

## City Council Regular Meeting (Budget Adoption) – 9/10/2019

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 9/10/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 9/10/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[10:09:50 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: all right, colleagues. We have a quorum. It's 10:09. September 10, Tuesday, 2019. We're in city council chambers here at 301 west second street. This is our meeting to consider budget-related items. We have two folks that are signed up to speak, so let's take their testimony. Is Marissa Perales here? What about Kathie Mitchell?

>> Tovo: She's necessary the lobby. I saw her.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Those folks are here, they should come. While they're coming, Ed, why don't you go ahead and

[10:10:51 AM]

start.

>> Good morning, mayor --

>> Mayor Adler: Before -- they're telling me that I need to start with the script. So on August 22 and 28 council took public comment regarding the city's proposed budget, closed the public comment required there are the Texas local government code. We will now conclude the hearings by discussing and voting to adopt the city's budget for fiscal year --

>> Tovo: Mayor, I think --

>> Mayor Adler: For fiscal year 2019-2020. I will again call for speakers today. We are two signed up. Kathy Mitchell, you want to speak us to? Speak to us?

>> So sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Then I will call for Melissa Perales again.

>> Thank you. I want to say I'm just here today to say how excited I am. It seems to me that funding for improved mental health first response and reforms

[10:11:51 AM]

from the 911 call center that will, you know, then impact everything down the scale to the level of people receiving that improved response. I'm excited to see that that seems to be moving forward. Obviously, I'm called up prior to any discussion about it, but I do hope that you consider putting some budget direction on metrics so that we can actually see the improvement and understand any further steps that we're gonna need to take, and I would like to see you make -- and I'd like to, you know, be assured that the community will be able to participate in the process of the implementation and the review of those metrics as they start to emerge in implementation. So I know I'm cart before the horse a little bit here, but you called me up first, so, yea. I'm here to say thank you and metrics, metrics,

[10:12:52 AM]

metrics.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Quick question, Ms. Mitchell. I know that you were running down here, and so appreciate your words. Can you just clarify for us sort of what sorts of metrics it is that you think are most important and what sorts of intermittent changes we might need to be open to making that you think might be most important?

>> Yes. So I think that the meta's report was clear that the sort of worse outcomes were not equally distributed among people across the city. They tended to occur in spanish-speaking neighborhoods, low-income neighborhoods, and, you know, part of what they did that I so appreciated from the planning process was start to map where we see, you know, a higher volume of forced response, where we see possibly higher volumes

[10:13:54 AM]

of inappropriate jailing and hospitalization. And I think the learning from that is that our metrics need to really get to where those interactions occur in the city and with whom by, you know, demographic characteristics. I think that a public data file that is deidentified so we don't have any issues with hipaa. I fully understand all the privacy issues, especially around mental health, but there are ways that researchers deidentify data so that it can be used for purposes of growing -- really growing what we

know and not just sort of reporting from what we used to know. And then, finally -- can I finish answering the question?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah.

>> Generally, I think we're hoping to see -- and I feel this from you all -- that we're hoping to see

[10:14:56 AM]

increases in a health care response to a health care need, and so those metrics would be things like tracking which kind of response was sent when a call has been flagged by the clinicians at 911 as a mental health-related call, who was sent, did they receive clinical care on-site, was it by telehealth or was it in person? Those kinds of things that allow us to kind of see the on the ground response with greater clarity than we have in the past.

>> Casar: That answers my first question about metrics. Then my second one, which maybe is captured in your metrics answer is, you mentioned that you would like for the community to be able to stay engaged in case there are changes we need to make along the way.

>> Correct.

>> Casar: What might those categories of changes be? Because we already have some budget direction trying to get to this point but I want to make sure just in the next few minutes as we finish crafting it up that we aren't missing something.

[10:15:57 AM]

So what sorts of categories of changes you think would be important for us to monitor.

>> Yeah. I think we all hope to see clinicians going out on calls at a higher rate than they have been able to in the past. I think we're all familiar with all the reasons why, you know, it was hard to bring a clinician through ahead of traffic at 5:00 P.M. To a call, and some of what we're trying to do here is solve for some of that by adding telehealth, by adding a different way of directing those calls from the top of the food chain. But I also think that down the roads that going to enable the existing emcot to possibly reorganize their staff to get more people out in the field. So we'd like to see to the greatest extent possible, whether it can be met with telehealth, that's great, if a person's mental health need needs to be met with a person that they are actually communicating with in the real world, we

[10:16:58 AM]

actually think it's very possible with the funding that you have currently given us here, us as a community, to increase that in-person response, and we'd like to see that play out in the real world. Now, you know, that's gonna be a matter of implementation. The protocols have to be created to address gaps that we currently have, but our goal at the end is to have health care people talking to people about their health care needs.

>> Casar: So essentially the core of that concern is the telehealth as we heard in the work session might be appropriate in some cases but we should be monitoring or ensuring that there's in-person response when that is most appropriate and how we're ramping that up.

>> That's right.

>> Casar: When it's most appropriate to immediate that hybrid model that the police department discussed which is telehealth when most ro appropriate and in person when most appropriate.

>> And inclusive of ems as well. I think we've all had a lot of conversation about how that works at the police

[10:17:59 AM]

department and I think we're looking -- very much looking forward to seeing ems pick up a greater share of those calls and that they have that same relationship where they're getting, you know, full support from clinicians to do that work.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you very much.

>> Kitchen: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Thank you very much. I wanted to thank you for all your work over the over a year, long time.

>> Long time.

>> Kitchen: So really, really appreciate it. And I assume that -- I think I'm hearing in what you're saying the importance of the clinicians in the triage part of the -- piece of the continuum so that they can -- so we actually have clinicians that are helping to make -- or that are making the call in terms of how -- what's most appropriate.

>> Right.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? Thank you very much.

[10:19:02 AM]

Marissa paraleas.

