has priorities very high, high sidewalks. We are able to track our percent completion of all of those very high and high priority sidewalks. You'll note c-6, percent of missing sidewalks, bicycle facilities, we would be able to break that down by different categories of project type. >> Flannigan: So essentially we're just adding the safe routes to schools to an existing, kind of, process to evaluate our progress on these broad plans. >> Correct. >> Flannigan: Okay. Then that sounds great. >> Mayor Adler: Further objection or concerns with any of the elements on the Ellis amendment? Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: I don't have an objection or concern, but to councilmember Flannigan's question, on commuting in, one potential thing we could look at is sort of a jobs/housing balance. I think that oftentimes cities measure their jobs/housing balance, and some cities like San Francisco have three, four, five, six times more jobs in their city than they have housing, which creates all sorts of transportation and affordability problems in trying to get to that balance may be one way, while

[11:40:05 AM]

they're going to be some number of cases like what you've described, councilmember, that doesn't work exactly the way that we want it to, that maybe more crudely, overall, it helps us try to figure out how much -- how much demand for housing there is inside of the city, given the number of jobs, and to try to create that balance, knowing that, given our geography, you're never really going to fully get there, but you have something you're striving towards and you know how much worse things are getting, or how

much better. So that's one potential way. I know it doesn't actually address some part of what you described, but I'm supportive of keeping this in as the staff tries to figure out what the right ways are measuring that distort things the least. >> Mayor Adler: Further comments on the Ellis -- yes, councilmember pool. >> Pool: I have some similar questions, and not necessarily opposition, but just trying to drill down a little bit more on what it means that my colleague, councilmember Flannigan, had on number 5 on adding a new metric c-7, percent of people working in Austin who commute in for work. Without any parameters on that, I could say that I commute in to work. And anybody who works -- so it just is very -- it doesn't have the level of specificity that I think are we talking about commuting in to the central business district for work, or that in Mr. Flannigan's example, leave in cedar park and work in the central business district, and I'm just not sure what it is we're trying to measure because I guess we would say that 100% of the people working in Austin somehow commute in for work, because we don't have any specifics on the distance. And this says, for example, don't live in Austin, but it seems to leave it open for other examples. >> Completely understand that and appreciate your point on it. The intent is to be measuring

[11:42:06 AM]

people who are coming into the city parameters, like the city of Austin geographically, because time and time again, we hear about people who are priced out into communities surrounding Austin, whether it's Buda or Kyle or San Marcos or pflugerville, I mean, we could -- there are so many places where people are having to actually leave the city of Austin. And the intent behind this is also to understand how that affects the things that we then need to spend money on, like infrastructure and things like that where, if you are paying into a different city tax base and a different county tax base, how that overlaps with our budgeting, given that we do need to repair our roads and we need water infrastructure for people. >> Pool: Sure. That makes a lot of sense, so maybe I might suggest a simple amendment to track what you were just saying. Percent of non-austin residents working within the city of Austin who commute in for work. >> Mayor Adler: That would be 100% of the people, though. So what about percent of people working in Austin that come from outside Austin? >> Pool: Well, I was saying non-austin residents. >> Mayor Adler: That commute in from outside the city, would be 100%. Because everybody you first defined the people that move in, then you ask what percentage of people move in. >> Pool: Got you. So flip it. >> Mayor Adler: I think what you were doing as I was hearing you talk, it's the percent of people working in Austin that come from outside Austin. >> Pool: That's it. I think that's it. Does that sound right to you? >> Ellis: Yes, I would accept that. >> Pool: Great. Does that help Mr. Flannigan at all? >> Flannigan: Ultimately that's what I thought it said. That was my concern. >> Mayor Adler: So people working in Austin who come from outside Austin. That language is made.

[11:44:06 AM]

Further discussion on the dais on the Ellis amendments? They've been move the and seconded. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Opposed? It's unanimous on the dais mayor pro >> Garza: In the interest

of time mine was discussed on work session so I would move the amendment we had such as amenities such as grocery stores, such as mobility strategies number 4. >> Any objection to the mayor pro tem's amendment? Hearing none, it is also included. Is there anything else on this item? >> Yes, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember harper-madison. >> Harper-madison in the amendment I proposed earlier, just for consistency's sake, we need to add the amendment to make sure certain that it says percentage of population -- percentage of affordable housing available at 60% mfi and 80% mfi within a quarter-mile of transit priority network and a half mile of transit and bicycle network as it stands. That we have both. That the percentage of affordable housing within a quarter and a half mile. Do you see what I'm saying? As it stands currently, it says just percentage of affordable housing it says -- it's it's b-5. >> Mayor Adler: What page are you looking at? >> Harper-madison: It's under transportation costs. >> Mayor Adler: Page 3, b-5, percentage of affordable housing... Within one half mile of transit and

[11:46:06 AM]

bicycle priority networks. And you want to say one quarter mile and one half mile? >> Harper-madison: Correct. >> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that amendment being made? We're tracking both quarter mile and half mile. Hearing no objection that also is included. I think we had already taken the vote. >> Kitchen: Could I -- >> Mayor Adler: No, we had taken the vote on the amendment. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: So the b-5 would read the same way, that we be looking within a quarter-mile and a half mile as well as a half mile for the bicycle network. >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: It's a quarter and a half mile both for transit and the bicycle priority. >> Kitchen: Both. Okay. >> Harper-madison: Right. That's how it reads currently. It says percent of affordable housing Mabel at 60% mfi and 80% mfi within half mile of transit and bicycle priority networks. >> Kitchen: Got you. >> Mayor Adler: It's a quarter and a half mile for both bicycle and transit priority network. Any objection to that being included? It is also included. >> Garza: Just a clarification. I hate to lawyer this, but I want to make sure that staff -- that could be interpreted as it has to be a half mile and a quarter mile. >> Mayor Adler: I got you. >> Garza: I think staff understands we want both. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on this item 14? >> Ellis: I have a couple of questions while we're on it. I want to clarify on metric e-3, can you confirm that preventive maintenance includes markings and crosswalks? I this was a question we submitted. I just wanted to identify that we're talking about crosswalks and pedestrian safety too in this metric. >> Correct, it would. >> Ellis: Fantastic.

[11:48:07 AM]

And then on a-1, commuter mode C and B 1 and B 2 on transportation costs could they metrics be gathered at the city level and regionally? >> Can you say it again? Which ones? >> On a-1. And B 1 and B 2. >> The b-2 is-- that's coming from the -- the community survey, so that is to individuals that live within the full purpose boundaries of the city of Austin. For a-1 and b-1, we can collect that on a regional basis as well. >> Ellis: That would be great. I think that would be really helpful for this outcome. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other comments on this item 14? Let's take a vote. All those in favor? Those opposed?

It passes unanimously. 14 is now taken care of. Yes, go ahead, make a comment. >> Alter: I just wanted to thank Ms. Alvarez and her staff and the folks who were working from atd and the other folks on this section of the strategic direction, but more broadly on the strategic direction. I'm very excited for us to be using this to leverage our resources moving forward and I want to commend you on all the work that went into this behind the scenes. I know there were many staff members beyond the core team that were involved, but I think this is going to be super helpful for us as a city as we move forward in focusing us on how we can make the most impact from the resources that we do have, so thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So we're down to 10 minutes before we have citizen communication. There are some things that I think we can take care of within this period of time.

[11:50:07 AM]

We have item number 45 I think that came from the committee. It's a resolution appointing two individuals to the menu civil service commission and the chair. Is there a motion to approve that? Councilmember alter makes that motion. Councilmember pool seconds it. Any discussion? Those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais with councilmember Renteria off. I think we have three items that have been set for public hearings that no one has signed up to speak on. Item number -- the strategic mobility plan we're going to be considering later. Item number 51 is the Texas gas service item. No one is signed to speak on that. Is there a motion to approve the item and to close the public hearing? I need a motion. Councilmember Flannigan makes a motion. Is there a second to that motion? Seconded by the mayor pro tem. Any discussion? All those in favor these plays your hand? Those opposed? It is approved. Item 52, this is the public hearing and ordinance on the bowie high school transfer of impervious cover. Is there a motion to approve this item? Councilmember Ellis makes that motion. Is there a second to this motion? Councilmember kitchen. I have no one signed up to speak on this so it's also a motion to close the public hearing. It's been moved and seconded? Discussion? Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I have a little discussion. I know there are some representatives from -- who are representing aid here. I'm going to support this item, but I just want to point out that we did have

[11:52:08 AM]

conversations and I don't know if Mr. Anderson would like to speak to them, about the use of portables on the sites from which the impervious cover transfer is originating. And so we have a situation here, and I understand this is a really quirky situation where there was a miscalculation and we need to make right the situation -- current circumstances that are on the ground, but there have been concerns expressed from time to time that some of the portables at our aid facilities are really not temporary. And some of them have been in place in some cases I believe for decades. And they don't count toward the impervious cover total on a particular site in areas such as the ones we're considering. You know, there is an environmental -- it is environmentally important to consider the portable use on those sites, so we did ask if aid would be willing to restrict the further use of portables on those elementary school

sites. They're not able to do so or do not want to do so, but I want to say from the dais that I think this if this is a transfer of impervious cover and those sites will be adding portable buildings to accommodate their inability to add to this front because they have -- to this footprint because they have transferred to the bowie site, that concerns me. So I would -- while we're having this conversation I would just say that I think portable buildings are -- I don't think anybody believes that they're the ideal learning environment for the students and the teachers who occupy them. They're obviously not designed to be a permanent solution and I hope that we can especially in areas that are environmentally sensitive really work to eliminate those. I see Mr. Anderson. Did you want to say a word? So again, since there's not an ability -- there's not a

[11:54:09 AM]

meeting of minds in terms of codifying here, I would just ask that to be a consideration for the school district moving forward, especially with regard to those two elementary sites. >> Absolutely, councilmember. Dave Sanderson working with aid on this 2017 bond implementation program. We've had conversations with the internal team at aid about this issue and I would like to have drew Johnson with the district address those concerns. I agree that they are appropriate. >> Hi, councilmembers, I'm drew Johnson, director of planning for independent school district construction management department. We share similar concerns. We often hear them from our communities, our schools, that they're a good temporary solution to a population problem. They're not deal in the long-term. We recently rewrote our building sign standards, our educational specifications, to try to build in flexibility into our buildings so that new designs, new construction have the ability to increase capacity without portables. This is part of our attempt to be more flexible so that we can respond to population demands. And also working with our community input organization have a plan in place to reduce our portable inventory over time. We're projecting several dozen pos over these projects as -- portables over these projects will be disposed with. So we share your concerns and are trying to respond to them. >> Tovo: Thank you. I appreciate that new direction. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. That has been moved and seconded. It includes closing of the public hearing. Those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed? That item passes. That gets us then to item number 53, which is conducting a hearing for the full purpose annexation. No one has signed up to speak on this. It's not posted for action.

[11:56:10 AM]

So should we close the public hearing or do we just move on? Close the public hearing. Is there a motion to close the public hearing on this item 53? Moved by the mayor pro tem, seconded by councilmember pool. Any discussion? >> Flannigan: This is in my district -- >> >> Mayor Adler: Sorry about that. >> Flannigan: My understanding is this requires two hearings so this is not closing in perpetuity. The community has a lot of questions about this and a companion zoning case that will be coming back in the future. So the community is understanding this is not ending your ability to talk to the council about annexation. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Helpful. Motion to close the public hearing today. All those in

favor raise your hand? Those opposed? The hearing is closed today. We're three minutes shy of being able to do citizen communication. Do you see anything else on this agenda that we can do fast? Number 37 has speakers signed up. 4:30 we're going to do after executive session. 3434 has three people signed up. 37 has five people. We've taken care of 45. The others are -- the other ones are executive session and then I think 54 has one person signed up for it. Floodplain variance. Well, 51 -- 54 is 54. Is Jay Amadi here? >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to speak? Come on down. This is on item -- colleagues, this is on item number 54, which is the public hearing on second and third reading on the floodplain variance at 4515 avenue D. Go ahead, sir. >> Mayor, members of the council, my name is Jay

[11:58:13 AM]

Amadi and I am here to request support for the floodplain variance at 4515 avenue D and for you to accept and ratify the city's own watershed department for this variance. Watershed's recommendation for variance comes after two years of me working closely with their department and my own engineers at a significant personal cost to design a structure and foundation that ensures a much safer situation than currently exists with my current house, which is below the floodplain. My proposed new structure will be two feet above the 500 year floodplain, single story that suits my growing family's needs and allows me to age in place. I would also like to note that in recent past my neighbors had 4518 avenue D, 5606 avenue D, 4515 speedway, which is a duplex, and 4508 speedway have received floodplain variances under the same or very similar conditions. As documented in the backup in any given year the probability for a flood in 25, 100 and 500 year floodplain is four percent, one percent and two-tenths of a percent with a velocity he similar to a small stream. I've received support from the Hyde park development review committee, the Hyde park steering committee and it was brought up to the Hyde park neighborhood association for general support. It was 23 in favor, zero opposed and two abstentions. These activities were documented in the Hyde park pecan press newsletter. Again, these support this variance. If you have any questions I'm glad to answer them. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Back up to the dais. Is there a motion to approve this item? Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: If you want to take the motion first, I just have some questions. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to approve this item? Councilmember Casar makes a motion. Is there a second to this motion? Councilmember Ellis seconds it. Any questions? Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Basically this is one that was very close vote last time we took it up

[12:00:15 PM]

and I remain concerned about the issue of allowing, -- you know, allowing homes to stay in areas that are floodplains. I don't know that we've ever really resolved the issue because we've raised issues about what the expectation then is, if there is a flood because I'm understanding in this case there's not safe egress if that's the right term. And we haven't really resolved the policy question about it N that kind of case if we're going to allow these kinds of homes to stay in these areas are we setting an expectation that there won't be any rescue, that people will shelter in place? In other words, what expectation are

we setting? So that's my -- I know that's a much longer policy conversation and I'm hoping -- I think we need to have that policy conversation as part of updating our flood mitigation plan, which I know the staff is undertaking that. But because of issues like that, I'm going to stick with my earlier vote against this. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember pool? >> Pool: Yeah, I appreciate what councilmember kitchen has said and I also plan to continue my opposition to this. I worry that sheltering in place with no opportunity even for our first responders to get to the home would put the people there at a risk that we haven't mitigated for. I recognize that it is being raised up and I appreciate that. That indicates a recognition of the concern about the level of the water and the flooding situation, but I don't see any certainty that we could get there -- get into that -- into your home and rescue you. I don't see how our first responders could do that. So I will continue in my principled objection to

[12:02:16 PM]

permitting flood variances to be overcome and approved and will plan to continue to vote against this one as well. >> Mayor Adler: Obviously a close vote and there are reasons on both for and answer on this one. You know, there's a safety concern about leaving the house where it is because the house is in the floodplain, so it's much more likely that someone is going to be calling for assistance in the house in the condition that it's in than in a house in the elevated condition. So I know we can all look that the lots of different ways, but it is equally for the safety reason that I'm going to be supporting the variance. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I'm glad you reminded me of that. There was one other thing that I was just curious about and it's more rhetorical. I'm not really looking for an answer, but I know when we did the buyouts on Williamson creek, for example, we are now turning those parcels into parkland, I believe. And it just seems to me like that ought to have been a consideration here. If this parcel really is so completely contained within the floodplain and in fact if the new floodplain under atlas 14 is even larger than it had been before when those other homes were -- possibly were able to get a variance, then why are we not looking at keeping people from living there for the very same reasons that you're talking about? So thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and take the vote. Those in favor of granting the floodplain variance please raise your hands. Flannigan, Ellis, Casar, Renteria, chairman and me. It passes on third reading, final action on the council. >> Second reading. >> Mayor Adler: It's on second reading? So we have to have six again the next time. So I misspoke. You have to come back one more time. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: It passes on second reading only. >> Garza: I will change my vote to a yes to avoid him coming back because I don't think anything is going to change.