>> Good morning, council, mayor, my name is Marissa paraleas, I'm here on behalf of communities united. We're here to present a petitions that been signed by hundreds of residents of the city of Austin and this petition includes our list of priorities. I refer to these as our priorities, but really I think of these in terms of justice and a commitment to the residents of Austin, particularly those who are most marginalized and most vulnerable. Justice as we all know is different from philanthropy. Charitable contributions from the goodness of our heart is different from making folks whole, folks who have suffered injustices or whose rights have been infringed upon. Based on my review of this very complicated budget it seems that our budget has it backwards. We have a commitment to corporate incentives. We may them millions every

[10:20:03 AM]

year and we've been doing that for several years. We have a commitment to funding the land development code rewrite, again, contributed millions to that endeavor, and we have a commitment to contribute even more. But when it comes to addressing displacement we treat that like a fill tropical endeavor, a charitable contribution. There's a proposal to dedicate a little more money to the housing trust fund this year maybe out of the goodness of our hearts but that doesn't reflect a real commitment to the injustices -- the injustice of being displaced or facing displacement. Same with folks at risk of flooding. We know those floodplain boundaries have expand, yet where's our commitment to making sure those at risk have the resources they need before they're flooded out. With Austin police department we have a commitment to increasing this bloated budget every year, providing more positions when we know that they have position that's they can't fill currently, but when it comes to public

[10:21:05 AM]

health, electron infinity, equity, addressing maternal mortality, we're grateful for the increase in those contributions proposed in the budget but, again, it seems we treat it more like a charity. I encourage to you flip the script. I encourage you to think of commitments to the folks in our city who are at most risk, most vulnerable, treat those as our commitment and those charitable contributions [ no audio ] -- Contributing to those different endeavors. This petition I think will help provide guidance on what those commitments should be. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. David Johnson. Mr. Johnson here?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Come on down.

[10:22:11 AM]

>> Good morning, everyone. What I have to say is very simple. First I'd like to thank you for being creative and finding the wherewithal with regard to resources for the mental health first responder program, but what I simply want to say is that we have a responsibility, all of us, to -- through due diligence ensure that this program is implemented effectively and with great accountability. The last thing that we want to do, I think any of us in this room, is see another instance where the city of Austin failed its most vulnerable populations and fails to hold those providing services accountability. As integral care has stepped in to play the role of the clinicians and first responder program, I'd like us to be very honest with ourselves of the fact that while integral care is quite successful their record is not absolutely clean and is not without checkmarks so I want us to have an agreement collectively to hold integral care accountability, to hold

[10:23:12 AM]

ourselves accountable to accurately track and have available for public reference every time a call for mental health response is put in and to ensure that if we are truly doing this to treat this issue as a public health issue that it is rather than a criminal issue that every time it is possible we send mental health first responders out, track their activity, track the response provided, track the resolution of the situation, and as a absolute last resort only involve law enforcement in the process. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues. Those are all of the speakers that we have. With that the rest of the day is ours to see if we can hammer out a budget today. Mr. Van eenoo, I turn the floor over to you and let you present to us what I hope will be the base budget in the initial motion and

[10:24:12 AM]

then we'll talk amongst each other and then get to a place where we do amendments. Please.

>> Thank you, mayor, and good morning. Good morning, mayor pro tem, councilmembers, city manager, city attorney. I will present to you a handful of budget amendments the staff would like to offer to the proposed budget that we presented to you back on August 5, but before I did that if you would indulge me one last time. I'm sure I must be beginning to sound like a broken record but I had a few slides where I wanted to maybe again speak to the budget we've presented to you. It's something we as staff are very proud to offer to you and the community for your consideration. Very high level, you don't have this one in front of you, I just gave you the slide of the amendments but all funds budget \$4.2 billion as 3.8% increase, general fund budget came in at \$1.1 billion, little more than 5% increase.

One of the things we've talked about a lot as a council and staff is the percent of that general fund budget that goes to public safety and you continue to see a budget

[10:25:13 AM]

here where that percentage goes down to now 67%, which is essentially one percentage point lower than it was in fiscal year 2019. To some that may not sound consequential but 1% much a billion dollars is over \$10 million, right? So it is a significant shift that we've been seeing as the council has been electing to invest here in social services, health services, services for people experiencing homelessness and we still continue to add to public safety needs throughout the city. I think it's an affordable budget. It's a budget that has a total increase for our typical tax and ratepayer projected at 2.7%. It's a budget that continues to very aggressively align our programs' expenditures to the six outcomes and the direction you provided through sd-23. Just a few highlights in that regards. I think council clearly over the years reemphasized the importance of improving services for homelessness and housing in both regards this is a historic budget

[10:26:17 AM]

with \$62.7 million for homelessness. It's a budget that puts \$14.4 million to the housing trust fund and I'm not even talking about the bond, C.I.P. Side of the program where we have a \$250 million bond that's underway, the implementation of it is underway for affordable housing programs. I mentioned we continue to invest in critical public safety services. This is a budget that includes funding for 30 additional officers, as well as the opening of a new fire and EMS station in the del valle area of the city, puts more money in the budget for mental health and community health paramedics, you'll see that when I get to my amendments and finally equity has been a big priority for the council and community and you literally see dozens of proposals in this budget that align to the recommendations we received from the city's nine equity commissions. I think you've come to -- I'm sorry. You've come to recognize this graph. We've presented this a couple times. This is a slightly updated version of it. When I get into amendments

[10:27:17 AM]

you'll see the staff is proposing \$2.5 million of amendments to our proposed budget, so but it's a similar story. We're projecting a balanced budget in fiscal year 2020 but even more of that budget now going towards onetime expenditures, \$16.2 million to onetime expenditures, what had been a projected balanced budget for fiscal year 21, the budget we're proposing to you we now feel not only would we be balanced we'd have a small surplus in fy21, of course under 3.5% revenue cap as you get out to fy22, 23, 24, it's red ink and we have a lot of work to do to solve that. This budget buys us the time we need as a

community, council, staff to come up with that plan to solve those red gaps into the future but I would encourage you as you're looking at additional budget amendments today to keep those -- that red ink in mind and try to find ways when you're amending the budget to not make the situation worse.

[10:28:19 AM]

And try to not increase those future budget deficits. Then finally I can't end without providing big thank yous. There's so many people, literally hundreds of people throughout the organization, throughout the community that have participated and provided voices and input into the budget development, boards and commission, you as city council, our public information office was a tremendous help. We had hundreds of people participate in the nine equity community forums that were hosted by our equity commissions. As you know well over a hundred public speakers during our hearings. I would thank our department directors and managers, the city manager's office, all our department financial staff and last but certainly not least our budget office staff with a special very much appreciated shout out to Michael, who was responsible for facilitating all of your budget questions and requests for information this year. He literally handled hundreds of requests, including many dozen that came in over the weekend. I believe as of now we have

[10:29:20 AM]

successfully addressed all of the questions and information requests that have come us. And so thank you to everybody and in particular to Michael. So with that I'm going to move right into a handful of slides for the amendments that we would offer to our proposed budget. Some of these you saw last week when I talked to you about the amendments that we knew of at that time. There's a few new ones in here. There's two portions to this. The first amendment I go through are the items that pertain to your adoption of the operating and capital budgets for the city. I'll hold off on the fee amendments until we get to item 2, which is the item to approve fees. Staff is proposing to increase property tax revenues by \$2,467,352 reflecting the certified tax roll and a tax rate of \$0.4431 per \$100 of taxable

[10:30:21 AM]

value. Couple of the new items we'd be proposing to offer would be the funding for the mental health and community health paramedics programs. That's what the EMS and police and downtown community court expenditures pertain to. You'll see a little bit of that coming up in some of our future slides. We have additional funding and budget stabilization reserve funds. These are all general fund amendments. You'll see other aspects of that in a can you believe slides. The two positions in parks. That was an oversight on our part, we are expanding -- we forgot to put two ftes into park so they can implement those enhanced services. There was a lot of discussion during the public hearings about our

lifeguard classifications and the pay series and equity of that. The human resources department has corrected that, including pay increase for open water lifeguards to \$16 per hour but fixing the compression and other equity issuing that occurred

[10:31:21 AM]

throughout the series. That comes with a price tag of \$67,000. \$170,000 in the parks department to establish a land management plan for our preserves system. As well as reclassifying an existing position to a higher level position that we actually have a person with the skill sets to implement that plan. We're adding \$95,000 and one position to parks to oversee encampment cleanups, all part of the idea of having encampment cleanups in addition to a workforce first approach to those encampment cleanups and that's where you see \$145,000 in Austin public health to add two additional workforce crews, now a total of three. Two of those crews would be focused on encampment cleanups. You'll see an additional dollar amount when we get to the enterprise slides in Austin resource recovery to fund portion of this program as well. Then finally we would propose transferring an

[10:32:25 AM]

additional \$540,000 to our reserves. That would bring our reserves levels to 12-pointed 4%. Of course your policy level in the budget is to maintain reserves at 12%. This transfer puts us \$410,884 above the policy level. Those would be all the general fund amendments, just a handful of other operating budget amendments. In our budget stabilization reserve fund, one I talked about last week, we did not get to a point in our muni court move to the new facility where we were prepared to do all the furniture purchases so this is something we had in our budget in fy19, we just need to carry it forward because we haven't made those purchases yet. In regards to the budget stabilization reserve fund we are revising our estimate for the retirement system, that was an oversight and miscommunication. Our intent was to put \$250,000 in the budget to hire an outside expert to help us review two of our three retirement systems. The communication chains got broke, we ended up adding

[10:33:27 AM]

250 for each system, a good bit more than we need so we're lowering that to \$250,000 from the 500 and then we would propose using that \$250,000 to help us fund the community health paramedics program. There's a lot of equipment that goes into running that program so this would be a funding source to pay for that equipment. In the support services fund, mayor and council's budget, with your approval today we would carry forward a total of \$594,000 of savings you had in your budgets this year, carry that forward so it's available to you to expend in the fiscal year 20 budget. Then as promised in Austin resource recovery we would add \$300,000 to fund a portion of that workforce first homeless

encampment cleanup program. In regards to the hotel occupancy taxes, I talked about these last week so I won't spend a bunch of time on this but council approved an additional two pennies of chapter 351 hotel taxes on August 8, projected to bring in an additional

[10:34:28 AM]

\$21 million, just shy of that. And then we lay out here where we'd be allocating that fund, additional funding to the capital fund for expansion purposes but also additional funding to the cultural arts fund and historic preservation funds. This is our last slide in regards to our capital budget. We had a couple of oversights, two in the Austin transportation department. We'd propose adding \$1.5 million to mitigate traffic impacts, related to their transportation impact fee, and \$350,000 of a capital amendment for pedestrian safety projects in the parks department we left out \$150,000 program being funded through insurance proceeds for garrison park and then, finally, one more item related to the community health paramedics is \$150,000 addition to our C.I.P. Program to purchase vehicles for those six new community health paramedics. So that would be all of the amendments staff would offer

[10:35:29 AM]

to our proposed budget for your consideration.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So we can get started.

>> Kitchen: I have some questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So it's in front of us. Does anyone want to move passage of the budget with amendments presented by staff? You want to do that? Mr. Renteria. Second? Councilmember tovo. Now let's have discussion and go to questions.

>> Alter: Thank you. My question is really quick. In my conversations with you over the weekend it was my understanding that Ema long was included in the land management plan. It's not on the slide so I just wanted to confirm that it is included in the plan for that.