[12:04:16 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So there's a motion to -- I make the motion to reconsider. Is there a second? Councilmember Casar makes that motion to second. Any objection? We'll reconsider. Let's take the vote. Go ahead. >> Garza: I think I gave my reasons the first time. Having gone through buyouts in my district, concerns about public safety, I understand both sides of this, but I don't see the point in having to have this on the agenda again if the votes are there to pass it. >> Mayor Adler: Those in favor now of

the variance please raise your hand? It's the same vote as before, with you with the mayor pro tem joining. That's seven people. Those opposed raise your hand? The remaining four. It passes on second and third reading. We're done. Council, let's move to citizen communication. And then we'll come back at 2:00. When we come back at 2:00 we'll do the consent agenda on zoning, that let's the greatest number of people go, and then we'll pick up the two items from this morning that we have yet to reach, item 30 and item 34. >> Alter: So we're going to executive session after public comment? >> Mayor Adler: We'll go to executive session after we break from citizen communication. All right, citizens communication? All right. Is koo-hyun Kim here? Is Susana Almanza here? You will be on deck. Go ahead, sir. >> Thank you, thank you. It's amazing, grateful,

[12:06:18 PM]

unbelievable chance, god given chance to introduce you the greatest president Donald Trump to you again. Right now I receive the email notice, my friend [indiscernible], Oklahoma, grand master tie Kwan do, he send me 500-dollar puzzle with clothes, bring new clothes and suit from shoes, everything. He ask me to receive it by Saturday for president's election campaign Donald Trump. I waiting for that. How wonderful it is I'm going to introduce president Donald Trump first again. He is Superman and also he is time traveler. He is a very stable genius at time magazine said, and the best U.S.A. Patriot by south korean American. I'm not jewish, I'm not white, I'm not African-American. I am yellow from south Korea. He is the best president ever. Why he's Superman? He always won. He never lost. Why he's time traveler? He know everything. When I wrote my doctoral dissertation 1992, he know it. He knew it. How he knew it? Because he's a Superman time traveler. I wrote Korean unification by the building north korean economy and the

[12:08:20 PM]

American enemy Kim Jung Yun. He said the same thing in 2019. I have been a democratic since 1981. Up until that time I have been a Democrat for years in the United States. I did not know Donald Trump. But he's denuclear rization of North Korea and the new the north korean economy. He is a Christian. I changed from Democrat to Republican to support Donald Trump. He will be absolutely elected 2020. [Buzzer sounds] Oh, the time is already up? Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thanks for being with us today. >> God bless you all. You all make Austin city better, great better. >> Mayor Adler: Susana Almanza will speak, but after her I had Matthew Rodriguez, but I understand he's not with us today. Is he here? So then we go on next to William mayor? Is William mayor here? William mayor? No? What about Matthew Kim? Is Matthew Kim here? You will be on deck after Ms. Almanza. >> Poder invites everyone to celebrate the life of Cesar Chavez by attending the social justice March. The March will take place Saturday, March the 30th, 2019. Assemble at 9:30 A.M. At the Terrazas library, 1105 east Cesar Chavez street for openin blessing. March begins at 10:00 A.M. And ends at ab Cantu pan American hillside 2100 east third street. Cesar Chavez was born on March the 31st, 1927 in

[12:10:22 PM]

yuma, Arizona. Cesar Chavez was a Latino farm worker, labor leader, civil rights activist and crusader for social change. Chavez was co-founder of the United Farm Workers that advocates for better wages and safer working conditions on American farm lands. Cesar Chavez is more than a symbol and role model for farm workers. Cesar Chavez demonstrated the need for all working people to support those who are oppressed and exploit upper and lower deck splitted. Working for dignity on the job and in the community, increasing democratic rights of working people, challenging the powerful in defense of the powerless. March the 30th, 2019 marks the 18th annual Cesar Chavez March in Austin, Texas. We must continue our powerful coalition building among groups target by trump's proposed policies from attacks on immigrants to attacks on public education and the environment, from assaults on unions and health care, from voter suppressions and efforts to deny fair wages for women. We recognize the interwoven nature of all forms of oppression. Protect mother Earth and protect humanity. Austin residents residents sell rated the life of Cesar Chavez and his work for farm workers and economic rights, justice, environmental justice, peace, non-violence and empowerment of the poor and disenfranchised. March for the right to stay and the right to return and dreamers right to stay. Right to stay and right to return programs help both renters and homeowners who are historically residents of lower income communities of color to remain in their homes. It would begin to alleviate and make reparations for Austin's years of racist zoning, inequitable development and the total disregard for the residents of the east side. Dreamers should have the right to stay in the country, work and attend school. As Cesar Chavez said, we have a power that comes from

[12:12:23 PM]

the justice of our cause. So long as we are willing to sacrifice for that cause, so long as we persist in non-violence and ticket-to-work spread message of our struggle, then millions of people around the world will respond with their heart and in the end we will overcome. [Speaking foreign language]. Viva Cesar Chavez. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Before you go, Mr. Kim, I had skipped some names. Is Quintie there. Folland here? What about Michael Levy? And William Mayor is not here. So Mr. Kim, you're going to be up next. >> There's one basic truth. There never has been a non-preventable traffic accident. No one has ever needed -- it's never needed to happen. The council has given \$3.5 million, there's \$3.5 million to the transportation department to significantly, and the key word is significantly, reduce traffic fatalities with the vision zero program. As you can see from the top sheet that's being handed out, there has been no statistically significant reduction in fatalities. The number of fatalities do not reflect the profound injuries suffered. Many people would have been pronounced were it not for the Brack Trauma Center and EMS say they wish they had not been salvaged because they will never ever have a good day for the rest of their lives. What can the people on this dais do to make a difference? The primary way to reduce fatalities is significantly is to have more cops with heavy and visible enforcement. There are not enough

cops to do it. Also in your packet are some information on neighborhood associations that have hired their own constables. They can afford it. The neighborhoods that want

[12:14:24 PM]

it the most can't afford it. It's kind of elitist in my opinion. Number two -- there's 20,000 less traffic stops in Austin in 2018. It's because there are too few cops. Change the conversation from just high speed roadways roadways to neighborhood streets. Number three, I realize, Greg, that why you don't want -- not to impound cars where the drivers are -- have no license or suspended license, but we also know that they cause 34% of the fatalities. If we could go back to what has been recommended by the public safety commission, we would save a lot of lives. I mean, that's just statistically correct. And number three, you've got to move, manager, vision zero away, away, far away from transportation. Vehicle services could do a more responsible and a better job. Transportation has spent vision zero money on -- 10,000 on a self congratulatory brochure, intersection improvements that have nothing to do statistically with fatalities. Education and media campaigns, I think everybody on this dais can say that these kind of campaigns will not have any impact on the pathology of -- on the psychiatric pathology of bad drivers. I think there's one thing you can do, one more thing you can do. When you go to sleep tonight think about a loved one, how bad it would be if you got that dreaded knock on the door to let you know that a loved one was killed by a drunk driver, aggressive driver, a driver that did not have a -- that had a suspended license, an aggressive driver. [Buzzer sounds] Can I make one last comment? >> Finish your thought. You can finish your thought.

[12:16:25 PM]

>> I was confirmed by a -- in Dallas by temple I I Iman well. If you have the ability to make a difference and you choose not to, it's wrong. You can even call it ascent. People on this dais have the ability to save a soul and make a difference. Thank y'all. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Kim? No, no. The other Mr. Kim. You've already had a chance. And then after Matthew Kim, Maeve verroye cannon? >> Am I able to speak here? Good afternoon, city council, my name is Matthew Kim. I live in yes or no and I'm currently a sophomore student at St. Stephen's. For as long as I can remember I've been fascinated by plants. I maintained a small garden since third grade and at a time I grew whatever I wanted, believing if I gave my plants enough love and attention they would provide us food. Words cannot describe the joy I felt watching the plants emerge. I felt so happy. However, I fear that my lovely childhood garden may quickly become impossible. Climate change has recently led to droughts, restricting the use of water. And in addition, climate change is also recently contributed to extreme weather conditions. On my own climate change will have a greater impact on other it farms and our nation's food supply. So I want to help preserve the world for the next generation so they may have the chance to experience the same joy that nature also brought me. It's because I fear that the generations after me will live on a different planet, a warmer planet with extreme weather around a loss of wildlife. This has led me to found and act as the president of the Austin's chapter for students for climate action. We are a group of youth in

[12:18:26 PM]

Austin representing many districts and high schools dedicated to advocating for climate protecting legislation. Currently one of our goals is to further the discussion of led lighting in Austin, street lighting in particular. Although we do acknowledge and greatly appreciate the city council's support for led lighting because I know you guys require led lighting to be placed in new buildings, but however we do ask that you prioritize the signallation of led lighting in parts of Austin that may not yet benefit from it. Because better street lighting has been shown to reduce crime rate, so it's a win-win situation there. I'd like to end with thanking you for all your hard work to making Austin such a great place and such a leader in renewable energy. And I love that our city is committed to 100% renewable energy by 2050 and I'm optimistic that we'll be able to get that goal 100% energy sooner. And I've also been a benefiter of the Austin youth council with Dr. Eugene here. I'm thankful for the council that has given me lots of inspiration and leadership skills and I hope that you all may -- will decide to speak with us more on climate action as a member of the students for climate action. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Good job. Thanks for being here today and thanks for your work on the council. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Maeve verroye cannon? >> Hello, good afternoon, mayor Steve Adler, city manager and councilmembers. My name is Maeve verroye cannon and I'm a member of district 8. I'm a president of the Austin waller school Earth club, chair of the miscellaneous committee in the Austin youth council and I'm vice-president now of the students for climate

[12:20:28 PM]

action, the Austin chapter. Yesterday I transplanted six sue seen any plants in my small boxes and the sun was shining down, I could hear the wind through the Tuesday. I watered them with clean water and they are now growing out in front of my house with the help of sun, water, air and healthy and thriving environment. And that's great for now, but how long will we be able to rely on the stable climate, clean air and water and a partially clean environment. When will our ozone layer tear so much now that we chant thrive in the sun. When will our water be contaminated to where we can't drink it or use it? When will our air reach the maximum level of pollution and be unfit toe? In you want to know the answer? It happens when we don't take charge or make change? It happens when we fall back and disbelieve in the findings of climate sciences. It ups happens when we let greed and wealth override your love and respect for the Earth, our home. The sad truth is it's already happening. It's been happening for years now. And there's still a severe lack of action on the state level here in Texas. I understand that the city of Austin has vowed to be renewable by 2050 and that is wonderful. However, we believe it is entirely possible to be 100% renewable energy and green jobs sooner. We, the Austin students for climate action, part of the national organization of students for climate action, we believe that we can do more. As you heard our goal is to connect with elected officials and hold them accountable in regards to climate action policies. We are a growing group of motivated youth striving to ensure that the legislation we support does not get shut down because it is considered unconstitutional. Our current goals consist

of pushing legislation that prohibits the building or use of coal plants in the state of Texas and furthering the discussion of eco friendly street lighting in the places that lack street lighting in the city. In terms of fossil fuel plants, to my knowledge there is no legislation prohibiting the building or continued use of fossil fuel

[12:22:30 PM]

plants, including the two nuclear power plants, sole power plants and unlimited petroleum refineries. What we the students for climate action is looking for is legislation and new policies that prohibit the continued use of such plants. We understand that Texas has great concerns regarding shutting down such plants because of wealth and jobs, however, there are other ways of creating wealth for our state. For example, when cities switch to led street lights it cuts down our cost by a significant amount. Same goes for power plants. There was a lot of money in the renewable energy realm and we would like to show our realities that. We need to speak up and show them that shifting to renewable energies and green jobs by 2050 is constitutional. Thank you for your time. [Buzzer sounds] >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Good job as well. Is silver white mountain here? Is Ted gault here? You will be up next. >> Thank you. Ask not what city council can do for you, ask what you can do for city council? Mayor, I feel you were wrongly accused four years ago. I encountered a similar situation when I crossed paths with the individual who accused you of touching him. I saw him at the cowboy Breck Taft and being acquaintances I said hi. When he didn't respond a nice young man tapped him on the shoulder to get his attention. He turned and shouted don't you ever touch me! His reaction implied that he was touched in the wrong way. Everyone was surprised. Then to top it off he said he didn't know me and accused me of stalking him. I feel like he could have said don't talk to me or don't touch me. Mayor, while most know you're innocent there may be doubt in the minds of some. I hope this new information will help clear that up. And mayor, this doesn't mean we're allies. We're still adversaries. Now, since I was accused of stalking, I would like to defend myself. If I was going to stalk someone they would have to have a car, a house, a career, engage in intellectual conversation of, be a Republican, but

[12:24:30 PM]

most importantly, be retired military or have served and left in good standing. Reason being is at the age of 16 I made a packet with one of my cousin sins that as soon as we graduated we would enlist in the military. We graduated, she enlisted in the army, but I had fallen for a young man. He made his first million by age 20 and then lost it all within one decade and committed suicide at the age of 32. So not being in the military I don't qualify for being buried in a military seminary. I want that plot. I had a good prospect, but his family thought I wanted his money, I wanted his cemetery plot. So an individual that would not meet all the qualifications I want and need. I'm disclosing some of the skeletons in my closet before someone else does. Because I'm planning to run for office at the state level. In 2016 I had planned to also, but it seemed no one had proceeded to do so without paying the fee with signatures only. And by the time it was figured out it was past the deadline. And mayor, I didn't vote for Gus Pena

either. Not that you care, but some people sure wanted to know. I voted for Laura Morrison who was on the previous, previous city council because she would always respond to me. Oh, and mayor, the homeless gentleman who was here with me to present the hero awards in December passed away last month. He died waiting on a place to live, chaired liendig, went by chuck. He was 60. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ted gault. >> Mayor Adler, fellow councilmembers, thank you for the time here. I was here on January 31st in regards to the grafitti and the grafitti task force that has been established and dealing with obviously an epidemic we're dealing

[12:26:31 PM]

with with our city. If we had to rate our city as far as the health of it, we have terminal cancer with this grafitti going on throughout our city. It's something that we can no longer ignore going up and down north Lamar, Guadalupe, burnet, airport boulevard. All these streets are affected by this. These taggers are going by and destroying our city, affecting tourism, affecting businesses, affecting everyone's way of life. This can no longer be ignored. I'm here as a concerned citizen, but I also have a lot of great ideas that I can help share with you and I look forward to working with each and every councilmember in eradicating this issue here. It's a very common sense situation if you look at the root of the problem. One of the root of the problem is the spray can. I've talked to Home Depot, I've talked to Lowe's. Some have cages like home Depot will have a cage, but half the time they're left open because of the paint guy is busy and doing something else. So to have an ordinance banning the spray cans is what I'm suggesting, okay? And here me out on that. It's because the retail stores have the kids come by, they do what's called racking. They steal the cans, they destroy our city. It's in every location. To have some regulation to have them do it over like email -- I mean, they can order it through like applications, Amazon or wherever, so the artists, the people that -- I'm not trying to cut off the ability for an artist to be creative, but we have vandals that are plaguing our city, which everyone sees. Leslie pool, I'm in your district, I go from north loop down through Lamar boulevard and I have personally erased 100 grafitti tags myself and made the city a better place and that's just me as a concerned citizen utilizing the Austin resource recovery center, getting paints from them to be able to eradicate

[12:28:32 PM]

some of the stuff. But there's things I've dealt with Pete Valdez in Kathie tovo district 9 area. I don't have enough time to tell you all the stuff that I do, but I would love to get with all of you to talk about some solutions, common sense solutions that make a difference. I just talked with Ann with echo. I will hire some of the homeless people to help rat indicate -- I talked with them about whether they would be willing to work with us. And this is something that I think it's twofold because it's getting the homeless off the street, it's getting them to be involved with something and helping the community out to help eradicate the grafitti from these vandals that are destroying our city. [Buzzer sounds] I'm not here to show pictures. If you need to see that we obviously have people that have databases like George that can show that. But I'm here to help as a concerned citizen. So I would appreciate meeting with you guys

at some point in private and discussing options. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Council, those are all the speakers we have signed up for citizen communication. It is 12:29. We're going to go ahead and go into closed session. We'll take up four items. We're going to -- pursuant to section 551086 we're going to take up the competitive matter related to item 47, pure student to 551.071 we'll take up legal matters, three of them, item 85, Garcia versus the city of Austin, item 49, Texas association of business versus city of Austin, item number 30, which is the multiterm contract with workquest. Before we go into executive session, councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Yeah, mayor, I have no objection, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut off your sentence. I just have a comment. >> Mayor Adler: I was going to let you make a comment. Do you want to make it before? >> Tovo: That would be great. I just wanted to call the audience's attention and others who may be listening to this, to the fact that in our lobby in the atrium

[12:30:34 PM]

today of city hall we have kind of a mini first day. Some of you may remember that sometimes the animal center brings its van to city hall or nearby city hall on council days and the effort is called furs day and they have animals for adoption. We have a mini one here today in the atrium with two dogs who are available for adoption. So if you are -- well, just go out and take a look. It's good to do research even if your in the looking for one. >> Mayor Adler: They're awfully cute. All right, without objection we'll now go into executive session. I would anticipate probably back about no earlier than 2, given what we have. It might be longer than that. We'll go into recess. [Executive session].

[3:13:18 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We have a quorum back in here. It's still Thursday, March 28th, 2019. It is 3:13 P.M. We're going to start with the consent agenda. We have some folks here on item number 69, so what I'm going to do is ask staff to call up number 69 so we can take a vote. I know there are some folks here from Westminster who wanted to be here. That way while that group is getting up and leaving at the end of it, we can do the consent calendar in zoning and then we will double back to the items that we had called for this morning and then back to the zoning agenda. So why don't you take us through 69 here. >> Mayor and council, Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. [Lapse in audio] We would be closing the public hearing and approving on all three readings. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. This is item number -- give me the number again? >> 69. >> Mayor Adler: 69. Is there a motion to approve this item number 69? Councilmember alter makes the motion. Is there a second to that? Councilmember Renteria seconds that. Is there any discussion? Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I just wanted to thank the folks from Westminster from being here. This is a request for an important community asset in my district. I want to thank the representatives from Westminster for working closely with the neighbors on this particular zoning case, and I'm pleased that it looks like we'll be able to pass this on consent on all three readings. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Any further discussion? It's good to see you all

[3:15:19 PM]

down here again. Let's take a vote. All those in favor of item 69 please raise your hand. Those opposed? Those abstaining? Councilmember Tovo abstains, the others voting aye. It passes 10-0-1. That item passes, thank you. [Applause]. >> Tovo: I'll just explain, mayor, if I may. I was abstaining. I have family who live it there and I don't believe it requires a recusal for any reason, but decided it was best to abstain. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Why don't you take us through the consent agenda. And if you all want to leave you are welcome to leave. If you want to stay, surely there are more exciting things to do. [Laughter]. Why don't you take us through the consent agenda. >> Thank you, mayor and council. Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning department. Item number 55 we're offering for consent approval, case npa-2018- npa-2018-0021.03. This is ready for consent approval on second and third readings. Item number 56 is case c14--2018-0088 also ready for consent approval on second and third readings. On the 2:00 zoning and neighborhood plan amendment items, item number 57 has been withdrawn, no action required. Also item number 58, case c14--2018-0093, has been withdrawn. Item number 59 is case c14-2018-0130, this is ready for consent approval on all three readings. Item number 60 is case npa-2018-0021-.01. Staff is requesting a postponement of this case to may 23rd. Item number 61 is case c14-2018-0080, staff is requesting a postponement of this item to may 23rd. Item number 62, this is case c14---2018-0151.