>> It is, that 170,000 on the slide includes \$120,000 for the plan, which is 20,000 higher than what it originally was to capture the Ema long park.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

[10:36:29 AM]

>> Kitchen: I want -- I had a question about the first responder. I was thinking that we were -- and I may have -- I may not be remembering and it may be in here, but I was thinking that we had talked at work session in terms of four ftes for the clinician, so I assume that's in the line that says 392 for call center training and clinicians. That's one question. The other question is, I was thinking that we said 2.5 ftes for telehealth and six for community health paramedics. So I just -- because of the way this is rolled up I just want to confirm that that's what we're talking about.

>> Yeah. And so we listed on here the positions that would be city staff. So I'll speak to the clinicians who would actually be austin/travis county integral care staff.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> The seven positions for the community health paramedics does include six more and I believe it's a captain position, the supervisory position for those six, that's why

[10:37:30 AM]

there's here. I didn't put it on here I didn't want to create confusion with the fte count. The funding does include funding for 6.5 additional clinicians, some located at the call center and some of whom would be field persons.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry 37 say again where that is noted.

>> It's six point.

>> Kitchen: For the 6.5.

>> This funding funds a contract with Travis county integral care and through that contract they would be adding 6.5 clinicians.

>> Kitchen: So there's additional funding in that contract?

>> Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Or Dr. Tovo.

>> Mayor Adler: What?

>> Tovo: I said or Dr. Tovo. Quick question on page 5 of the budget stabilization reserve fund.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry?

>> Tovo: I was just kidding.

>> Mayor Adler: Dr. Councilmember tovo.

[ Laughter ]

>> Tovo: On the revised, the

[10:38:31 AM]

retirement study, I had a question for -- from a constituent why the retirement systems themselves wouldn't absorb that cost? And I assume it's because we want to have sort of an independent analysis of that, but I just wanted you to speak to that since it's identified.

>> That's exactly the think. So I serve on the employee retirement system board as a city manager representative, councilmember pool is the council representative. Of course you served along with cfo hart on the police systems but those are completely separate and distinct systems from the city organization. We're the plan sponsor. They have their separate boards. So the feeling here is we all need to be working together. They have actuaries, staff who are experts. This is the city bringing to table some third-party expertise that we believe can help us -- that hopefully will have expertise in dealing with retirement systems and other cities and states so they'll just bring additional knowledge and expertise to the table. I view it as a partnership. It wouldn't be inappropriate

[10:39:31 AM]

for the retirement systems to fund something like this, but to my -- I can speak for the ers, the ers has not considered bringing in this type of third-party review. I suspect the prs has not either. So that's where this -- city manager and city staff believe this is a need for the plan sponsor to actually have some expertise that's taking a look at things from our perspective.

>> Tovo: I really appreciate that explanation. Thank you. And then with regard to the various -- thank you. I think the amendments that you've brought forward, that you and the city manager and other staff have worked on are very responsive to the kinds of things that we've been talking about in our work sessions. I believe that we received some additional information about the txdot cleanups through some of the question and answer. Are you immediately familiar with that? If not, I'll just find it and mention it if it's relevant and if not I won't mention it.

[10:40:32 AM]

>> My -- what I've been told -- I know just enough just to scratch the surface on this is that txdot used to fund an Easter seals contract for encampment clean-ups they stopped doing that and our public works department picked up that same contract with Easter seals to continue doing that work and that is where my knowledge of that topic ends.

>> Tovo: Thanks. I think I got additional information along those lines. I think that is one of the things that would be appropriate for our homeless strategy offer to take a look at, just to see whether there are additional places of alignment that we can -- that we can make between those different -- between those different contracts, the one through Easter seals, then the one -- the workforce first. I understand they're serving different purposes but just to make sure that we're using those resources as efficiently as possible and I think the workforce first additional crews are a terrific idea so thanks for working to make those possible.

>> Mayor Adler: While we're on a related subject real quickly, on item -- question 43, we went through the detail of what the spending

[10:41:34 AM]

was for folks experiencing homelessness and I have a question about that and I don't know if now is the time to do it or to hit it later. As we go through the program and as we have the new person on and as we consider next week amendments, I think there's at least a chance that the priorities that we have might change, we might find other synergies as we go through this. If -- and I anticipate that on the message board this morning there's gonna be a post kind of from the council working group so that the rest of the council can get engaged on those issues. One thing that might make sense to consider in the future is having a larger platoon of people that are on our streets interfacing with folks experiencing homelessness to help make sure they get to places where it's good and safe for them to be as well as to

[10:42:35 AM]

access services. We don't have money allocated in the budget right now to expand that group, and as I was starting to go through item number 43, I wasn't prepared to start making cuts to individual areas because that didn't feel right to me either, but at the same time I don't want us to lose the opportunity to do something like that if the exigencies as we do this make it look like, hey, if we're gonna tell people where they can and can't be we might actually help them do that and if we're trying to get people to services maybe we need more people. If we're going to spell out more clearly that we want our public safety people to -- before they would take an enforcement action to make sure that there's somebody else there to interface with that person, how do we fund that? I just don't know -- I'm not prepared to go through this and start changing things, but at the same time I want to know that that flexibility exists if the

[10:43:37 AM]

exigencies allowed. I just don't know how that would be handled.

>> I think my answer to that would be, right, \$62.7 million in the budget for homelessness. Obviously some of that is related to staff, once you're funding a staff person that's really hard to move around but the budget is a plan. The city manager does have the discretion within the city charter to do things differently and to move resources around, so I certainly believe that the budget before you, the manager and the homeless strategy officer have the ability within their charter authority to do things slightly different if that's what the need was. Obviously if it was anything significant I think we would want to come back to this body to explain that to you, but it wouldn't necessarily require a budget amendment. It would be an operational change that the manager might want to bring to this body to consider if the homeless strategy officer has ideas on better ways to do things.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So councilmember tovo, we had talked about that, and I had talked about maybe making changes. I'm prepared not to do that

[10:44:37 AM]

and just see how this all -- conversation develops.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I appreciate that. And I certainly, you know, would join you if there are immediate needs that are identified after we've passed this budget. I would certainly join you in looking creative at how we might find some funding inclusions, including, who knows, in our -- depending on the size of it, in our own budgets potentially if not in other places. But I appreciate -- I appreciate that approach because I took another look at 43, too, and I took a look at the housing trust fund programs and they're all things that I think we want to see continue in the short-term at a minimum. So thanks for that approach.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen is next.