[3:17:23 PM]

Councilmember Flannigan has a quick comment on this one? >> This is the historic zoning and I think we're just going to do this on first reading only and get a more specific site plan to see if -- make sure that we're preserving the Ciscos and not the only business on that site. We'll see if it's possible as we go to second and third reading? >> Mayor Adler: Without objection that will be listed as a first reading approval. Go ahead. >> Moving on to item number 63, case c14- 2018-0120. This is ready for consent approval on all three readings. Item number 64 is case c14- 2018-0115, this is ready for consent approval on first reading only. Item number 65 is case c814-01-0038.03, staff is requesting a postponement to April 11th. Item number 66 is case c14--2019-005, this is ready for consent approval on all three readings. Item number 67 is case c14- 2018-0148. This is ready ready for consent approval on all three readings. That was item 67. Item number 68 is case c14- 2018-0135. This is ready for consent approval on all three readings. Item number 66 we just took action on. Item number 70 is case c14- 2018-0136. This is ready for consent approval on all three readings. >> Flannigan: Mayor, I wonder if there's -- just to clarify, this we normally would have done on Tuesday, but we ran out of time. Is there any objection to leaving the prohibited use co's as they exist on the site and not adding any new ones? >> Mayor Adler: Does

[3:19:23 PM]

anybody object to not adding any new prohibited uses? This is item number -- >> 70. >> Mayor Adler: 70. There was a co that was added that added prohibited uses. Mr. Flannigan is asking that we in essence -- only leave the prior uses that were prior existing. Does anybody have any objection to that? >> Pool: I don't have an objection. I just want to make sure that the applicant is aware. >> Mayor Adler: The applicant is okay with this, I think? Is the applicant here? >> Pool: It looks like the rep is coming down. >> Mayor Adler: Are you okay with that? >> I'm fine with the will of the council. >> Mayor Adler: That's good. Without objection that changes. Owe. >> Tovo: Can we ask the staff -- with question pull it and do this? >> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and pull 70. Let's pull 70. >> Item number 71 is case c14-2017-08022, the applicant has requested an indefinite postponement. This will require renotification before this item is brought back. Item number 72 is case c14- 2018-0102. This is ready for consents approval on first reading only. The applicant did note in a note to me that they would like to consider this coming back on April 11th, which is your next meeting. That agenda has been pretty much set, but we wanted to make that request to bring second and third reading back on April 11th for item 72. This is only ready for first reading today. >> Mayor Adler: If we approve it on first reading you will bring it back when it's ready. You will bring it back on the 11th, then you will. >> That's correct. Item 73 is case npa 2017- 2017-0016.02. We have several speakers that have signed up to speak to item number 73.

[3:21:27 PM]

And related item 74, c14- 2017-0094, we have five or six speakers for that item. Item 75 is case c14-2018- 2018-0128. The applicant has requested an indefinite postponement of this case. This will require renotification when we would bring this back. Item number 76, this is case c14--2018-0112, this is ready -- >> Mayor Adler: I think we're pulling this one? >> Flannigan: Unless there's no objection to removing the co. >> Mayor Adler: Let's pull it and come back to this. 76 pulled. >> Let me move on, item 77, this is c14- 2018-0065, this is ready for consent approval on second and third readings. Item 78 is case c14-2018-0064. I believe we have one speaker for this item. So that would be a discussion item. This is 78. >> Casar: 77 and 78 are virtually the same zoning cases. >> Mayor Adler: 77 and 78 -- >> I don't have any speakers I believe on 77, but I do on 78. >> Renteria: I just want to move that we take it on consent on second reading. >> Mayor Adler: Just on second reading? >> Renteria: Yes. The neighborhood asked us to pull it and I agree with the second reading and they will -- >> Is that item 77 and 78 or just 78? >> Mayor Adler: They're companions. So 77 and 78. >> Mayor Adler: So those will be for second reading only. Is it also to leave the public hearings open for both of those items? >> Renteria: Yes, yes. >> Mayor Adler: Is the applicant okay with that? >> There was a request to bring this back for third

[3:23:30 PM]

reading consideration on April 11th adds well. >> Mayor Adler: If you could do that, bring this back. I will comment on it here in a second. >> Casar: Mayor, since we have a speaker -- if we're going to comment -- or we can comment -- >> Mayor Adler: All right, go ahead. >> And item number 79 and 80 are related. Number 79 is npa-2018- npa-2018-0012.02. Sh. And 80 is case c14- 2018-0100. Sh. These two cases, the

applicant has requested a appointment. The neighborhood does not object to the postponement. There is an adjacent property owner that would like to address you, but has no problem leaving this for a postponement and bringing both of these items back on April 11th. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll have that person speak on the consent agenda. Not right now. They'll speak on the consent. Go ahead. >> Pool: Mayor, I'm sorry, I missed, was it April 11th for Mr. Guernsey on that item? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. Okay. Is that it? >> No, mayor, on item 62, just to clarify where we're closing the public hearing on item 62? >> Mayor Adler: This is Cisco. >> Flannigan: I'm always in favor of closing the public hearing, but I don't think given what I'm thinking, we might want to leave it open. >> Leave the public hearing open. >> So that concludes what I can offer on consent. >> Mayor Adler: The ones being pulled are 70, 73, 74 and 76, is that correct? 70, 73, 74 and 76. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: The consent agenda goes from 55 to 80. >> 73, 74 --

[3:25:31 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: 70, 73, 74, 76 and 80. 70, 73, 74, 76 and -- >> Wait, 78 for one speaker. >> 79 and 78. >> Pool: And 77. >> Mayor Adler: The ones being pulled are 70, 73, 74, 76 and 79 and 80. >> Pool: What about 77? >> Mayor Adler: There's one person with a comment. >> Pool: But there's paired up. >> Mayor Adler: 77 and 78 are both passing on second reading with the public hearing left open. >> And for clarification, mayor, not item number 80. >> Yes. 79 and 80 are agreement to -- there's no objection to postponement to April 11th with one speaker. >> Mayor Adler: They're not pulled, they're being postponed. >> With an adjacent property owner just asking to address you. >> Mayor Adler: There's one person to speak on that. There's one person to speak on some of the areas. They get to speak on the agenda consent agenda. 79 and 80 are on the consent agenda -- >> And further clarification, there's no speaker for 80. >> I was just told that speaker has just declined to speak. [Laughter] >> Mayor Adler: I don't blame them. [Laughter]. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I have more people that have signed up for 79 and 80, but my understanding is that we're okay. No one is going to speak now on 79 or 80. It's going to pass on consent and it is a postponement to 4-11. Yes. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Mayor, to add to the confusion, 76, which we were going to pull, it's my understanding the amendment is to remove the co and if we're talking about the co to limit commercial and office uses to 25% of the building square footage, is

[3:27:32 PM]

that what you intended? >> Mayor Adler: We pulled 76. >> Tovo: I was going to put it back on. I am in agreement to removing that co if that's all we were doing on that piece. >> Mayor Adler: With that understanding 76 goes back on to the consent agenda. We have some people here to speak on the consent agenda. Let see if that's true still still. Susana Almanza is here to speak on the consent agenda. Is Susana Almanza here? No? Okay. 77 and 78 are only going to be passed on second reading. I had some comments on that. It's my understanding that the restrictive covenant is being worked on on this matter to accomplish, colleagues, several different things. One of them is to ensure that if any of the

additional entitlement is actually utilized associated with this upgrade, that it requires residential development. In other words, it couldn't be a nonresidential project. And it's further going to provide that if it exceeds any of the existing entitlements that the project has to be predominantly residential and that nonresidential uses are limited to the first floor. I just wanted to make sure that if we were giving this additional to get that residential use that we in fact got it. And then it builds in the affordability element into the residential component. That's the kind of thing being worked on in the restrict that will come

[3:29:32 PM]

back. And if you can get that to everybody ahead of time so everybody could look at it, that would be great. Okay. Any further discussion on the consent agenda? >> Casar: Mayor? So I'm going to vote no again on second reading on that case, which I think which numbers was it, 76 and 77? >> 77, 78. >> 77 and 78. I'm still against the case. I recognize the need for new housing. In fact, just yesterday the mayor pro tem and I posted, suggested on the message board that we need to at least double the housing capacity in the entire city in order to help with our affordability displacement and environmental challenges but we have to be really thoughtful when we're zoning in gentrifying areas. And with this case I tries these units could price up on their own regardless of our zoning change, but regardless of that, by approving cases like that N we could unnecessarily accelerate the gentrification in an area that's already experiencing a lot of displacement and I'm afraid what these sorts of projects, what kind of affect they could have on a corridor like this. And I recognize and appreciate that this proposal has gotten better since first reading. On first reading there was not a guarantee of any affordable units and now if they go above what is entitled there, now there would be, as I understand it by this restrictive covenant, 10% of affordable units so that is an improvement from first reading. And I know it's important for us to fight for more affordable units in the city city, but no matter what we always have to make trade-offs. And this council has voted not in majority favor to get us affordable units sometimes where there was a warehouse. Sometimes it's not voted for majority -- in majority for affordable units when there

[3:31:36 PM]

was a parking lot and a commercial use. So there have been cases where this council has not chosen to pick up those affordable units, place where's I think it did make sense. And in this case losing dense multi-family in exchange for some number of affordable units, while I recognize why folks on the dais might want to be making that trade here, I just don't think that it's necessary, especially given, one, the continued gentrification of this corridor and two, that we can actually rezone and remap the entire city, alleviating pressure on gentrifying areas by adding housing capacity where there aren't existing, already dense older multi-family and working class families. >> Mayor Adler: And I certainly don't challenge and understand, -- and I understand and appreciate everything that you've said and I recognize that by allowing greater development entitlements on this property it's going to redevelop. And I understand

that and I appreciate everything you've said. Where I come down on this is if we don't do anything, the status quo is not the existing structure. The status quo is the existing structure with much higher rents the more likely it develops, whether it's existing entitlements for units that again will not be affordable units. We have the opportunity in this situation to plant permanent affordability and families that can be therein definitely on this property. And I just wish we had done this in more places in the city than we did. We would have a lot more affordable families planted in our city indefinitely. And this is an opportunity and I think that we need to take it. I only wish the status quo was that this would stay forever as it is, but since it's not, that's why I put it the other way. Mr. Flannigan and then Mr.

[3:33:36 PM]

Renteria. >> Flannigan: I don't know that we want to do too much soliloquies on consent. Mostly, mayor, I was thinking what you are thinking on this and nobody likes redevelopment. Certainly not the people who live where redevelopment is occurring, but it is occurring and we have opportunity to consider the long-term affordability through redevelopment or short-term affordability without doing redevelopment. And I think we have to take a long-term view. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. Growing up in Austin and seeing the lost opportunities that we've had in the past because we were so determined to get affordable units that there have been, we lost a lot of affordable units. We did the cure over there in rainy thinking that we were -- Rainey, thinking that we were going to get the height for the affordable units and we didn't get a single one out of that place. So if we continue this path we will have -- get to that point where the low income and the middle class people are going to be gone out of Austin. And we need to really address these issues. And I'll support any kind of affordable housing that gives us the opportunity to keep our population here. You know, when we were able to get 10% from the base, not from -- the additional height, it's a great opportunity to lock in this affordability that we need so desperately in Austin. And I've gotten to the point now where I'm old enough to now that we have failed in the past and I don't want to keep doing that same thing over and over and over again. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember pool and councilmember kitchen. Anything else? >> Pool: So my support for this case is contingent on a satisfactory agreement between the applicant and the current tenants at the

[3:35:38 PM]

mesh apartments. And what I'm hoping to do with my vote is to challenge the parties to work even harder toward third reading to get to the place where everybody is accommodating. I understand there have been and will continue to be such discussions between the parties and I look forward to seeing the discussions bear fruit and lead to acceptable terms that everybody on the dais can support. The case illuminates our lack of planning and policy related to existing market affordable housing and how best to preserve it. I realize we can't solve that big picture problem in time for this case. But with my vote here I'm signaling my desire to work with my colleagues on policies and programs to support workforce housing and to preserve existing market affordable housing as a vital resource for our city. This is going

to happen eventually in all reaches of the city of Austin. I'm going to vote yes, but it is with the challenge extended to the applicant and the parties to please come to terms that are acceptable and that minimize or ensures that there is no displacement for the folks who live there now. >> Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: I was just going to say that I do support it. I think that what we're working towards here is a situation where we will actually be able to secure a larger number of affordable units, which I think is important. And I also think the other part that's really important, as others have said, is that we look at how we work with the folks that are living there now. So I think we've got some good -- some good provisions in there for that also. Thank you.

[3:37:38 PM]

So I'll be supporting that. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar? >> Casar: And I think one important thing to note and some folks have asked why pick out this case in Marx and it's actually not plucking out this case. This actually is the first case, at least the first big zoning case I've been able to come up with or the staff has been able to come up with, that has been presented to the 10-1 council that has involved a big rezoning of older multi-family where folks' leases could be interrupted by demolition where we would be actively upzoning larger multi-family in a gentrifying area. So these cases traditionally are not presented to us. It is the first time that we have had a case of this time. Traditionally we are upzoning older office or green field or what have you you. So my position has been clear on this since I came on council and that's why I'll be voting no. And I do take some exception with voting no on this being seen as a short-term view rather than a long-term view. I haven't contested and I don't think anybody has, there can be up filtering and the rents could go up regardless of our zoning vote. I don't think anybody is contesting that. For me the longer term view is if we can create opportunities for some of our older multi-family housing stock to not be replaced by luxury and in the longer term we add enough supply and subsidy in the market that we slow gentrification up and down corridors like this even further east. So to me it isn't -- I recognize and respect the argument that it might seem like a short-term view to say hey, not up zoning this, isn't this going to get expensive anyway, I recognize that, but my vote is coming from a longview of if we add enough supply in the market and bring enough subsidy to bear we might wish we still had some of

[3:39:38 PM]

these older units around. >> Mayor Adler: Since we're on consent I'm going to resist the urge. >> Casar: Well, I wanted to pull it, but if you want to consent -- >> Mayor Adler: Let's pull it and -- >> Mayor? Just note that we're closing the public hearing where applicable. The item number 76 that was placed back on your consent agenda deleting the conditional overlay the commission added regarding that 25% mix is also ready for three readings but we can delete that and still proceed with the ordinance. And I think Mr. Rusthoven has one comment on one of the cases that he made sure got on the record. >> Real quick on item 66. The applicant -- property is located at 4400 and a half east William cannon drive and the applicant when they submitted the case was intending to call it apc towers, Nuckols crossing. Somehow

that was mistakenly mistyped into the system. The address is correct in the posting and we will be changing the name in the computer so it will say Nuckols crossing. >> If you could note who made the motion and the second for the consent agenda? >> Mayor Adler: We haven't -- is there a motion to approve the consent agenda? I don't think we got a motion on that. Mr. Renteria makes the motion. Mr. Flannigan seconds. On the consent agenda, the only items that are pulled are 70, 73 and 74. We're closing all the hearings unless it was otherwise stated that they remain open. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Mayor, I have a question about item 70, a very quick one, I think. >> Mayor Adler: That's been pulled. >> Tovo: Sorry, not 70. 79 and 80. It's my understanding this is a postponement request from the applicant? >> That is correct. >> Yes. The neighborhood does not object and it would be to April 11th. >> Tovo: It's my understanding that part of the request generates from awaiting a survey of the property or that there was an error in the existing survey? Can you just clarify that? >> I understand that the property owner and the

[3:41:41 PM]

next-door neighbor have discussions over surveys on the property. There seems to be some issue over a matter of I think six feet that borders on the eastern side of the -- of this property. And there's some question about ownership, I guess. >> Tovo: Okay. So when is the -- one of the neighbors requested that I ask when there would be a corrected survey available for people to review? >> I would have to actually I guess ask the applicant. I'm not sure what is coming back with regards to address that particular wish. >> Thank you, councilmember. Glenn Coleman for the applicant. They surveyed, we engaged a new surveyor, they were officer surveying yesterday. A couple of days. I'm committed to the neighbor to have it Monday morning if possible. If not, I will obtain correspondence showing -- asking the surveyor when are you going to get it. >> Tovo: I appreciate that, that information. Thank you. And I would just say with regard to -- I mean, 77 and 78 are very challenging cases and I appreciate the thoughtful comments of all of my colleagues. I'm going to support it today, but I, as councilmember pool said, am going to really look carefully at what that final agreement looks like. But I would also just mention, you know, we have a standing resolution that we did a few years ago asking our staff to update us frequently on how we're doing at preserving market rate multi-family housing along our corridors and I don't know if we've been getting those updates. I think we have a tremendous amount of work to do in these areas to look at strategies that are workable and it's a high priority of mine to see what we can do to preserve as much of that as possible and not to incentivize this redevelopment. And I think east Riverside corridor as I've said both in this setting and others

[3:43:42 PM]

presents us with a real interesting case study analysis of how a planning process can actually exacerbate redevelopment and the displacement of individuals. And I hope my office -- my office has been mulling over how best to get at some of that information as a way of understanding how to prevent -- how to prevent further displacement as areas redevelop. So I may be bringing that forward as a resolution, but

one of the things that happened when we did the east Riverside corridor plan and I voted for it and supported it, one -- because we built in so many entitlements in that planning process, we have gotten no affordable units that I'm aware of, none of the projects that have come forward have participated in the density bonus. And as we've seen lots of those apartments have been redeveloped or in the process of doing so. So I hope we can be -- look at that example -- look at that area as an example of how we might face the future a little differently. >> Mayor Adler: By the way, for the record, while we took our recess, we were in executive session and discussed competitive matters related to 47 and legal matters related to items 85, 49 and 30. Continuing on, we have a motion and a second on the consent zoning. Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Two items, just for a statement on 63, which is judges' hill rezoning, which I'm in support of. Just noting the challenge of the downtown Austin plan describing judges hill as a single-family neighborhood when in one part of the report it talks about preserving a single-family home neighborhood and another part of the report talks about how this is surrounded by offices internal to the neighborhood. So it's a good discussion question for the future about what the natural evolution of a neighborhood looks like in the context of land code. And then on 67 I'll talk a little bit more about it when we deliberate 70.