>> Kitchen: Yes. I think that that's a good approach also. I have a suggestion when it's the right time to bring it forward. I had posted it before.

[10:45:38 AM]

It's intended as -- and could potentially get us in that direction, but I know you're not ready for -- we're not ready for those amendments at this point. So but I think in general my expectation would be that -- I think it's absolutely critical that -- assuming we move forward with, you know, address the concerns that we laid out -- that you laid out in your resolution on 184, addressing the concerns about restrictions and limitations on camping as well as places that people can camp to make it real. We're really gonna have to talk about how we can better connect people to services, and that's probably gonna take some resources. So I would expect that we can have that conversation as we -- once we determine as a body what we want to do there. And so as long as we're not -- I think there's enough flexibility as long

[10:46:39 AM]

as we're not taking dollars out of -- there's a couple of programs that have to get started and are already set so as long as we're not talking about those dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm comfortable with that approach, given what we've heard from both the housing staff and the budget office. My only question that I wish I had resolved before today but we've been so busy is that with pay for success, if we budget out multiple years for pay for success, are we setting that aside in an account that is getting paid every year or are we sending one bigger check up front?

>> It's being set aside in an account, paid out once the performance goals have been achieved.

>> Casar: Great. So in that case I think some of my earlier concerns I raised at work session are moot for the same reason if our community comes together, homeless strategy officer aligns with it or not, whatever, if there is good reason for us to take some money from that account and spend it on services now and then pay off our obligations later on down

[10:47:40 AM]

the line we still have the flexibility to do that. My concern was sending all the money given we wouldn't actually get services for paying in advance. And so actually ear marking some of the pay for success money for a different purpose right now doesn't make sense to me compared to our homeless strategy officer and our community coming together and saying, hey, maybe instead of -- maybe we can refill some of that account sometime in the next two, three years. And we have that flexibility. Of course I have no intention of and I don't think anybody on the dais has no intention of not paying all of the obligations at pay for success, I think it's at our option that we're building that entire account this year. So, again, I don't think there's actually direction that's necessary to provide us flexibility there.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks. I wanted to thank staff and all of the folks that were on that slide that Ed brought to us. Really, this is a great budget and I very much

[10:48:41 AM]

appreciate, city manager, the additional amendments you and your staff put together after many conversations in work session and in our meetings. This is really helpful. I did want to point out a clarification that I think is really important, too, Ed, if you could help me on this, page 6. I had fielded some calls from folks in the community who -- first let me say that often -- I have found often trying to

describe the various sources of funds and revenues and programs because of state statutes for the hotel occupancy tax has been confusion, there's two different statutes, numerous different funds and they have certain limitations and restrictions. At one point there was some discussion in the community that additional funding for the cultural arts fund and the historic preservation fund would be coming from the new 2% that the council had approved, tapping into

[10:49:42 AM]

from chapter 351.

>> Yes.

>> Pool: Okay. And you are -- and I think there was a slide at one of the work sessions that was a little ambiguous, and a couple of us had asked staff to clarify that. And I see on page 6 that you have clarified that, that the monies for -- the 3.14 million for the cultural arts fund and an equal amount for the historic preservation fund are transfers into those two buckets in the convention center operating fund.

>> That's right.

>> Pool: Okay. And the convention center operating fund is found under which statute?

>> The operating fund is funded primarily through chapter 351 funding.

>> Pool: Okay. But it is separate from the 2% that we --

>> The 2% is a separate subsection of 351.

>> Pool: Hence the confusion and the ambiguity and so forth. Okay. Thank you so much. And, again, thank you, city manager and to our budget director, for a really good budget.

[10:50:42 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Just a follow-up question on that. On this question.

>> Alter: Itch a follow-up question on the discussion that the four of you just had --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do that and then we'll come back.

>> Alter: Which was related to a amendment I had?

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Alter: As I mentioned at work session I'm interested in creating flexibility for the homeless strategy officer. Some of the information I got when I was looking into stuff is a little bit different than what you guys are talking about so I want to make sure we have the same information. For the housing trust fund, if the money goes into the housing trust fund, it can't be spent on services. Now, we can change the

rules that govern the housing trust fund and then change it back again, but I don't know if that's what we want to have to do in order to access the money going into the housing trust fund. And in my conversations with nhcd, you know, there's two programs that are getting the money, the extra money, I believe, from the budget

[10:51:46 AM]

stabilization reserve fund and while those are worthy areas and we would want to invest a lot of that programming doesn't exist, so having that flexibility before you put it into the fund saves us a step potentially later on that may become messier if we start to open up the rules over the housing trust fund at council. So I think I've got it right that that was going into the permanent supportive housing and the home repair and that those system -- those projects out of those buckets were not -- are those -- maybe Ms. Truelove can clarify for me on that and anything else you would like to add. So it's not quite as straightforward as we can just redo it. Of course we can change it all, but I think there's some Pandora's boxes we may be opening follow up we do that with respect to the housing trust fund. Ms. Truelove.

>> Sure, Rosie truelove, director of neighborhood housing and community development. We just have tentatively

[10:52:50 AM]

slated 7.7 budget stablulation reserve fund to go into two different programs. One is a very well established program that you guys are all very familiar with, that's our rental housing development assistance program and that's how we incentivize or provide financing for the construction of income-restricted units so that's \$5 million of the 7.7. The remaining 2.7 is slotted to explore the idea of a home repair program that will specifically target areas of town, neighborhoods that are experiencing intense gentrification and displacement pressures to help repair that housing stock so homeowners can stay and remain in their current homes. If we do opt to keep the dollars in the housing trust fund, I would not recommend changing the rules of the housing trust fund. I would just recommend a simple budget amendment to shift the funds out of the housing trust fund to the more appropriate place. And if something comes up in our work with the new homelessness strategy officer we would of course welcome that because we're all on the same side of the problem here.

[10:53:50 AM]

>> Alter: Okay. So that was a different conclusion than when we were talking that now you think we can just transfer the money out.

>> It would require a budget amendment. So you can -- you could change the rules for the housing trust fund. I'm just not sure that makes most sense when just a simple budget amendment could suffice. We would still want to keep the housing trust fund dollars targeted towards creation of housing, not provision of services such as what would come with permanent supportive housing.

>> Alter: Okay. Thank you. You know, we'll talk about it later when we take up the amendments, but, you know, there are two places that we could take funding from that we can identify that we could provide additional flexibility to the homeless strategy officer, therefore, and send that message and that's the pay for success and the housing trust fund. I would still like to do that. I don't think that we need to be paying all five years in advance for a program that hasn't started yet when

[10:54:52 AM]

we have clear needs on the ground right now to address the homelessness. And it's a broader question than just the flexibility issue. You know, that program is not up and running yet. We're still doing the contracting. I think it's a very worthwhile program, but we may -- the program overall may be more successful if we make some investments in the short run through using that money.

>> Kitchen: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: One second. I'll come to you in just one second. I want to go back to -- are you still on that topic?

>> Kitchen: I'm on that same topic.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I just want to signal for folks because -- just I know councilmember alter has an amendment but I wanted to signal folks that I have an amendment also that relates to the dollars in the housing trust fund but it's more specific in terms of something that I had raised at work session, spending some of those dollars on the

[10:55:54 AM]

best single source bss program so that it would allow for some immediate targeting and working -- immediate targeting of individuals that are lower on the vulnerability scale. So obviously these are all amendments that we need to talk about at the right time, but I wanted to let folks know that I also have the amendment that I had talked about in work session that would impact a relatively small amount of dollars that are slated for the housing trust fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. What we're going to do is continue asking questions of Ed and then before we take any amendments we're going to give everybody on the dais a chance to talk about what their priorities are, what amendments they want to bring, so that we can see the universe of things that may

be in front of us. Anybody else on the question of the -- that we're on right now with Ed on the homelessness allocation of dollars?

[10:56:55 AM]

Now that we've been talking about. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I need to better understand a couple things so I can be mulling them over throughout the day. So I'm not entirely clear, councilmember alter, on which budget lines in the housing trust fund you were proposing shifting funding from for flexibility.

>> Alter: So they would be the ones where the budget stabilization reserve dollars went no, which would be part F of the displacement mitigation activities, and I'm not sure which line --

>> Tovo: I'm sorry are you in budget question 43 or budget question 64.

>> Alter: I'm in budget question 64. But maybe Ms. Truelove can show me where the other one is.

>> Tovo: I don't have an -- I'm sorry, I don't have -- I just have bullet points. I just have a bullet pointed list in 64. Am I looking in the wrong place?

[10:57:56 AM]

>> Alter: That's all they gave us was a bullet pointed list. Which is the one you're looking at? I can show you on that.

>> Tovo: I see, it's F. Got you. Under displacement mitigation activities you would propose holding back on the 2.7 of home repair services specific to displacement mitigation.

>> Alter: I'm not necessarily saying we would want to do all of it. I was just trying to get, you know, a million or 2 million for that bucket and then there was another bucket with the rental displacement. I'm not sure which line that went into on this version. Because you're right that across the two they're different.

>> Tovo: The legal -- so I think that

>> Alter: It's not in the same displacement mitigation budget.

>> Tovo: And fee has two different kinds of legal assistance. I'm doing it off the top of my head, but some was for

[10:58:58 AM]

tenant eviction counseling and some of it was more general. And actually I could ask a question that I've wanted to clarify myself about that. But anyway, I guess -- >>

>> Alter: We had talked about the money that was the budget stabilization reserve dollars and I have a different copy than the what I talked with them about in my minder so I can't find it exactly.

>> Tovo: So I just want to be sure [overlapping speakers]. If you find that if you could let me know what that line is.

>> I can tell you what that is right now if that's okay. It's the one two three four -- fifth bullet under uses of funds. There is gap financing for permanent supportive housing and that's both a combination of the general housing trust fund allocation we're getting for the year and budget stabilization reserve fund. And under the next bullet it's item F, which is

[11:00:03 AM]

2.5 million of.

>> Alter: So I had the right bucket originally but there's multiple things under that bucket of the gap financing.

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: So you did speak to -- you did speak to the displacement -- to the home repair services in areas that are experiencing lots of -- lots of gentrification and displacement. Can you talk for a minute please about the gap -- before I move on to that, the gap financing, I mean, the -- the home repair services. I assume you wouldn't be able to spend all of that money all at once anyway.

>> That's correct.

>> Tovo: So if we kept that where it is and the homeless strategy officer or the council identified another extremely important program that needed more immediate funding, we could certainly take it up. We could certainly do it that way too. We could leave it where it

[11:01:03 AM]

is with the understanding that if there is an immediate need for which we needed dollars and the housing trust fund is an appropriate source we could address it at that point?

>> Absolutely. This is a new program we have talked to some of our home repair providers and we think it has some merit. We have not set out any program guidelines or any details of the program. It's very kept actual right now.

-- Conceptual right now. It would definitely not be spent all this year or even be ready to be spent in the first half of the year because we would need to establish the program first.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I'm a little more concerned about the gap financing because that seems to me -- well, I guess if you could explain to us what that program is. It sounds like it would be used for organizations that might have a property in mind or have an opportunity to purchase it and we would step in and provide them with that financing, which would be more substantial sums of money than with the other kind of program.

>> Yes. This is funding, additional funding for our rental housing development assistance program that you reprogram any see.