[3:45:43 PM]

67 is a rezoning in my district going from sf 3 to cs. And in this case zap did not add any of their standard uco's about bail bonds or adult businesses that we normally see, which I always say why would we do it that way? On the same agenda we have an item where they did do it and then they didn't do it. And so I'll talk more about this when we deliberate number 70, but I'm in support of both of those just with that comment. >> Mayor Adler: Let's take a vote on the consent. Those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed raise our hand? It's unanimous with the notations made. We're going to go to the items from this morning and then come back to zoning. Item number 30, this is the cleanup under the txdot items. There's a motion -- item in front of us. Does anyone want to make a motion? Mr. Flannigan makes the motion. Councilmember kitchen seconds it. Any discussion on this? Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Mayor, I'd like to amend it to say that the optional -- to require that the optional contract extensions may only be granted with council approval. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a -- any objection to that amendment being added? Hearing none the amendment is added. >> Tovo: Can I say a few words on that fronts? And just a few because we had the opportunity to talk about it on Tuesday. I really encourage the city manager and his staff to continue to talk with txdot about a more shared partnership. I'm glad they're going to continue to maintain the underpasses to some level, but I believe it does, as I indicated on Tuesday, really concern me to see us taking on this expense when we have such scarce resources and so many needs, especially when it comes to really meeting

[3:47:45 PM]

the needs of individuals in our community who are experiencing homelessness. In addition, I hope that we can talk with txdot about how -- how we might also negotiate what happens under those

underpasses in a more collaborative manner. I think we've in the past, and I cited on Tuesday the long process that was required to get permission to have a temporary restroom, for example. And so in trying to -- in trying to have different things happen on those underpasses, it's been occasionally a long process with txdot and I hope that as a part of our moving forward and working with them both on this particular issue as well as others that we can come up with some different strategies. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. It's been moved and seconded with the amendment added. Ready to take a vote? Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I just want to thank councilmember tovo. We had a great conversation on Tuesday about this item and just to note the conversation we had this morning about the legislature's contemplations on property tax caps not only is this an unfunded mandate, but it also -- txdot properties represent undevelopable land where we might be able to do more growth. And one of the things the legislature says is 2.5 is fine because you get growth for free is one of the INGs I heard a legislator say. Except when txdot comes in and takes all of the land, I can't now get growth on. And so it's a double, triple, quadruple whammy that we get down from the state in that way. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes. I think it will be -- it will be interesting to explore with txdot how we can partner on some innovative ideas for how we might -- the city might work with spaces under overpasses, for example. >> Mayor Adler: That's good. I just want to remark too that I think txdot, based on all the conversations I've had from Terri Mccoy, the local district guy, that

[3:49:46 PM]

he's open to -- in fact, he said in his letter, a continuing conversation about a joint use agreement and I think it's a good time to raise these issues. I'll also say that we're fortunate to have Terry Mccoy in the position he's in because he's such an advocate for our city. And there's a lot of things that we can do together with txdot. Okay. We have a motion and a second. Those in favor of this item please raise your hand? Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais with councilmembers alter and Renteria off. All right, let's pick up then item number 34. The no-kill item. Council, we have a bunch of people here to speak. Do you want me to just go ahead and start pulling them up? I'll go ahead and do that. So I'm going to call people to come up and speak. First is David lundsted here? On deck is Ellen Jefferson? Is Dr. Jefferson here? You will be up next. You have time donated to you, Dr. Jefferson, Casey hhiab here? You will have five minutes when you come up. >> [Inaudible - no mic]. >> Why don't you go ahead and tell the clerk because I'm not showing that. Go ahead. >> Good afternoon. I'm David lunsted, I'm chair of the animal advisory commission. I want to let you know that those of us who signed up in favor of this item will agreed to the bare minimum. I just want to thank our sponsors, mayor pro tem, councilmember pool, councilmember alter, thank you, mayor, thank you, city manager, for your support not only today, but everyday for the work that animal services does. The rescue partners, volunteers and the animal advisory commission. We really, really appreciate it. I offer my personal support

[3:51:47 PM]

for this item. And with that I'm going to sit down, but I'm here if anybody has any commission-related questions. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Dr. Jefferson you had time donated. Was somebody else donating? >> No, I don't need it. >> Mayor Adler: You have five may minutes. >> I'm Ellen Jefferson, I'm the executive director of Austin pets alive. As most of you know in 2007, Austin was only saying few of the animals coming to our shelter. It took an incredible amount of vision in 2010 to pass a 90% resolution and that vision is being surpassed today and as you guys consider 95% as being the lowest threshold for life saving in Austin. And we're extremely grateful to councilmember pool for initiating this, to mayor pro tem Garza, councilmember alter and councilmember kitchen for co-sponsoring and the rest of the council because we know that animals are important to all of you. You should know the backdrop of this issue. In the U.S. Greater than a million animals are killed in shelter every year, dogs and cats. And in Texas alone one-10th of that killing is occurring. So 100,000 of those animals are being killed in Texas. But Austin is a safe haven. And believe it or not, everywhere else outside of outside was so much worse five years ago than the numbers we just told you. And the numbers are dropping because we as a city have shown that no-kill is possible and it's the right thing to do and people are following our suit. You will likely hear today that we need to do better for the pets saved and we absolutely do. We are just on the other side of stopping the killing and it's been a huge mountain to climb. That means that there's a whole new path in front of us that is uncharted territory and we have -- we need to use that path to improve the not killing process. The reality is that shelters originally were built in every city in America to catch and kill pets. And changing an

[3:53:47 PM]

institutionalized way of handling a social problem doesn't change overnight and it doesn't turn into life Savi perfection immediately. The good news is we live in Austin and we're an innovative city, we're bright, and we're determined to not only continue saving all the pets, but to continue improving on the how. The resolution is simply about not going backwards in the meantime. If we kill our problems, we will never figure out how to solve them. I'll finish with a really short video from our American pets alive conference, America pets alive is a collaboration between Austin center and Austin pets alive and it was created because there's a demand to share what Austin has achieved even with our flaws so that every city in America can some day stop their killing and pass their own 95% no-kill resolutions. We can go from being the worst in the country in being the best in the country in life saving and humane care. Thank you for recommitting to fixing the system and this broken system of animal sheltering. [Video playing]. [♪Music♪]. >> We are speaking at the American pets alive conference and we have people from all over the country and all over Texas coming together to learn how it we no-kill and getting the whole country closer to no-kill. >> I'm looking forward to meeting more people and getting more advice and making a difference in our community. [♪Music♪]. >> I'm here today as a member of the [indiscernible] City council to learn more about how we can implement life saving policies in our shelter. >> It's very exciting to come to Austin and -- in no kill. >> Everyone should be coming to ampa.

[3:55:48 PM]

We get some concrete programs and next steps that we can apply the very next day that we are back at work. If you want to improve the quality of life in animals in your community, this is the conference that will show you how to do that. >> We hold them up as a model city, model organization. It's pretty incredible and all the tools are here. >> Thank you. >> You have time donated. >> I won't use it. As was said, we've limited all the fours got together and limited our time so it will be two naval of us speaking and that will be it. I'll be the last one you'll hear from on my side, my understanding, anyway, unless someone signed up after me that I don't know about. We want to thank councilmember pool for your leadership on this, mayor pro tem Garza, councilmember kitchen and alter and councilmember Casar who communicated with me in support of this resolution so we want to thank all of you and in fact every single one of you has communicated with me at some point regarding your support for no kill in Austin so we thank each of you for helping Austin continue -- to continue to be a city on a hill when it comes to homeless pets. A little bit of history about the 90% goal. Dr. Jefferson and I sat at a bar in Austin in 2009, trying to come up with a plan for Austin to become a no-kill city. At that bar we didn't know what the number was so we chose the number 90%. That's why our city's save rate goal is 90%, because we set a bar and we had a goal of what this should be. We now know based on our history here and what the

[3:57:49 PM]

animal services department was done that 90% was artificially low. The goal was set in March of 2010. It was met in February of 2011. And has been met every single month since February of 2011. And then in 2015 we started hitting over 95%. By 2016 we were entirely over 95% and have been for the last three years. We're now at 98% last year and 97 the year before. So we've far exceeded our 90% goal, 95 percent is not an aspirational goal, something the shelter is already achieving so we're not asking the council to set some aspirational movement. We're simply asking the council to recognize the amazing work Austin animal center has done along with Austin pets alive and others. The other reason we ask for this it's a pivot moment in Austin, we've been without a shelter director for more than two years and are in the process of hiring a new shelter director and we want to make it clear that this city expects the shelter to not go backwards, that's all we're asking. Especially given that the additional pressures that the legislature may place on the council. Lastly, I want to say that my kids are, one, almost two, and four. They have not been -- they've never lived in a city that didn't care for its animals, that didn't protect almost every single animal that comes into the shelter and I ask that you maintain that commitment so they never have to live in a city where that takes place. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Next speaker is David munyo. You have time donated from Liz garsko. >> I took my time back. >> Mayor Adler: That's fine. What about James Taylor so I'll have fine minutes? >> Good afternoon, I live in

[3:59:49 PM]

district 9. I've been a volunteer at Austin animal center over four years, started out helping with the rabies clinic and walking the easiest dogs. I'm a volunteer lead and mentor and a founding member of the Orange dog crew. I logged an average of 700 hours for each of my four years and contributed at least that same number in unlogged hours promoting and marketing dogs and facilitating fosters outside the shelter. I share this so you understand I'm in the thick of this effort. My opinions are based on what I've seen and know. Please know that nobody wants Austin to achieve a live outcome rate of 95% or higher more than I do. I'm able to give so much of my time and heart to this effort in part because I know I'm not going to walk into the shelter and find out a dog I've been working with is going to be euthanized because of space or minor behavior issues. Why do I oppose this resolution? I oppose it because even though I feel it comes with the best of intentions, it's a goal without a plan. If Austin wants to post a billboard that says we're the nation's no-kill leader it's time we pay for it, not just with money but with the actions of the entire community. Last Saturday while under red alert for overcrowding once again begging for fosters to take a dog home I watched as a line formed outside the intake door. Dogs were coming to the shelter as fast or faster than we could send them home. This is now the norm. We have reached a point of unsustainability at Austin animal center. If Austin wants to be the no-kill leader it's time everyone in Austin participated. We can't earn this number with a resolution. We can earn it by solving problems we discovered by saving so many animals. Problems like chronically overcrowded shelter where some dogs spend 24 hours a day in a small crate with two breaks a day on a good day and don't stay there for days or weeks, sometimes they stay there for months.

[4:01:51 PM]

And the psychological effects they suffer are long lasting and heart breaking. Problems like the average number of [indiscernible] There aren't enough staff volunteers or kennels to adequately work with the dogs who start declining in the shelter environment, problems like bright, caring, committed volunteers leaving one after another because dealing with an overcrowded shelter day after day is too much. I've been surrounded by some of the most creative Himes for the last four years, learned so much from every one of them and applaud every one of them. We are now in uncharted waters. Eight years ago when Austin set the bar at 90% solutions were shelter based. It happened by changing the way our shelter operated. It has become painfully obvious to sustain this effort in a humane manner we must change. We're saving every dog that enters our shelter that can be saved. If the residents of Austin want to claim no-kill leader they can no do it while shopping for a purebred puppy from a breeder. They must stop refusing housing to a dog based on breed. If Austin wants to be the no kill leader Austin is going to have to lead, we're going to have to make decisions other cities are afraid to make and it's time to legislate solutions, not numbers. I know this seems like a purely symbolic resolution respectfully I can assure you that -- to the staff and volunteers who are at Austin animal center it is not. I work with current leadership day in and day out. I assure you there is no complacency. Staff and volunteers are as committed as ever to saving every life we can. As the city prepares to hire a new chief animal services officer you have the opportunity to hire someone just as committed to this effort. Please tell them it's the way we achieve the number that matters. Don't pass a resolution to save 95%, pass a resolution

[4:03:56 PM]

to innovate city ordinances to keep dogs out of the shelter, support leadership and staff with the tools and dollars they need, pass resolution to end breed restrictions on Austin's apartments and neighborhoods. I applaud the authors of this resolution for wanting to be America's no-kill leader. Please make sure you're also the city leaders that give us the means to deserve that title. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Liz Crosco. On deck is Sandra Muller. >> Thank you, my name is Liz, I fully represent district 9. I'm reading this on behalf of Erin, lives in district 7 and she couldn't be here and I agree with what she wrote 100%. She and I oppose the resolution and it isn't because we are anti-no kill. I'm strongly committed to the notion we should not be routinely killing companion animals in our shelters and while I appreciate your concern for shelter animals in Austin, the resolution does not address the most current and important need in the city, which is better standards for the animals who are living in Austin public and private shelters. Because of the no kill policies these animals are often living many months -- and some years in shelters without adequate safeguards. No kill in some cases is becoming a very harsh way for companion animals to live. I am concerned that the resolution is a reaction to the advocates talking to council since last spring about the need for better conditions at both AAC and APA. The volunteers raised important issues. The need for daily kennel breaks for dogs at AAC and emphasis on spay and neuter. Those issues are not addressed in this proposed resolution. Right now the city provides very minimal staffing to provide walks for dogs. Spay and neuter, please note advocates have fought even modest attempts to improve spay and neuter laws. The resolution also calls attention to APA.

[4:05:57 PM]

APA has taken in more animals from outside of Austin and Travis county. New intakes of 375 dogs in February 2019, only 70 of those were from AAC. Since July of 2018 dogs at AAC have been living in temporary crates in a conference room. Crates are not acceptable means to house dogs in a shelter, according to the national sheltering standards of the Association of Shelter Veterinarians. APA is misleading its volunteers and efforts to lobby for the resolution. A recent email from APA said that turnover at AAC has left no-kill policies in a state of uncertainty and we are facing a very real future where only 90% of pets would be saved, other 7.5% would not. This is not true. AAC already strives for a high outcome rate through the city's budget process council ensured that AAC has a high live outcome rate. The resolution also mentions Austin's intake diversion programs. What that means in practice is that people who can no longer care for any animal for any reason cannot easily surrender that pet. AAC is no longer an open intake facility. Sometimes people are required to make an appointment several months into the future. Many people who cannot or will not wait that long, animals are suffering by being dumped or allowed to simply go stray. Not only does this jeopardize the animal's well-being it also becomes a public safety issue. I sincerely hope you consider amendments to your resolution that emphasize the quality of a shelter animal's life is just as important. If not more so as the numbers. [Buzzer sounding] The fact that dogs often do not get a single kennel break is very troubling. If Austin really wants to be a true leader in humane animal sheltering please add amendments. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Thank you. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers.

[4:07:57 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. Your mic isn't on. Try again. Point it to you. >> Oops. Can you hear me now? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Sandra Muller, zen of district 7. I've been walking shelter dogs for ten years, eight of those in Austin, for the past ten months I've been walking dogs living in crates in a conference room because Austin animal center is overcapacity. Last weekend they put an urgent request for fosters and adopters because they're out of space. Meanwhile Austin Pets Alive has been bringing in animals from Palm Valley and other areas outside of Travis County into Austin. This is burdening AAC, who is required to assist under license agreement while they're using the city land. Over the past few years APA has brought in more animals from outside of animal than taken from AAC. In connection with Hurricane Harvey APA received contributions and grants of \$15 million, pretty enormous, but most of it will be used outside of Austin. I am opposed to this resolution because it is already usually being met by APA and AAC and is already stated in Performance Modernize outlined in the 2018-2019 budget so I feel it's entirely unnecessary. With regard to the \$15 million, 4 million of that is for Mattie's fund for leaders of other municipalities to come learn about Austin's no-kill model expel that's mentioned in the proposal. The resolution also mentions the intake did you have version program, which means that people who can't care for their animals are being asked to wait usually a couple months until there's room. So for those who can't wait there's a good chance that animals are going to be abandoned or dumped and I've seen animals tied outside of AAC and APA. The resolution also mentions intake reduction. But I believe the city of Austin's intake has hovered around 16,000 for three years. And let's also be clear no-kill did is not mean no

[4:09:58 PM]

animal is killed. It's really an easy term to embrace because nobody wants to kill the animals. Everyone in the room is here to save the animals. If you look at a bag of cookies and it says no peanuts, that means no peanuts, zero, but no-kill means 90% and I think it's time to be honest with Austin and change the marketing to high save and equally to remind the public that very unfortunately not every animal can be saved. This year seven dogs at APA declined to take into the program were euthanized. The behavior medical end of life decisions can be difficult and should not be pressured by this goal of a certain number. Saving every animal should not be on the shoulders of an open intake taxpayer funded budgeted municipal shelter. That should be passed on to rescue partners who have the time, donations to work on difficult cases. Austin Pets Alive have brought fantastic results and I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak and thank you for helping save the animals of Austin. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Next speaker is Alata Smagula. Is Will McKinney here? You'll be at the other podium. >> Good afternoon, Mayor, Councilmembers. My name is Alata Smagula, and I'm a member of district 1. I began as a large dog volunteer and foster at Austin Animal Center November 2014. I was an employee of the center from November 2015 to October 2017 at which time I returned to volunteering. I currently serve as a liaison working on finding solutions with staff to volunteer issues and concerns. For at least the past

six months, I have been cleaning crates in the multipurpose room Monday to Friday mornings while other

[4:11:58 PM]

volunteers take the dogs that live in those crates for over 23 hours a day out. I'm telling you my background with the animal center with the hope that it will help you understand that my statement today is based on my and other volunteers experiences there. As we used to say in the military bottom line and respondent. I'm opposed to this item on the agenda. Reaffirming commitment to the current no-kill resolution and increasing live outcome rate from 90 to 95% without offering needed amendments to the current resolution is not commitment, simply symbolic. I respectfully request that you postpone or withdraw this item, instead issue a proclamation, which is more apt for this symbolic gesture. This issue should be discussed publicly at an animal advisory commission meeting where our input can be heard. The commission had no meeting in March so by putting this item on the agenda now the public is not being given the opportunity to provide their input to the animal advisory commission. Which at the last meeting indicated that this resolution would be discussed at their next meeting. Please don't get me wrong. Maintaining a high live outcome rate is important to me. However, this reaffirmation does nothing to do that. The Austin animal center has been consistently exceeding the 90% required by the resolution already and has been for years. We will not achieve a higher life outcome rate by reaffirming a resolution. I would like to note that of all the people today that spoke for this, not a single one is involved in the day-to-day operations at Austin animal center. Although in the minority opposing this, I am involved there. Don't act on this item at this time. Instead act by asking the animal advisory commission to provide the city council with plans to keep animals out of the shelter. To support shelter leadership, neighborhood programs, community outreach, and staff by giving them what they need to do their jobs.