[11:02:03 AM]

It's largely funded with our general obligation bonds. What we would utilize these funds for is to help supplement the general obligation bonds to really drive down to the deepest levels of affordability that we can get. So it's an extra layer that we would add on to take something from say 50% down to 30 or below.

>> Tovo: So that too wouldn't all be spent at once, but spent in larger amounts.

>> It would be spent in larger amounts and it could be spent easily in the first year. This is a program that we're all in agreement that we're trying to get as many units incentivized as quickly as possible so that we can get more units on the ground. So if we have opportunities to really bring down the level of affordability on the loans and the projects that we're bringing before the Austin Austin housing finance corporation, we're going to try to take advantage of that.

>> Tovo: Thank you. And then my last question I think is 43 talks about two different kinds of emergency assistance. And I want to be sure I'm understanding the difference.

[11:03:05 AM]

So on is question to 43 there is 57,800,000 for legal advisory assistance for tenants facing eviction. I'm clear on that and that was a council resolution that we all passed that I brought forward so I'm very supportive of that. Displacement mitigation also is described as providing legal or other assistance to tenants facing eviction or displacement. Can you help me understand the distinct between those two funds? I'm assuming those are in part situations where tenants might be faced with eviction or with displacement because of property damage and substandard conditions, but I'm -- I'm speculating.

>> The question is between the two responses, 2.1 and 7 the other place?

>> Tovo: No. The -- what would be the purpose -- can you help us understand the purpose of the displacement mitigation fund, which is also providing legal and other assistance? Maybe it's beyond just legal

[11:04:06 AM]

assistance, but also rental assistance to those tenants faced with space.? You can get -- with displacement. You can get back to us. I'm sorry I didn't submit it through the Q and a. Okay. We can circle around back to that.

>> So I know the -- one of the dollar amounts listed for 500,000 is a contract that we're working on and it's all but on the streets for legal services associated with eviction prevention. The other 500,000 that's listed are the second legal services contract that's listed, I'm going to need to look at. I'm worried that might be a duplication in the response but I need to go confirm that.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I guess that's comma R what I wonder too.

[11:05:06 AM]

>> Okay, thank you. >>

>> Tovo: I said that was my last question and I was mistaken. My last question is this: City manager I hope at some point -- and perhaps it would be more appropriate when we're considering amendments. I want to be sure that you feel at the end of the day that you have the ability to move forward on contracts associated with homelessness that are identified with 43 and 64 and that the conversation about coming back with budget amendments, if our homeless strategy officer identifies an immediate need or something like that is not going to -- is not going to slow us down on some of the programs that are identified in here because I think if there's a chance that it will I would rather have an up and down vote on that direction.

>> I appreciate that, councilmember. And certainly not only getting the additional feedback as we move forward, but also if there are changes to how we think about the scope and services within those contracts, but I think the direction that you might provide today would clearly state we were going to move forward with these contracts, but there's

[11:06:10 AM]

always additional feedback that we would be getting from the community and the homeless strategy officer to make adjustments to the contracting process. So I think that will solve a lot of the challenges

that we're seeing in terms of getting the feedback in an orderly time frame, but still being able to move forward with these contracts.

>> Tovo: Great, thanks. I think that's the approach I would favor. And in some of these areas where there are more dollars and they aren't all going to be spent at once, that seems to me to provide us already with the feedback -- with the flexibility that we would need if there's an immediate need that has to be addressed for which there's no funding identified today. I'd rather kind of keep it as is.

>> Kitchen: I'd like to clarify, if we do end up in a circumstance where the suggestion is, councilmember tovo mentioned that that be brought back to us before it's done. So because I shared her concern that without naming them all we have a number of

[11:07:10 AM]

commitments that we've already made to programs, and some of -- all those are commitments you can't have the program if you don't have the money for it. So I would not want those changes to be made at all for some of them, but we need to have a conversation if there's an interest or a reason to do so.

>> Mayor Adler: Further conversation on this issue? Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So I wanted to speak briefly to this and then I had a couple other clarification questions and other elements of this. So I was not aware that we could just transfer it out of the housing trust fund and that way when we had our prior conversation. So I will try to put -- change my amendment into more of a budget direction that provides, you know, signals to the homeless strategy officer that we are very open to that, and that

[11:08:10 AM]

we want that kind of information to come back and that, you know, before we're taking steps on those two programs that are listed in the housing trust fund that we have had some conversation of other things in that process. Without saying what should be done, but I think those are the pots of money that we've identified I think as a council that we could look to that don't jeopardize existing contracts and that would also provide our staff the time to develop those other programs so that we would be able to look at them between them because I don't think we need it to be a budget amendment, but I do think it is important to have a vote of confidence saying that we want you to have that flexibility and I think it's also important for our community to know that we're going to have some of that flexibility moving forward. The other two questions I had were related to pard. So there's one -- in one

[11:09:10 AM]

version of this there were -- they were getting solutions to address cleanups in parks. Can you tell me the status of that? I'm particularly interested if this allows for a cleanup crew in the north? Because there's currently only help in the south for the parks.

>> So the staff amendments do include two additional workforce first crews. We anticipate they will spend a lot of their time doing camp encampment cleanups in parks, but to be clear that the funding sources wouldn't limit them to just some of those areas. So I just wanted to make that clear. We are adding a position to parks who will provide administrative oversight to not only the existing parks crew that they have that does cleanups, but also to these additional two crews to the extent they're working in the parks. And in regards to the north-south issue, I would have to defer to parks in

[11:10:11 AM]

regards to the operational plan for how they would deploy those crews.