[4:13:59 PM]

To end breed restrictions in Austin's apartments, neighborhoods, and by homeowner associations. And to support spay and neuter. It is time for forward thinking and planning for the future. It is the time for action and I hope you will be the city council that does just that. I request that you postpone or withdraw this item. Thank you for your consideration. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is pat [indiscernible] Here? You'll be up next. Go ahead, sir. >> All right. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. My name is will Mckinney, resident of district 8. I started the dog walking aac dog walking push in 2015. And it's very sad that it's still -- still hasn't gone anywhere. There's been periods of time where we did have two very hard -- actually three very hard working people, including alata, that put all their time and energy into getting the dogs out every day. Currently right now we do have two part-time dog walkers. It's been very obvious that we need more people on the ground working harder. When I started this push, we followed the chain of command. I'm a Navy veteran myself. I know all about chain of command, so we did that. And the problem is, we got nowhere with Chris noble at the time. We got nowhere with tawny

Hammond, we got nowhere with Leanne, and so that's why we're so outspoken, why we're coming up to y'all. That is why we're coming to the press. These dogs deserve more than they can get, more than they are getting right now. And it's very sad that it's not happening, that these

[4:16:00 PM]

dogs' quality of life is so low, especially when they're there as much as six months. I was a former Austin pets alive volunteer also aac volunteer. I know about both organizations, and I'm against this resolution because we need to adequately of life into the equation. And it's not fair for our dogs and cats not to D that. Thank you for your time. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Mayor, councilmembers, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is pat [indiscernible] And I live in district 9. I'm here to speak on item 34. I am neither for nor against increasing the live release rate for dogs and cats from 90% to 95%. What I am opposed to is an animal services department with 111 employees and a \$13.9 million budget being judged entirely by one performance measure and a questionable measure at that. The original premise of no-kill was to find homes for homeless dogs and cats. We are currently not finding homes for many unwanted vulnerable kittens and cats. Friendly adoptable kittens and cats are being put back on the street without a care taker. That should not be considered a successful outcome. But it is considered just that under live release rate. Because live release rate is such a poor performance measure, what [indiscernible] Goal chooses to adopt is not as important to me as establishing better performance measures and providing adequate funding to meet them. Therefore, I request that whatever live release rate council chooses to adopt, council should be prepared to fund shelter services at

[4:18:01 PM]

a level that achieves that rate without overburdening front line staff, without overburdening volunteers, resulting in lower morale, inadequate basic care of animals at the shelter, and outcomes that save lives but increase animal suffering. Whatever rate for live release council chooses to adopt, you should set equally high performance standards for spay/neuter and animal protection to adequately fund those two programs as well. In other words, a hi live outcome rate is important but should be achieved by a realistic assessment of what resources are necessary to ensure successful outcomes for all three programs. Shelter services, spay/neuter and animal protection. And providing adequate funding for all three. All three are needed to provide quality of life for pets and quality services to communicate residents who care about them. Thank you for your time. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, that brings us back up to the dais. Do you have a motion? >> Pool: I do. I move to approve this item. >> Mayor Adler: There's been a motion to approve item 34. Is there a second to that? >> Harper-madison: I was not seconding. >> Mayor Adler: That's okay. Is there a second to the motion? Mayor pro tem. Discussion? Councilmember pool, you getting to first, it's your motion. >> Pool: Thanks, mayor. Thanks to everybody who calm here today and thank you no matter which side of this resolution you spoke on, whether for, against, or on. Animals matter to all of us here in the city, and this resolution is an acknowledgment of the excellent work that everybody, whether you, again, were for this or not for this,

what we are all doing together as a community to support a quality life for our 4-legged and 2-legged pretends that may have fur or 15thers. It's really important. When I was a kid I remember

[4:20:03 PM]

now, I think Ryan mentioned this, about being in a community that doesn't euthanize or kill animals, and I realized growing up that was just expected. When our dog got out and she got out a lot being a dalmation, very active, we were fortunate that the dog catcher, y'all remember dog -- maybe y'all don't remember dog catchers but there were dog catchers, would put Mandy up in the front of the cab with him because he knew she was a generally dog and a really friendly dog and active dog. They were not going to take her and kill her. So we were fortunate in that instance not to have that happen to us, but I'm sure there were plenty of families in the neighborhood that I was growing up in outside of fill Delia where that wasn't the case. Here in Austin it is trial an honor to be living in a community that so values the lives of our companion pets. I want to make the point that the 95% no-kill rate is an acknowledgment of the performance measure for this item that is currently in our budget. It's not a new number. But that number has been exceeded, again, as our speakers have pointed out, for the last few years, and I think we should celebrate that and thank everybody who gives their time and effort and care to the critters that come to us in need or looking for a new home or just need some shelter for a time until they can be reunited with their families. So thank you all for coming here today. It's really important I think to the rest of us to show our support for the work being done by our animal services here in Austin. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Further discussion on the dais? >> Harper-madison: Yes, please. I'd first like to echo councilmember pool's sentiments about being very thankful about everybody who came out who took the time to speak so eloquently about

[4:22:03 PM]

your concerns, and while I echo a lot of what I heard today about our commitment as a city, also echo a lot of the concerns, that to say it's without question that I am committed, as in, you know, what's essentially being established with this resolution, to us being a no-kill city, us having no-kill shelter goals. I'm also concerned, though, like a lot of our speakers pointed out that we're falling short in providing the best standard of care for the animals who are living in these shelters. So maintaining our commitment to our no-kill status is gonna require significant resources and good leadership. We must also prioritize these areas to continue to save as many lives as possible. So if Austin, if we, as a stickers are gonna be truly committed to animal welfare we need to ensure staff and volunteers have the resources that they need and the support that they need to not only achieve high live outcome rates but also to ensure that we are achieving high quality care for the animals that we take in. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Further discussion on the dais? There's been a motion and second. Are we ready to vote on number 44? 37 rather -- no, 34. Those in favor of item 34 please raise your hand. Those opposed. It's unanimous on the dais. Thank you all very much. [Applause] That gets us I think to item number 36. We have

people signed up to speak. I'll call them to speak on this. Is Gus Pena here? Francis McIntyre? Why don't you come on up? Fred Lewis here? Yes.

[4:24:03 PM]

>> Flannigan: If I can suggest maybe having a little bit of conversation so the speakers understand -- I have questions I think maybe they have. I want to make sure that the comments are understanding what I think is -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's hold on just a second. I'll accommodate the councilmember. We'll get to you in a one second. >> Sure. >> Flannigan: Thank you, Francis. >> Mayor Adler: I'd move passage of item 37 if there's a second I'll speak to it. Make the motion for 37. Is there a second? Mayor pro tem. Thank you. You know, there were several things that gave rise to this item number 37. Not the least of which was just watching what happened recently with one of the city employees, and that started a broader conversation. I believe very much in transparency and for public engagement, and I think that one of the reasons we're a wonderful city is because we do that so much and I think we're really a standard for other cities. We have to also make sure that we do it in the right places and in the appropriate ways. There are three classes of employees, I think, that -- for this matter are relevant. There are online employees that report to someone on staff. There are the executive-level employees that also are on staff and report in this case to the city manager, and then there are those employees that are city council people that ran for office or work for an elected people or serve on a board and commission. And right now our ordinances are written such that those first two groups -- or the first group, the first group, just the online employees, if there's an ethics charge, it's something noted by the

[4:26:05 PM]

auditor but handled in the chain of command in the city of Austin. At the other end, if there's an ethics charge against one of us or one of our staff members or board and commission person, in those instances the charge gets -- the findings by the auditor, when they do the investigation, get turned over to the ethics commission. Usually a period of time while it sets up and the charges are known in public, and then they're adjudicated or handled or resolved. And I think that both of those are the appropriate way to handle both of those. In the middle are employees that are not publicly elected, they're city employees that report to the city manager, the executive level. Also include the legal department. And in this instance under our current rules, if there's an ethics charge that comes from the auditor it's treated as if they were elected officials, and that's what happened in this one particular case. There are advantages and disadvantages to having charges brought like that before they're able to be resolved or evaluated by the final adjudicator. If there's a charge that's later dismissed or found not to be pursued, as was this case, there's an impact to reputation that can't really be returned because the charge is hanging out there for so long and then people sometimes don't find out that there was a resolution and you become known for that. I think we accept that risk when we run for elected assume that risk as well

when they serve for an elected official. But the question was, was whether there was a more appropriate way to handle executive employees. So we drafted a resolution that had kind of a middle

[4:28:06 PM]

ground with respect to executive employees. And basically this resolution provides that for those employees, if there's an ethics substantiated claim, as determined by the auditor, that report is given to the person against whom the charge is found, as well as everybody else in the report. They're all entitled to make comments, the auditor takes that, completes what is a draft report, and then gives the draft report to the city manager, who is the person to whom those employees report. So that he or she can take whatever action or not take action, however they determine, as the supervisor. But then they have to write up what it was that they did and give it back to the auditor. And only then does the auditor complete the final report, and then that final report is given to the city council, and at that point it's made public. So as to ensure that there will always be public transparency and at that point involvement or engagement so that no finding of any kind of ethical violation would not be made public or available to the community and certainly as a city council we can hold the manager accountability and then the public can certainly hold us accountability. So it takes that middle group and it creates a way to handle those executive employees. Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Thank you, mayor, for laying that out. You know, it's always tricky under the open meetings act when you can't get a simple question answered but in a public meeting, which is where I found myself in this scenario. My first read of what was posted did not make it clear that the final report would be made public, and that's what caused me concern. I think it caused a lot of concern in the community. Knowing now that the final

[4:30:07 PM]

report is made public, there is transparency to whatever was alleged and to whatever was concluded and it still comes back to the council, I'm much more comfortable with this. I see there's even an updated version in backup that adds more specifically that the report is provided to city council. So, you know, I know I've gotten emails from a lot of folks, Francis, yourself included, and I needed this bit of clarification and I feel much more comfortable knowing that it does go public once the final report is made. So thank you, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you. We ready to get to speakers? Okay. Ms. Mick entire. >> Good afternoon, I'm Francis McIntyre with the Austin league of women voters, and we're here today to comment on agenda item 37, which will change how some ethics complaints are handled by the city. The legal women voters of the Austin area has always supported governmental transparency and believes an open government increases trust between leaders and its citizens. This proposal and the amended part would give the city manager rather than the ethics review commission, as currently provided, the responsibility for determining whether action should be taken against certain city employees accused of ethics violations. While this proposal would allow for some transparency, it would only come after the city manager has completed a review. Transparency after the fact isn't the same as transparency during the process. In addition this proposal will place an added burden on the city

manager's office and it will lessen the authority of the ethics review commission. We believe the answer is not less but more transparency. We urge the council to consider the 2018 charter review commission's proposal

[4:32:08 PM]

for an independent ethics commission. This new commission would have more power to review and investigate ethics complaints. It would administer and enforce all city campaign finance laws and its members would be chosen in a similar way as for the citizens independent redistricting commission which was used to create the ten city districts you all now serve. The league feels an independent ethics commission would be a better solution handling future ethics issues and we encourage you to put that on your agenda for public discussion in the near future. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. [Indiscernible] What about Carol Guthrie, why don't you come on down. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council. I am here or we are here to support item 37. When we originally saw the information we, too, were concerned about the loss of transparency. I believe this change handles two very significant things in our point of view. One being I don't think the process that has been used in the past -- I don't think it's fair that when you go in front of the ethics commission that one side already has a whole report and you're just showing up there and, you know, some people feel like they have to take an attorney. I mean, it gets very complicated at that time. So I believe that as a city employee all the way up, all the way down, as long as they are treated the same, we are okay with that. So the current procedure as it is right now, the auditor's office takes a

[4:34:10 PM]

complaint, they issue a draft report, the employee has an opportunity at that time to respond to that report. They have 20 days to put their side of the story, and that is the difference here. Is that that party gets to have their side of the story. Both -- it is incorporated into the final document that becomes public, and you have the employee side and you have the auditor's side. And we believe that is a fair process. We think this change keeps that process whole. The only difference is it would go to the city manager, and so I've done a lot of thought about this, thinking, well, is there a way that main the city manager can sweep this under the carpet? And I don't think there is a way that that can happen, so we are trusting that this is a good change and a supported change for city employees, and I would ask that you all support this with one caveat. If we're gonna be watching this new process and evaluating this new process, and if six months we find that things aren't quite working the way that we thought they were gonna work, we will be coming back. Okay? Thank you so much. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. And the language of this requires the manager, when he makes that determination, actually to make it within ten days. And then to give that information to the auditor, it becomes part of the report. The auditor then is instructed to give that report to the council. At that point it's public. Any further discussion? Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I just wanted to say that I appreciate the mayor's

staff incorporating my amendment, which was the new addition with the reporting procedures to deliver to the city council, which I think clarified some of the confusion that we were

[4:36:10 PM]

hearing. So I appreciate that. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else? Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I appreciate those in the community who have provided feedback on this proposal over the last several weeks. I had some pretty significant concerns about the proposal, as the mayor had laid it out on the message board, and I appreciate that we had some conversation before the speakers to lay out how some of that -- how that had evolved. And I am very comfortable with making this change with exactly the caveat that Ms. Guthrie said, that we -- I, too, will be watching closely and if we notice this isn't in the best interests of our city, I will certainly be joining with some of my colleagues, I hope, to make changes back again. But I would just point out, you know, we've made several changes to the ethics review process over the last several years, and I think that shows that we're working hard to make sure that this is a fair and accountability process for our employees, for our managers, and for the city generally. And so, you know, making -- continuing to iterate in that regard is appropriate and I think what we're doing today should move us forward and if it causes any concerns we can certainly address them. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Like my colleagues who have spoken here already, I also was reluctant on this item, especially the way it had played out from the very beginning, really appreciate the league of women voters weighing in and doing the analysis and providing feedback. The league's opinion is really important, and they help a lot in helping us guide and -- with direction on public policy, especially appreciate Francis' involvement. Thank you for that. I had called up our leaders at asme, I'm a member of asme, and I wanted to make sure that our employees were going to be treated equally and fairly and that there wasn't a chance for

[4:38:11 PM]

something to be swept under a rug and I was glad to hear in my phone conversation when I was talking with Ms. Guthrie, with Carol, that asme is gonna be watching this, as I will and I think the whole dais will to see how this plays out. If we find that we need to come back and make additional changes I'll be looking for direction both from our friends with the league of women voters and also with asme in order to continue to improve on the process, which as councilmember tovo notes is iterative, as are all our ordinances. I don't think we've ever really gotten any one of them right the first go. Thank you for -- everybody for pulling together to come with what looks like an acceptable revision. Thank you, mayor, for leading on this, and for the other councilmembers who were cosponsors. >> Mayor Adler: Just so the record can be clear, I appreciate everyone's help in making this good and making sure that everything was in order. In the original message board posting, back in early February, with respect to the reporting it said that the auditor would do the report and then the report would not be finalized or made public until after the city manager had determined whether or not to take action. And then the manager's decision would be included in a published final report so that there would be public oversight. So I think

that was always the intent of this. It's been moved and seconded. We ready to take a vote? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. Unanimous on the dais with councilmember Casar gone. Yes? Do we need to do something different? >> I can expedite your 4:00 items very quickly if you'd allow it. >> Mayor Adler: Got you. Why don't you help us dispense with the two 4:00 items, one withdrawn and one postponed. >> Development services. Item 81 is a public hearing

[4:40:12 PM]

on an appeal of an outdoor venue, music venue permit. The applicant has asked to postpone that to your April 25 council agenda, and the appellant has agreed. Item number 82 is actually withdrawn by the applicant. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Item number 82 is withdrawn. We have the postponement on item 81 to April 25, '19. Someone make a motion to postpone? Councilmember pool makes that motion. Is there a second to the motion to postpone is? Mayor pro tem, thank you. Any discussion? Those in favor of the postponement please raise your hand. Those opposed. Unanimous on the dais with councilmember tovo off. We're all here. Oops. It's unanimous on the postponement. All right. That takes care of those I'm sorry. I think that gets us to probably the remaining zoning cases and asmp. Let's hit the remaining zoning cases. >> Thank you, mayor, council. I think the first of the items is item 70, this is c14-2018-0136. Councilmember Flannigan indicated that on this particular case -- >> Mayor Adler: Why don't we go ahead and call him. We'll get him up here now that you've brought this in for us. Item 70 has no speakers on it. Do you want to speak to your -- >> Flannigan: Yes. So the question here is that the -- there were originally use restrictions on this property, and I'm fine leaving those on. It's just the ones that were added that I think are unnecessary because these were already permitted uses on the site.

[4:42:13 PM]

So that's why I'm making this motion. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So to tee us up, Mr. Flannigan moves passage of item 70 with removing the additional co restrictions that were added -- >> Flannigan: That were added during the final and at zap. >> Mayor Adler: During the zap -- >> Flannigan: The applicant and zap added additional use restrictions that were permitted on the site today and so I don't see any reason to additionally restrict a site already permitted to do these things. >> Mayor Adler: Motion is to pass item 70 with those items taken out. Is there a second to that motion? Mayor pro tem seconds that. Discussion? Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I'm sorry, mayor. So those have the additional -- do these strip out the two added by zap? The original motion is. >> Mayor Adler: That's the original motion. >> Tovo: I'd like to ask staff. It's my understanding that the two that were added and agreed upon by -- were agreed upon by the applicant as well as zap and that was adult oriented businesses and alternative financial services, which are like what -- >> Those are -- yes, that would be, like, the payday loan that you might find, adult oriented businesses speaks for itself. Those are the two the zoning and platting commission -- I understood from councilmember Flannigan's comments that there were additional uses that the applicant offered that included kennel, pawn shop, laundry services, bail bonds services, camp ground, and funeral services, that councilmember Flannigan's motion also would remove those. >>

Tovo: Thanks for the clarification. >> Those were offered by the applicant, and that was brought also to the commission. So the only three uses that are part of this motion that would remain as part of the co would be prohibiting

[4:44:14 PM]

exterminating services, the vehicle storage, and drop-off recycling. Those three uses would remain under the co as I understand it is part of this motion. >> Tovo: So this case went to zap, the applicant was in agreement about prohibiting these uses. >> Yes. >> Tovo: It passed on zap with the understanding of those conditional -- >> Yes, passed on consent on a vote of 8-0. >> Tovo: I guess will we hear a presentation from the applicant or can I ask the applicant's representative to speak to whether -- >> She is here and she can speak to -- >> Tovo: Great. >> -- The proposal. >> Tovo: Did you have any concerns about having those uses restricted? It sounds as if the applicant -- the applicant him or herself had offered those to be prohibited, kennel, pawn shop, laundry services, bail bonds, et cetera and was in agreement on the additional two? Michelle with [indiscernible] Applicant for item 70. I did in fact suggest those, those things I did not think were congruent with single family. Then I was asked at zap to add on additional two that I just agreed to do as wl. Again, understanding the will of the council I'm happy to go with whatever is decided today. >> Tovo: Did your applicant have any concerns about the prohibition of those uses? >> I'm the applicant. No. >> Tovo: Okay. I'm going to make an amendment that we add back in the prohibited uses that were identified by zap, both those offered by the applicant as well as the additional two that were added on. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I'll come back to you in a second to make that. It would be a talking amendment as opposed to making it. I'll make sure we come back to you. Councilmember kitchen and councilmember Flannigan. >> Kitchen: I have a question, again, for the applicant. So did you -- in coming up with this did you work with the neighbors around there?

[4:46:15 PM]

>> I generally let them know of uses. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I think it was the -- sorry. Two extras that I had suggested with my application. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I was asked generally if there were other items that could be added, not specific. So I kind of came up with those on my own. >> Kitchen: Okay. So it's their understanding, too, that these conditions would be on it? So I guess I'm a little concerned about taking -- just taking them off now when everybody's understanding and agreement is to leave them on. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: So to be clear, the applicant did not come to me and ask me to remove these. Right? This is a policy conversation I would have preferred to have Tuesday like has kind of become the practice but we ran out of time. When we make a zoning decision, it is not enough for the applicant to agree because the applicant has a site plan in mind, they have a project they're gonna do, they would agree to probably add 50 restrictions because they think they're gonna do one thing. That's not why we do zoning. In fact you get too far down that road it becomes contract zoning or spot zoning and we don't want to tread that line either. For me the premise was these were already permitted uses on this site. The original three use cos not touching, there didn't seem to be a

reason to further restrict the site when it already had cs. If this was going from, you know, lo to a cs it would be a much more interesting conversation around use where I cans but, again, doesn't seem to make a lot of sense why we would add these cs restrictions, and, again, my point that I had on the other case, there's a cs case we approved on consent in my district where zap did not add prohibit uses that is adjacent to existing sf-3 zoned properties it's not clear to me the process that zap uses to do this type of thing. My understanding is that

[4:48:15 PM]

these get add on consent but don't seem to get add on consent on every cs case, so, I mean, ultimately I don't know that it makes that dramatic of a difference to what gets built on the site but this is, again, the type of policy conversation I think is better on a Tuesday but we ran out of time so that's why I'm daylighting it today. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on the dais? Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I think I need to make that amendment. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Tovo: So I will amend the base motion to include as prohibited the following prohibited uses, kennels, pawn shop, laundry, camp ground, bail bonds, as well as adult oriented businesses and financial alternative services. >> Mayor Adler: Been a motion. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember kitchen seconds that. >> Tovo: I'd like to suggest if this amendment fails that we then -- I intend to then come back and say let's just hear it on first reading because I do think there's an expectation of those involved in the conversation that these were going to be prohibited uses and I would like to go afford them an opportunity to come and talk. This is an area of east Austin and as we have talked about in the past, you know, there are studies that have been done that showed that there was lots of cs zoning inequitably throughout east Austin, and this is an opportunity -- this is a tract that's very close to, as I understand from the staff report, to single family, to other kinds of residential uses, and so I think we have an opportunity here to provide a zoning category that is in -- that is better and come for compatible with the kinds of residential uses around it, and I think we should in our discretionary ability to do zoning here, I think we should come up with some provisions that are more suitable to the area where it is. And I also, you know, would point out that it doesn't cause concern for the

[4:50:17 PM]

applicant, and so it's not going to be a hardship for how they want to develop the tract. So that's the substance of my motion. >> Mayor Adler: I'm gonna stay consistent the way we voted on these before. I really appreciate you daylighting nine point -- the point because I think you're right from a policy standpoint. At the same time there's a notice issue councilmember tovo raised where people were there and something happened and there's not the notice for people to come back in if there was something they wanted to say. I hope this is something we take care of and fix as we rewrite the land development code with respect to cos across the and I and we take care of that in how we define the tools that we use. So I'm going to support the amendment offered by councilmember tovo. Further discussion? Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Yeah. I want to thank councilmember tovo. I think we're

actually in more agreement, just get hung up on this case versus philosophically how we should be doing this in the future. I reason I keep bringing these sup because I want us to be thinking about these as we rewrite the code to ensure -- what my hope would be is that we do use restrictions at a policy complex not just when zoning cases show you up. If we're looking at east Austin having too much cs and kennels and bail bonds we should just be eliminating that use as a matter of policy and not waiting for a cs case to come before us. I'm hoping that's the kind of stuff we can get to in the code rewrite, is despite what happens in this particular case. >> Mayor Adler: Ready to take a vote? Those in favor of the tovo amendment please raise your hand. Councilmember Flannigan voting no, otherwise aye, item passes. Those in favor of the item -- all three readings. >> Correct, closing the public hearing. >> Mayor Adler: Those in favor raise your hand, those opposed. Again, Flannigan is opposed,

[4:52:19 PM]

others voting aye, councilmember harper-madison off the dais for these two votes, both on the amendment and on final passage. But it passes 9-1-1. Thank you. >> Thank you, mayor. Last two items, item 73 and 64 are related. Item 73 is case npa-2017-0016.02 neighborhood plan amendment for the govalle Johnston terrace. Item 74, c14-2017-0094, zoning change for that same property. There are two speakers, mayor, I think that you have signed up for both of these applicant and neighborhood representative. >> Mayor Adler: That's right. >> This has been approved on first reading. The public hearing was left open, and this is ready for second and third reading approval on both items 73 and 74. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> So I'll pause and you can listen to the applicant and neighborhood. >> Mayor Adler: We'll do that. Colleagues by way of time check it's ten minutes to 5:00. We have the asp folks that have signed up to speak, which is the only other item after this item. That's about 30 minutes in testimony. In that additional item so it's conceivable we could be done before we do proclamations and music. If we move quickly. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I just wanted to confirm we're not gonna vote on this or if we do vote it's only on first reading -- >> Asmp, we're not there yet. When we get to the asmp we will not be voting on it -- I say that we could be voting on it but if we do it's first reading only. It's notgoing considering any amendments I think is what we talked about doing so we can move it along in

[4:54:19 PM]

the process. All right. I'm giving the applicant the first chance to speak. You have five minutes. >> Mayor, mayor pro tem, councilmembers, my name is David and I'm representing Barton creek capital and flats on shady lane, items 73 and 74. I'll keep this very brief and I don't -- I don't think we'll need it. We have slides available for presentation if you'd like. The strategic housing blueprint and draft implementation plan calls for 135,000 units over the next ten years of housing. That includes 25,000 workforce housing units between 80 and 120% mfi, 75% of the new housing units are recommended to be within a half mile of an imagine Austin center or corridor. The flats on shady project was -- is designed -- our approach to it is to focus on workforce housing options. It is -- it is across the street from an imagine

Austin center. So that's the context from which I'd like to start. A quick project summary, again, we're at the zoning stage, so this is a conceptual site plan. It is just under 8 acres, 290 dwelling units, again, market rate, middle market focus. What that means is 5% of the units will be restricted to 60% mfi renters for 40 years. That's via a private restrictive covenant that we have in place with habitat for humanity or home base, which is the same as habitat for humanity. There's no displacement so contrasting with some other cases that you've talked about today, this is green field, no displacement. The type of project that we have envisioned is what we call garden style apartments, which means surface parked, which means

[4:56:20 PM]

we have flexibility to do two things. No garages, means we keep costs low, which means rents are focused in the 80 to 100% mfi range. Second, we can work around the fantastic tree canopy that's out there. We're also offering minimum of 25% of family friendly units. From a zoning and land use perspective, here is the Springdale station neighborhood center and you can see the site literally across the street. Here's a snapshot of the zoning along shady lane. At the conclusion of several months of discussions, we heard from neighbors, met with the neighborhood four or five times and unfortunately were not able to get to a place of agreement, but what we did hear is that traffic was a concern. And so working over several months with city staff, atd, corridor program office, et cetera, we are at a position where via restrictive covenant we would like to build improvements on balm road in between southbound shady and northbound airport, build those improvements, so prior to release of a site plan so we are able to take advantage to the -- the development is able to take advantage of those and the traffic situation on that corridor can be addressed in a proactive manner. So that's -- this last came to you late 2018, and we've been trying to figure out a way to get that done since that this is just a summary of what that looks like. That's the northbound turn lane. I'll leave you with some goals from the govalle Johnston terrace neighborhood plan, page 41, you can read those for

[4:58:22 PM]

yourself. We are really focused on higher density residential development located near a major intersection. Fantastic. We meet that. We're trying to provide a diverse range of housing opportunities in this area, and we want to encourage the development of affordable multi-family units on vacant tracts. So we feel like we're checking a box on a lot of those things. Again, no displacement, focused on housing, five percent of the units restricted at 60% mfi for 40 years. And we're building traffic improvements to address neighborhood concerns. And I think with that I'll wrap it up. Mayor pro tem. >> Does anybody have any questions for the applicant? Okay. Go ahead. >> Mr. Anderson, thank you. I want to clarify a few minutes that you have provided in your follow-up to my office. So five percent of the units will be at 60% mfi and this is through an agreement you have in with habitat, as you mentioned. What is the bedroom count on those affordable units? What is the bedroom type? >> I have not discussed what the bedroom count is. Like I mentioned, we're able to do 25% of the units at two and

three bedroom, but we don't know the specific bedroom count at that point. It could be -- I'd have to talk with my client, but it could be reflective of -- for the five percent of the units it could be reflective of the overall 25% goal, but I would like to ask them. >> Tovo: Are you anticipating going on second and third reading today, or just second? >> We were anticipating going on second and third. >> Tovo: I think the answer to that question would be really important

[5:00:25 PM]

because it would -- it would 10 me if all fifiers of those are one bedroom especially since it looks like 75% of your project will be potentially one bedroom. You're committing to 25% being two and three bedroom, but that means we could have as much as 75% of the units on the site being efficiencies and one bedroom bedroom. And have paid for all of the units to fall into that category. >> Can I confer with my clients quick any. >> Tovo: Sure. And there are other speakers so if you want to confer and get back to us, that would be fine. >> >> Garza: Daniel Yanez is the only other speaker. Is pat Valles trellis here? >> I'm Daniel Yanez of the govalle johnstonster that is neighborhood steam. This first slide if you can see it, I want you to know that my neighborhood is accepting density. We have -- we're up to here with density. If you look at this, the number 600, that's the think east project. The 280 is the second tank farm site, which is -- which they had the zoning. We had nothing, no say in it. That's 280 units that's online. If you look at the extreme left, the 320 units, that's the Guthrie. The Guthrie is one giant monolithic five-story building. And since they were -- they started across the street, two others have gone up. I want you to know that the Guthrie is one giant monolithic building and everything else around it is single-family houses and one-story, two-story

[5:02:30 PM]

businesses. The 320 at the bottom of this is what the contact team approved last year as a vmu, and that is also 320 units. So that totals to approximately 1520. All of those are rental. Every single one. They're all . \$1,500 and up. None of this is affordable for us, none of this. But I want to illustrate to you that we are accepting density, and it's changing our neighborhood. Can you do the next slide, please? Oh, okay. So then this is the actual -- you see the proposed 280, that's this project. So I go back -- so if you look on the right that's 600 homes. In this area, this part of my neighborhood, 600 homes. Everyone enters and exits off of shady lane at bolm. Capital metro just eliminated a bus route here that used to go to memorial. Now, the 600 units at shady lane, I go back to the 1520 that we've accepted, think east is the only project that has affordability, and it has 250 units slated to be at 60% and below mfi. But one of the biggest things is the infrastructure. There is not infrastructure to support 600, 200, a little over a thousand units on this curve. Today, without those -- with only the 600 homes there, today traffic backs up from bolm road all the way to that curve. [Buzzer sounds] We're asking you not to approve this project, not because it's a good project,

[5:04:31 PM]

but because we don't have the infrastructure for it. >> Garza: Thank you, Mr. Yanez. >> I appreciate it. Thank you very much. Any questions? >> Garza: I don't think so. Mr. Anderson, do you want to close and respond to councilmember tovo? >> Thank you, mayor pro tem. I've talked with my client and we are able to offer 25% of those units -- of the five percent of the units at two or three bedroom as well to match the overall ratio of the property. As for -- in response to Mr. Yanez, who we've had a good dialogue with, we just disagree on this issue, this particular zip code, as councilmember Renteria knows knows, is different in that it has 55% home ownership -- I've got to get my numbers right here. When compared to the rest of the city. And 53% of the units are owner-occupied, 47% of the units are rental units. This is in stark contrast to other units in east Austin where there is a higher proportion to renters than others. Overall renters make up 55% of the residents. So when you look at whether or not this is an appropriate place for this type of project, the data would tell you that this zip code in particular has fewer renters than owners as compared to other parts of town. We think it's an appropriate use. It's consistent with the land use around it. It's consistent with the overall strategic housing blueprint goals and

[5:06:33 PM]

implementation plan, and we would love your support. >> Garza: Thank you. Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I don't have a question. I'm just ready to move on. I have a comment. >> Garza: Sure. You can sit down, Mr. Anderson. >> Flannigan: I'm in support of this as I have been when it's come before us before, and I think it's important to just note a lot of people in a lot of neighborhoods think that they have all the density and are getting all the density, but it's not limited to one part of town. I have one neighborhood in my district that we will seasonally cases the first six months of this year to add almost 2,000 units, rental units by a single neighborhood. So it happens all over town, and nobody likes change. Change isn't fun, but we're all experiencing change. And I just want to reiterate that I don't think it's wise to allow any perception that renters or rental units are somehow a defacto problem. Rental units are necessary, as I have often are remarked, I'm a renter myself. I now have I think two renter colleagues that have joined me on the dais, which is very exciting. So everyone would love to own a home. Not everybody can own a home, and I think we've got to be realistic about that. >> Garza: Thank you. I'll entertain a motion on this. >> Renteria: I'm going to vote to approve it. The main concern was the -- >> Garza: Real quick let me get a second on that. Are you moving on second and third? >> Renteria: Yes. >> Garza: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Rental Mr. Renteria. >> And the big thing was the traffic. And the developers have committed to -- for that turn lane.

[5:08:34 PM]

They're willing to pay for it and it's going to help this community a lot. And that was the big problem and concern of the residents that lived there was were they going to be able to get out and be able to leave their community there in a safe manner. So just the mere improvement improvement. And with my hope working with the city manager and the housing department, we own some land there right on the other side of bolm road where we can construct some houses and connect the trail from Springdale to govalle and it would be great to do that. And I can see the green line coming through there and it would be a great place to put a station there. So I believe that this is the right way to go. >> Garza: Okay. I'm going to gandy -- go ahead and ask for the vote. Do you have a question? >> Tovo: Mr. Anderson, I had a quick question for you. So as I understand, we're looking at somewhere between 14 and 15 units that are affordable, is that right? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Tovo: And then 25%, a minimum of 25% of those would be -- what is that, I haven't done the math on that? >> Four. >> Tovo: Five would be better. >> Four. >> Tovo: I would just encourage that number to be higher if possible. I think it is really important that we get those multibedroom units on that site, especially within the affordable component. So thank you for the back and forth, but we'd love to see that creep up. >> Thank you, councilmember. >> Garza: All those in favor on second and third reading, raise your hand. Everybody. >> And also it was closing the public hearing? >> Garza: It was second and third. >> But the public hearing was still opened. >> Garza: Okay. And close the public hearing.

[5:10:34 PM]

Okay. And I think we can get -- start speakers on the next item. So let's do that. Is Zenobia Joseph here? >> Kitchen: Mayor pro tem, was that 73 and 74 we just voted on? >> Garza: Yes, 73 and 74. Okay. Next speaker, Gus Pena. All right. Next speaker, it says hill Abel. I don't know if that's the other way around. Okay. Mr. Abel, you have three minutes and you're speaking in favor of. >> Good evening members of the council. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the Austin strategic mobility Austin strategic mobility, which I'm personally very, very excited about. I think there's some great information there. There's some great aspirations for the city to strive to achieve. I'm here to talk about two aspects of that tonight. And the first is I don't think it strived quite far enough because it did not speak to building out the bicycle master plan. The bicycle master plan, the urban trails master plan currently have a fiscal note of about 150 to \$170 million. And if you have had an opportunity to review the results of the moveatx poll that has just been released in the last day or on so, you will see that we have created safe facilities for people to ride bicycles in Austin, Texas and then we will see an uptick, basically a doubling of the number of people who choose to use a bicycle for transportation. Not to mention the hundreds of thousands of people who are choosing to choose other forms of human scaled mobility, specifically scooters, in the city of Austin. I think we all recognize the fact that we have a fairly

[5:12:35 PM]

serious crisis on our hands regarding that style of mobility, and by building out the bicycle master plan and making other strong decisions, visionary decisions saves removing travel lanes on congress avenue

to put in new facilities, that we can change the dynamic in the city of Austin and compel more people to choose a healthy, active lifestyle by riding bicycles and other human-scaled mobility. I think this correlates very strongly with another opportunity that we have before us right now. Tonight tonight as we speak there are quite a few people talking about the shoal creek revamp with bicycle facilities. And I think that one of the things that I would like to encourage the city to consider and the city council to consider is the fact that our roadways, our transportation networks, are commonwealth that is shared by every member of the city of Austin. And right now what we are doing is taking that commonwealth and we're allocating a significant portion of it to people that are storing their personal vehicles on the street for long periods of time, making it extremely dangerous for people to use bicycles or other forms of transportation on what could be an extraordinary network that would connect the city of Austin. It's literally a spine running north to south. I've personally am envisioning when the mckalla place soccer stadium is built out, hundreds if not thousands of people choosing to ride their bicycles to the soccer stadium instead of getting in their individual motor vehicle and jamming the roads, mopac, burnet and using parking. [Buzzer sounds] So it's time for bold action on the part of the city council. Thank you. >> Garza: Thank you. Patricia Schaub?

[5:14:35 PM]

No? Katie Kim signed up as neutral. You have three minutes. Good evening, I'm Katie Kim, a transportation engineer and urban planner. The mobility plan has some great goals, however it's known that cities within the U.S. Without transit densities and bicycle work still have traffic congestion because most of the trips are taken predominantly by conventional size automobiles. To set Austin forward on a better path the strategic mobility plan should include low speed electric vehicles and there are some examples up here on the screen. My specific ask to council is to include a key action item where you complete a . Low speed electric vehicle plan, coordinate with all the other plans and you actually set lse mode split goals. You would look at the driving lane after carpool and transit and how many of those trips can we take with low speed electric vehicles? There was a demonstration study done in the la area where they found there were trips used work trips, shopping trips taken by nevs. So I'm asking for the strategic mobility plan to commit like we do for bikes, sidewalks, public transportation, urban trails, to create 'urban network for the low speed vehicles. And here's some reasons to support them they support biking and transit, they create a much more inviting environment to ride a bike because they're low speed. They're good practical, efficient, first and last mile options to get to transit. More efficient for land development. They meet the climate change environmental goals we have set because they're zero emission vehicles. They're very affordable. And they meet zero because they don't exceed 25 miles

[5:16:36 PM]

per hour. Here's an example of where we could redesign a street where if we can get most of the drive alone trips be taken about the low speed electric vehicles we can restripe it and it opens up space in the right-of-way for bike lanes. And then here's some communities around the U.S. The city of Austin would

not be alone in creating a network for these vehicles. La metro, San Diego, Lincoln, outside of Sacramento, Georgia. There's lots of examples we can look at. And here's some photos from Lincoln, California, right outside of Sacramento. They actually create either separate bike lanes or separate Nev lanes or they combine the lanes. I went there a few weeks ago, I stood at the corner and I would see a low speed electric vehicle pass by. They have a network that connects commercial areas, residential areas, the network, schools, with these Nev routes. So my ask of the council is to please include in the strategic mobility plan a key action item -- [buzzer sounds] -- To create a low speed electric vehicle plan. >> Garza: Yes? >> Kitchen: Ma'am, could you make that presentation available to councilmembers? >> Garza: Next speaker is Mary Arnold, registered speaking against. >> Good evening, mayor pro tem, members of the city council. My name is Mary Arnold and I'm glad that there was a little discussion about transparency in city government. Because that's part of what concerns me about the

[5:18:38 PM]

proposal for its asmp to be an amendment to the imagine Austin plan because there's no information about exactly what in imagine Austin would be changed because of the asmp. I thought it was our understanding that the neighborhood plans were not going to be changed by imagine Austin. And I noticed that Mr. Anderson referred to the neighborhood plan when he was making a presentation about a zoning case, but as far as I'm concerned, the asmp does intrude upon an adopted neighborhood plan and so that's what concerns me, particularly since that neighborhood plan specifically did not cover the whole entire Brackenridge tract because the university of Texas system did not want the Brackenridge tract included in the neighborhood plan in their Flum. So here the staff husband put a road in the -- staff has put a road in the golf course which is owned by the university of Texas, but used by the city of Austin. It's been used as an open space and golf area for 95 years now. And all of a sudden after the network roadway thing has gone through public comment,, all of a sudden there's a new road that we didn't know about. And so I'm concerned about the transparency. I've gotten no answers as to exactly why it's there.

[5:20:41 PM]

The neighborhood has been asking for years to have traffic studies, but we've always been kind of refused. So -- but those are my concerns and I thank you for listening. >> Garza: Thank you, Ms. Arnold. The next speaker is Janis renkin. And after that is Connor Kinney. Is Phillip Wiley here? Is Timothy bray here? You have three minutes, Ms. Renkin. >> To the honorable mayor pro tem and members of the city council, I want to thank you for allowing me three minutes, and I appreciate your careful review of the things that I've heard you talk about today. Among those things this Austin strategic mobility plan looms large on the horizon for residents in Austin, people who might like to be residents in Austin. I want to urge you to keep Austin, Austin. Let Austin be Austin. We don't have to be the new York City of Texas where zilker park is the only green space like central park is in New York City. We don't have to be homogenized by part honored or Long Beach or other cities that seem to have these nice medians with

trees in the middle. Austin is not that kind of city. We're an eclectic city and a very desirable city for those reasons. I want to mention quickly the burnet road project from Kinney lane to Anderson, that's the first burnet road project that will be taken up. It needs more specialized engineering plans than just cookie cutter prefab plan for 18-foot raised medians down the center of that road. It's a vital artery in our neighborhood, Alan dial, crestview. It's our main street. So I just want to put out a reference to that.

[5:22:42 PM]

I also want to consider -- ask you to consider, refine this subject of affordable housing and density. I think that should not be part of the transportation plan. I don't think the transportation plan should drive density, just in order to create a market for multimodal transportation. If it's going to be a transportation plan let's make it clean, let's make it a transportation plan. We can talk about land use and the land yukon text and the land development code, but just very quickly, the extent to which the mobility plan strives to steer land use changes through transportation priorities, I think that's getting off course because transportation contracts are very lucrative. They're multi-million-dollar deals. So when you start mixing transportation deals with land use and density issues, I think you're getting into dangerous waters there. Just very quickly, affordability is sort of an amorphous content I think at this point. Having more density in single-family zoned areas is not necessarily going to give you affordable housing. There's a tract down the street on white rock subdivided. Was a about 3500 of an acre at that tract. But they subdivided it. And so now each of those tr is going to be valued at 350,000 without any improvements on them. [Buzzer sounds] So I think we need to look at doing something different with this plan and take the longview and think of people not just traveling to work or people who are vigorous enough to employ very active styles of transportation. I'd entertain any questions you may have and I want to shout out for my councilmember Leslie pool here. >> Garza: Thank you. >> Questions anyone? >> Garza: I don't think so.thank you.

[5:24:43 PM]

Connor Kinney, you have eye owe I think you have seven minutes -- I think you have seven minutes if I'm doing that right. >> So my name is Connor Kinney. I'm on the city's planning commission and I also lead the transportation working group of the planning commission and have been running point on the consideration of the asmp. And you have being passe out to you right now the quill exilelation of the planning commission recommendations on the zap and that's what I wanted to come here and talk to you about tonight. You can see it's pretty thick. We're glut tons for punishment as always. But I do want to make sure to call out the work that the other commissions did. It's amazing. The bicycle advisory council, the pedestrian advisory council, the urban transportation commission all have really great stuff that we weren't able to incorporate into ours and I hope that y'all are able to take a look at that when looking at potential amendments to this plan. Atd also did an amazing job. I can't have enough praise for them. The whole team there, the outreach they did. They set up a beautiful framework for us to accomplish these goals that are pretty ambitious that we know we need to accomplish this if we're

going to unchoke our city and save the planet. But some of us on the commission when we were reading into the plan noticed and became kind of alarm that when the plan sets us up beautifully and has a forecast to accomplish those goals it doesn't contain the commitments that we need to actually achieve them. It leaves that open. And if we don't make them now, we're looking at several years of needing to reinvest time and commitment and decisions into this plan to actually make those things happen. So what we really concentrated on was providing y'all with some of the -- some options that we thought might be worth considering to really help achieve those goals and in particular the transit goals. What atd tells us is if we don't get transit ridership

[5:26:44 PM]

traumatically up we will -- dramatically up we will fail at our goals. What capital metro tells us is if we don't change the system we will fail at ridership goals. So having a complete system is a big focus of ours. We've put a lot of time in that chapter. I'm also a former legislative staffer so I know the value of having it in chapters. You can drop it in any chapter you like. It has page numbers and anything. The two areas we focused on, one was completing the transit system and the other is transit supportive density. Completing the systems, the project connect, the the two dedicated lines, the Orange and blue lines, were the only ones that were called out in the plan as getting the investments for the dedicated pathways. Brt light is consigned to the transit priority network along with the frequent buses. Those two things should be treated completely differently. And we need a completely different policy framework for dealing with all the issues that go around them. The transit walk shed are different, the densities are different, the infrastructure needs are different. So what we did is we eliminated the brt lineup to the line. We said that's all our capacity line network. The transit priority lines are evolving. That's kind of built into the plan. It's what cap metro envisioned for the things so it would be evolutionary for the lines. And they reserved all that right-of-way to make that happen, but we thought we needed some follow commitments to actually get all the policy gears turning to -- all the associated land use policies, for example, I don't know if y'all remember common civic open space from codenext. That was a big thing. If we're able to dovetail these things when a property on those brt lines redevelops, we could set up a mechanism where they get credit for giving us the right-of-way and we don't have all these lawsuits and people fighting us and

[5:28:44 PM]

trying to fight for that right-of-way desperately. We also said where our commuter transit lines line up with the highway projects that the number one priority for city staff in dealing with city and state authorities needs to be having buses not moving in traffic and having entrances and exits line up with the stations so the amazing ridership gains that we saw on the mopac north line we see on every one of our lines. We know that adding a lane will just bring traffic down a little bit on a highway, but we know if we can put a successful commuter bus on there it's a game changer for the people who can ride it and for making those stations work. Transit supportive density. It's difficult. We all know it as -- I disagree

with my good friend Janis here who I've known for a long time. All of the research in the federal studies say we have to have a the transit supportive density to go along with it. I've spent a long time, personally spent a long time working on proposals to get the transit supportive density up. We passed a whole package of recommendations out of there one of them was an 8-2 vote and the orthopedics were an 8- 0-2 vote. We came close to consensus on that. The key there was realizing that transit supportive densities are measured on the transit as a whole. Not every part needs to look the same. The stuff a half mile away from the transit line doesn't need to look at the things a block away from the transit line. The way the government measures it in grants is what is the average density for the entire line. So really every story that you add downtown, because all these lines run through downtown, is a story that you might not have to add to allandale. So it all works together and the policy we came up with is our small area planning process should end up at a place almost like you have

[5:30:45 PM]

entraffic mitigation tomorrow up and you have a ticker going up with the density level. And we commit to a density level and that corridor plan isn't done until we achieve that density, but we have a lot of flexibility in terms wildfire we put it. We could put it all downtown. Maybe built build it a mile tall. So we did have a lot of consensus with that. Councilmember pool, I worked with our appointee, he's great. We came to consensus on that. I think it's really something that we can do. That actually -- there's some really interesting stuff we dove into the research on transit supportive densities and the standards the feds use on whether we get money. The transit supportive densities in here and councilmember alter I saw your questions in the backup, they're not quite right. Those are the ones that cap metro uses for all transit service. That eight and 16 to a quarter mile. That's not for high equity rapid transit. The federal government and the benchmark Puget Sound study used different levels and we include them in here. We suggest a level that you could shoot for, particularly for obtaining federal funding, but I think Christmas something that you will have to take up. [Buzzer sounds] To close, my contact information is on the front. I emailed this document to all of your transportation staffers. I've been talking with a lot of them over the last several weeks. Please utilize myself as a resource and I can point you to the other commissioners and stakeholders that we worked with who are experts in these things. I would love to be able to help you as you consider this plan. >> Garza: Okay, thank you. >> Any questions? >> Casar: Mayor pro tem, I just want to thank commissioner Kinney for all the work you've put in. The commission has obviously put in a lot in, but this is a lot you've presented to us and a lot of your volunteer time. Thanks a lot. >> Garza: Councilmember pool? >> Pool: I also wanted to thank Mr. Kinney for working with my commissioner Todd Schaub. I know he had to be out of down, so I appreciate the work you did in advance. So thank you. >> Garza: The last speaker

[5:32:47 PM]

is Cass -- and I don't want to mispronounce your last name. Is Patricia -- okay. You have five minutes. >> Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. Today I'd like to touch on a couple of aspects of

land use and transportation that y'all should consider regarding the asmp. Kind of just hammering home the point that Connor was just talking about,ind of a little bit more strategically looking. Up zoning near transit corridors should be a no brainer. We're in a housing and transportation crisis. Look outside at the traffic congestion, the cars have been lined up for quite awhile. Look at 35 and mopac right now. People are driving in from the suburbs because there's insufficient housing near jobs, transit and good schools. We can't just keep behaving over our blacklands, prairie and farmland. We have to let people actually live in the city. And this is the city's own policy. We should be getting rid of parking minimums, especially near transit. Cap metro calls for residential density of 16 persons per acre. Average household size in Austin is between two and three. Other industry sources like the Puget Sound study that PC recommends in their amendments is a little bit higher than that I believe for certain kinds of transit. In order to get 16 dwelling units an acre we have to zone for much more than that. It gets back to the capacity question that y'all balk about quite often and other land use people in the city talk about. Having high zoning capacity means we can actually get to that actual housing capacity in reality. So this is kind of what measuring the land use would look like. We're calling for 16 people per acre, that means something like garden units, that means apartments. That means allowing apartments everywhere in the central core of the city. In other words, we must zone for multi-family or greater

[5:34:48 PM]

within a quarter mile of transit corridors like y'all were talking about earlier as one of the performance metrics. On how much transit, how much housing is nr the quarter-mile so that people can actually walk or they can easily bike to the transit stops. Single-family on zoning is simply incompatible in a growing city near transit corridors. Now, we think about transit we should be thinking about efficiency. When we think about transportation, we should also be thinking about efficiency. Outside the door mines the motorcycle and the buses that go in the bus lane that's that sometimes has a car in front of it turning, sometimes doesn't, sometimes gets blocked, almost every single mode of transportation is more efficient than the mosley single occupied -- mostly single occupied cars out out there. If you want to move people more efficiently we have to spend out public funds more efficiently. And land use is an important component of that. Going into the parking that's required, you can see -- this is apace that's required for car parking versus bus parking versus bike parking. I parked my bike out in front of city hall and there's four other bikes and it's taking like two space maybe. Whereas one single car downstairs we're talking something like \$60,000 per parking space to build new build right now. So bike parking, bus parking, it all takes a lot less space. It's much, much more efficient. Here's another graphic to kind of talk about if we want to move more people, just expanding a lane is not really going to work. We need to think about efficiency. One of the things that I look at is the managed lane on mopac. And you can see the bus zooming by. The bus is able to -- is able to out bid other people, other users on the road because there's more than 10 people on the bus, and also they -- I don't believe they actually pay the toll. But even if the bus had to pay a toll or carpool had to pay the toll, they would be

[5:36:48 PM]

able to out bid a single occupancy use car so that they can get to and from their place of business to home. In a more quick fashion. So in conclusion, we can either aim to develop more like Paris our transportation and our housing or we're going to keep sprawling out. Also note that on the left this is what real high quality transit density looks like. That's upzoning on a corridor right there. And that's what we should be aiming for. And notice like in Paris, whoever has been to Paris, there's hardly any buildings that are greater than 10 stories high. So we can do it without, as somebody said earlier, new York size density. We can do it something like Paris. Thank you. >> Garza: Thank you. That's all the speakers I have wishing to speak. There was Blake Tollett and Fred Louis signed up against, but they both do not wish to speak. So I'll entertain a motion? Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I'll move to pass on first reading. >> Garza: Is there a second? >> I'll second. >> Garza: And keep the public hearing open? Councilmember pool seconds. For me I would have preferred we didn't do it on first reading, but that being said, I'm okay with first and I guess we'll see where the votes -- is there any more discussion on that? Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Yeah, that would have been my preference too. I guess it gets us to the same place as long as we keep the public hearing open, but if we do pass it on first reading I want to assure the public we have gotten Roth of feedback from -- and I expect we'll get more. And I know my office is working on amendments, some of my colleagues have already circulated some. So if it passes on first reading today if we decide to move forward with that kind of a vote rather than just move -- hear the testimony and move forward without passing it on first reading, I just want to assure people who are listening or following this item that we -- we are fully intending to make revisions

[5:38:49 PM]

between now and when we pass it on its third reading. >> Garza: I'll add that there was -- there was a pretty significant discussion at work session, including drafts of many, many, many amendments. So while slightly reluctant on first reading, I'll be okay with it with the understanding that when this comes back there's going to be a significant number of motions to amend the document. City manager, did you want to say something? >> Flannigan: Can I clarify my motion? I think it's good to clarify my motion. >> Garza: Sure. >> Flannigan: The staff recommendation the staff submitted on first reading because I've got amendments and I've passed out, but I'm not moving any existing passed out amendments because we're all acknowledging that process comes later, so we're only moving the staff recommendation on -- >> Garza: Okay. >> Flannigan: I think people understand what I'm doing now. >> Garza: Thank you. Manager cronk. >> I want to clarify that I'll be asking staff to prepare a memo just talking about that process for consideration from council because there are a lot of amendments. We're very clear in work session that we wanted to keep the public hearing open and not take up any amendments today, knowing that there's a lot that we wanted to talk about. Some which have aired. And the more we can continue airing those between now and the next council meeting the better so we can prepare a package for council consideration. >> Garza: Sounds good. Councilmember alter? >> Alter: Thank you. I'm going to support this on first reading. You know, as a statement of confidence in all the work that went into this and the massive outreach that was there, there's still a lot of work that tends to be in the weeds arounds it. And we may need to have a second and third reading to be able to really make sure

that we're comfortable with all of the moving pieces. As I understand it, we would be -- by saying no amendments we're saying this is exhibit a and that we

[5:40:49 PM]

would be getting the staff amendments now that they have the planning commission and other things to incorporate and things that they may have heard from us that they want to just incorporate that those would be presented as a package that we would consider at the next meeting. >> Garza: >> Councilmember Ellis? >> Ellis: I wanted to repeat some of the things from last session. We were in communication with the transportation district with some specifics in think district. I spoke about that and it's still on my radar and I'm supporting the first reading, but there is still work to do. >> Garza: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: And I also wanted to acknowledge the work that the planning commission did just so recently, just this week, which meant that staff didn't really have an opportunity to reformat things so that it would bear the public and all of us to read and digest. So I think that work is going to happen between now and the next time we -- on are shortly maybe and Mr. Spillar can speak to that too. So that whatever we have in the backup can be pretty straightforward and much more clear for all of us to know what those votes were. >> Garza: Do you want to quickly respond? >> Yes, madam mayor pro tem. Yes. What I understand you're passing is first reading, I believe is our draft of February 22nd. We will be bringing several tools. You have several draft tools before you now as exhibits B and C and D and E, and those are all preliminary, but we will be finalizing them early next week, and that will show clearly proposed revisions that staff brings that of course is everything from typos to map changes to recommendations we've heard from other folks. You will also get a full listing of all the proposed requested amendments from boards and commissions and then of course a full copy of all the comments. Mayor pro tem, though, before you move forward, if

[5:42:50 PM]

I could have just the privilege of introducing the team that got us here today. I have them here. Ms. Anik bayou dough, my assistant director, has been responsible for this process. Mr. Cole kitten, the division manager. Liane Miller, Warren cook, Dan brooks and Seaver Meyers have worked really hard and I wanted to recognize them. Many are sitting here and I wanted to express my thanks to them for this effort. >> Garza: Thank you. We all thank you for your hard work on this. [Applause]. >> Thank you. >> Garza: All those in favor of first reading and keeping the public hearing open say aye? Aye. I think that was everybody. That passes 11-0. Mayor, do you want to adjourn the meeting? Or can I -- okay. [Laughter]. >> [Inaudible]. >> Mayor Adler: They're phenomenal. >> Before we adjourn can I say something real quick. You guys acknowledge all the hard work that planning commission put into this package that they presented to us reminded me of something. We didn't go over item 31, which was acknowledging all our various appointments to boards and commissions. And I want to say thank you to all of the people who are volunteering their time and hard work to all the various boards, commissions, et cetera. We really appreciate you and thank you very much. >> Garza: Yes, thank you to everyone who

serves on our commissions. So having no more business -- aside from music and proclamations, we're adjourned at 5:44. Thank you.

[5:59:40 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Are we set? All right. Now we get to what is the absolute best part of city council meetings here in Austin. You know, I think that we are the only city council that I'm aware of anywhere in the world that stops every city council meeting we have pretty much to bring in a little live music, which is only fitting. [Applause] Which is only fitting because we are the live music capitol of the world. But la it says about Austin, the music, the creativity that is so much of who we are in our DNA and in our culture, it's in the way that we support the artists in our community. You know, and while it might not be exactly the same as playing Carnegie hall or, you know, the academy awards or something it's still pretty special, I think, that we do this here. And I'll tell you that there are meetings that we have sometimes, you know, where it's 2:00 A.M. And we're in this place and I strain really hard to hear the echoes of the music impressed in these walls and is just keeps you going. But this is just a really exciting thing, and, once again, we are so honored to have with us just an incredibly talented local group of artists, and, Greg, do you want to introduce who we have tonight? >> Casar: Sure. Who is ready for some grupo prestigio? [Cheers and applause] I'm Greg Casar, elected in north central Austin, and, you know, I'm just so excited that you guys are here with us today. [Speaking non-english language]

[6:02:04 PM]

So joining us today is the band that formed in 2013, and I think it's so important we recognize all the different kinds of music that bring us joy ask dance and together in this community. Grupo prestigio was an idea Raphael and Jose had after being children and after playing in different bands they decided to start their own journey, perform at private events, have headlining shows in central Texas and they played for a kids toys event in district 4 and that's where we kicked off this idea about finally declaring a grupo prestigio day. They had a chance to play with all sorts of kids, give out bikes, danced with police officers and with me, and the performance garnered hundreds of thousands of views on social media. Their mission really is to influence our community, to bring us together, to really highlight all the different styles of latinx music here in our community, and I am just so psyched to present grupo prestigio. I hear bad bunny is playing tonight in cedar park tonight and he's a little nervous he might get outshined here today so please join me in welcoming prestigio. >> Thank you. [Applause] [♪ Music ♪]

[6:05:28 PM]

>> I know every single one of you know this song so sing along with me. Here we go. Clap. [♪ Music ♪]

[6:09:52 PM]

>> Thank you, gracias. Thank you. [Applause] >> Gracias. >> Woo! [Cheers and applause] >> Mayor Adler: And a lot of groupies, really. So if somebody is watching on TV right now or looking at it later and they want to try to find you guys, do you have, like, a website or Facebook page or something? >> We sure do, sir. Let me grab my phone here just to make sure I state it correctly. [Laughter] >> Mayor Adler: All right. >> You can find us under grupo prestigio, Instagram, YouTube, please subscribe and follow us on Facebook, YouTube. I want to give a big round after las to mayor Adler and his team. Thank you for this opportunity and not only for this opportunity but also for making this beautiful city a better place. So thank you, sir, thank you. Prestigio was formed here in surrounding cities and we have roots in this beautiful place and it's an amazing feeling to sit and have this special day for prestigio, so thanks to all our family and friends for supporting us, being here on this special day. Thank you, Austin, appreciate it! [Applause] >> Mayor Adler: Someone likes daddy. [Laughter] If people wanted to see you play, I know that you do private events or do you have any gigs that are coming up or how would -- >> The way people can find us, we put our tour up on Facebook so if anybody is more than welcome to look up our page under prestigio, that way you can keep up with events coming up that are public. You're more than welcome to join us and be part of our music and presentation, guys. >> Mayor Adler: If someone wants to come get some of your music, how can they do that? >> They can find our music for digital download on

[6:11:52 PM]

Spotify, Israel Estrada tunes, Google play. Also please download our music. Thank you, guys, appreciate it. [Applause] >> Casar: So now we're gonna wrap this up by officially presenting you this proclamation. Be it known whereas the city of Austin, Texas, is blessed with many creative musicians whose talent extends to virtually every musical genre and whereas some of them have matching botas. [Laughter] , Whereas our music scene thrives because Austin audiences support good music produced by legends, local favorites and newcomers alike and whereas we are pleased to showcase and support our local artists, now, therefore, I, Greg Casar councilmember, Steve Adler, mayor of the live music capitol and my colleagues on the city council hereby proclaim March 28, 2019, as grupo prestigio day in Austin, Texas. [Cheers and applause]

[6:17:50 PM]

>> Mayor adler:we have a couple more proclamations. We're going to wait for the band to get their stuff and then we'll do the last couple.

[6:23:21 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: all right. We have another proclamation to do. So if folks that are leaving could do it quietly so we can get this done, too. This is also pretty important. Today we are declaring the first week in April as public health week and we have some of Austin's finest in our Austin public health department. We have the director, Stephanie Hayden, with us. But our interim medical director, Dr. Marian Rodriguez is going to give a couple words as I declare first. [Laughter] Be it known whereas national public health week brings communities together in a diverse nationwide movement to celebrate the contributions of public health in creating healthier people and families and communities and eventually the healthiest nation, and whereas people's health, longevity and well-being are connected to their communities, the places we live and we learn and we work, worship, and play, and whereas health equity is achieved when every person has the opportunity to attain his or her full potential of good health and life expectancy, and to make that possible, we need to address the health disparities that cause poor health, disease risk among individuals, and within our community. And whereas the Austin public health plays a vital role in creating a healthier community in Austin, with public health workers striving everyday to enhance the health and well-being of all residents by preventing

[6:25:22 PM]

communicable disease, protecting our environment, preparing for emergencies, reducing the incidents of chronic disease, and promoting a healthy lifestyle, now therefore, for all of that, I, Steve Adler, mayor of the city of Austin, Texas, do hereby proclaim April 1-7, 2019, as public health week in Austin, Texas. [Cheers and applause] Dr. Rodriguez. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler, city manager Cronk, all the assistant city managers, members of the city council, ladies and gentlemen, so next week is gonna be national public health week, yea! [Applause] So national public health week is a good opportunity for us to recognize the contributions of public health, as well as join it in its goal of creating the healthiest nation in one generation by working towards building a nation of safe and healthy communities. This week celebrates the efforts of public health professionals in creating healthier communities and supporting healthy choices and reducing rates of preventable diseases. To support the health of everyone in our community, Austin public health offers a variety of programs and services, such as support for pregnant women and new mothers and babies, health screenings, testing, and prevention of chronic as well as communicable diseases, monitoring disease outbreaks and trends, ensuring food safety, and preparing for public health emergencies. We know that people's health, longevity, well-being are connected to their communities, the places we live, learn, work, worship, and play. So much so that zip code has

[6:27:23 PM]

been found to be a predictor of health so this would be related to the public hearing earlier. So actually one speaker at the Harvard school of public health event even said that "Your zip code is a better predictor of your health than your genetic code." Just here in Austin, living in one zip code gives a life expectancy of a person to 89 years of age, whereas another zip code in Austin will give one a life expectancy of 75. So there's a difference, right? So this is based on national center for health statistics neighborhood level data on life expectancy. This highlights how much work there still needs to be done. Everyone has the right to good health no matter their race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, immigration status, income level, or their zip code. We want to ensure health equity by removing barriers so everyone has the same opportunity to live a long and healthy life. That's what Austin public health is. Thank you. [Applause]

[6:31:08 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: people that are -- choose to work for the city and have chosen a career of public service is just an incredible gift to the community generally. You know, nothing happens in this city without the - these public servants doing that work and goodness knows we don't pay anybody what they're worth in this city. So you have to really be motivated by a desire to do good, and then among that really salesperson -- special group of people are those people that have done it not just for five years or ten years or 15 or 20 or 25 but there are some people that give that gift to the community for 30 years. And then there are all kinds of really important jobs, you know, in the city, and one of the most important are the folks serve as our first responders. Not only because of the critical nature of the things they deal with, but also because of the risks that they take and put themselves in in unanticipated positions/situations all the time, which is why it is so important that we issue this distinguished service award here today. For your untiring service and commitment to the residents of Austin during a 30-year tenure as a dedicated employee of the city of Austin. Michael Shiply is deserving of public acclaim and recognition for his loyal service to the city of Austin and Austin/Travis County emergency medical services as a field clinical specialist. Medic Shiply has made a significant impact in the lives of those he served.

[6:33:10 PM]

This certificate is presented in acknowledgment and in true appreciation, therefore, this 28th day of March in the year 2019, the city council of Austin, Texas. Thank you so much. >> Thank you, sir. [Applause] >> Thank you. Wow. I wasn't really prepared for this part of it, the speech. Thank you, all, Mayor Adler, thank you. Wow. Thank you. Mayor Cronk -- manager Cronk, thank you. I promoted you. [Laughter] I'm nervous. I want to thank everybody behind me, my wife Melissa, it took a lot of effort to get this far and took a lot of people and a lot of Austin. It was a great journey, I made a few mistakes but they were not my fault. [Laughter] I just want to say thank you. This is very special. Thank you, all. [Applause]

[6:36:11 PM]

>> Renteria:good evening, my name is councilmember Sabino Pio Renteria, and I'm here to recognize some individuals that have given so much of their time to this city. You know, the boards and commissions that we have here in Austin, they're all volunteer positions. And people that volunteer to these boards and commissions put countless hours out there and sacrifice their afternoons, their evenings, their mornings, and so I have the honor to award these certificate of appreciation, and basically my first recommendation is gonna be [saying name]. I hope I pronounced it right. >> Thank you. >> Congratulations. Thank you. [Applause] >> The other person that's here with the parks and rec board, he's volunteered countless hours over the last four years, and I really want to appreciate this person here. You know, this in gratitude in his public service to the city of Austin in district 3, Michael casissis has faithfully served as a district 3 appointee to the parks and rec board. This certificate is issued with gratitude for his significant contribution in public service this 28th day of March in the year 2019. Signed by our mayor, Steve Adler. Michael. >> Thank you. [Applause]

[6:38:12 PM]

>> Renteria:the other recognition is this wonderful person here. This certificate of appreciation of gratitude for her public service to the city of Austin in district 3 Cindy fisher is deserving of public acclaim and recognition. She has faithfully served as a district 3 appointee to the library commission. This certificate is issued with gratitude for the significant contribution in public service this 28th day of March in the year 2019, signed by our mayor, Steve Adler. [Applause] >> Hello, everybody. My name is Jimmy Flannigan, I'm the city councilmember for district 6 and I have the pleasure and honor today

[6:40:13 PM]

of recognizing one of my close friends and close advocates and fighters inside this building, Rodney Gonzales. When we first put this on the agenda it was a real testament to the value that Rodney brings to the city based on how many people were afraid he was retiring. He's not retiring. He's sticking around. But what we are recognizing today is his service to the city's employees, specifically the lgbt employees through the creation of the stonewall equality employee network which Rodney served as its first president. One of the first things that we did coming into this office myself -- as the first openly gay man to serve on the city council was to work with Rodney and my own staff and others to bring this organization and to give it light. Rodney took the re next ns to a group that had not felt heard and even in recent years had been directly attacked from this very dais before I got there. So I want to thank Rodney for his service to our employees and for his ongoing, ongoing service to the city of Austin. So, Rodney, I want to present you with -- on behalf of mayor Adler and myself and the city council, the city's distinguished service award. Thank you. [Applause] >> Thank you, can be. First of all, I wanted to -- thank you, councilmember. I wanted to thank a lot of people in the room with me stayed, city manager

crank for his ongoing support of the organization. Deputy city manager Elaine Hart who was interim city manager at that time who hugely supported of course the creation of the organization, councilmember Flannigan and his staff, and the mayor who was present at

[6:42:13 PM]

our very first meeting on June 28, 2017. There are a lot of other people that were present and that were supportive. One of the people who isn't here with us today is here with us in spirit is ccgratus, here at some of our fuser meetings, Julia Hays, hours director, fierce advocate of supporting the organization. As well as Sara Hensley, who is currently the director of parks and requisition, who remembering racing, stepped up to be our exec perspective liaison. The list goes on and on and on. For those of you who aren't members it's not too late. Please join our organization. We are huge supporters of every employee in the city of Austin and we welcome all allies to the organization as well. I can't thank you all enough for your support, for your ongoing support, and for everything that you do to make the city of Austin a great organization to work in. Thank you. [Applause] [Applause] >> Thank you all so much.

[6:44:17 PM]

[🎵 Music 🎵] 🎵🎵