>> Good morning, Kimberly Mcneely, directing of parks and recreation. So the parks and recreation department's current plan is that we have on an average yearly annually we have between 30 to 40 medium to large cleanups, encampments that require cleanup. We have encampments that require cleanup on a daily base but it is our intention to deploy the crew or crews to the spaces that would require the extra work, the 30 to 40 or medium to large. So it doesn't -- it doesn't matter if they're in the north or the south. It would matter the fact that they meet a particular criteria that required a larger crew of individuals to dedicate a certain amount of time to the cleanup. So I think that the question is will we be able to satisfy or satisfactorily clean both the north and the south and the answer is we intend to do that with a

[11:11:12 AM]

different model than we in in the past.

>> Alter: Thank you. And you might need to be here for my next question. It was for the lifeguard pay, I seem to remember that there was a 75-cent request for the life yards and now \$16 I think only gets them 50-cent increase. I just want to understand what the assumptions are that were being presented with for addressing the lifeguards. Like how much of a raise are they getting with this amount? Or maybe you can tell me throughout the day at some point.

>> I think hr might be available. I did see at one point in time 15.50, so it would take a 50-cent increase and then I've heard no, it was actually 15.25 that the open water lifeguards were receiving so it would be a 75-cent increase. That confusion that I had when I put this slide together is why I said it's \$16, wherever they currently are that they would be at \$16 in the pay series and there would be a situation between the life yards

[11:12:15 AM]

cigars have the open water certification relative to those who don't and other compression issues are also being fixed in the proposal that we bring forward that has a price tag of seven thousand.

>> Alter: If it's possible to get some clarification today before we vote so that we can understand that and also what happens with sort of holiday pay, which I think is like when they work on a holiday.

>> I will make sure that we provide you clarification.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Ed, real quick. On the question on the two percent and the 15 percent and I know it's confusing and I want to make sure I understand. With this budget we're able to capture an additional three plus million dollars for historic preservation and three plus million dollars for arts. And that's money that we wouldn't be able to capture but for the decision to increase the two percent for the chapter 351 associated

[11:13:17 AM]

with the convention center expansion. Is that correct?

>> That's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Further discussion? Any questions now for Ed?

>> Pool: Can you clarify why that would be? Is it shifting money from one subsection of three 51 to the other?

>> It's the -- the subsection is -- states that the additional two pennies that you approved has to be allocated to expansion efforts. So that's why we're setting this up in a way where it's clear that that extra two pennies is straightforward with expansion. But then the 351 and the 15% applies to both the regular 351 and this subsection 32009 the extra two pennies. So when you do the math on that it's allowable for an additional \$3.1 million to go into those two funds. So that's -- to the extent there's confusion on the slide I presented, it's just

[11:14:17 AM]

because of the legal requirements of how this is set up and our accounting of it to make it clear that we're following all the legal parameters and the extra two pennies is going to expansion, but now the total 351 pool is bigger so that allows for 15% of a bigger pool is the additional \$3.1 million to each of those historic preservation and cultural arts buckets.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further questions for Ed before we go on the council to talk about priorities? No? Then let's talk. Greg.

>> Casar: I would like to lay out priorities, but before folks lay out priorities approximate about the employee cost of living increases, I wanted to bring acsme up to speak their piece because that may actually save us time as we go through the priorities once they've spoken their piece. So Carol if you would come up.

>> And hrd is now in the room to respond to questions that councilmember alter had.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll call them up next. Did you want to call someone

[11:15:19 AM]

up.

>> Casar: I wanted to have her come down. So I've worked on with the manager's office which is acsme recognizing the important testimony that we received. The worries of employees that we might be factoring in zero of next year, but what I've hand out here is some direction that acknowledges the facts, that is improving a 2.5 cola this year council acknowledges that our current financial planning for next year actually assumes a 2.5 cost of living market adjustment increase for all employees and that we're dedicating to understanding why we can't set a budget next year right now that we're dedicated to competitive wages for our workforce moving forward. In my conversations with union and I think they've had conversations with many of you, you had some thoughts about that and I wanted to see that.

>> Yes. Thank you all very much for being so supportive of the

[11:16:19 AM]

city employees. We really do appreciate that. As you heard through the testimony with the people who spoke, most of them were very grateful for the 2 and a half percent, but there was -- there was this feeling that there would be zero the following year and that's why we had bumped up the two and a half to the three percent. I did have a conversation with the city manager on Friday. And we have agreed to pull back on that three percent as long as there's a commitment. And we understand that you can't -- I don't know if you can commit to a budget that's not here yet, but I had a commitment from the city manager to make sure that the employees were taken care of in the following year. So that is what we would like to see. That we're very grateful to have the two and a half this year and even more grateful of that there will be money in the budget next year for the employees.

[11:17:21 AM]

>> Casar: Thank you. And the two things I failed to mention is one, I worked on the language with councilmember pool and I'm really thankful to working together with her and you on it. And then second, that we also don't have a health insurance contribution increase this year which other levels of government do that. So that actually makes the 2.5 an important piece and actually puts us ahead of some of those other levels of government. So I think that that's an important thing here to note. So thank you for this and we really appreciate the employees coming and testifying and I know all of us appreciate everybody that works on our staff.

>> Thank you all so much. Appreciate it.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Yes, councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Ms. Guthrie and Mr. Kirkman, thank you both for being here today. I and your memberships, our city employees, voices were absolutely heard by all of us here on the dais and in my conversations with you and Jake and with Chrissy, it was really important I thought to commit that we had heard your voices, that

[11:18:23 AM]

we all appreciate the two and a half% that was from the very beginning in the city manager's budget. I think the city manager recognizes the desire for additional recognition of our employees and that what is really important to all of us here on this dais is the goal of achieving an equal pay gross all of our employees next year. And I really was hoping that we would take this opportunity from the dais to express that support. We're hoping it will be in the fiscal 10-1 draft budget that you bring -- 21 draft budget that you bring to us next year. And I thank all of my colleagues for their work on this. I was really hoping the city manager would actually say that.

[Laughter].

>> I'll confirm that commitment on providing support for our employees. This is something that I

[11:19:26 AM]

have been committed to from the beginning. We have an incredible workforce full of dedicated staff that day in and day out provide great services for our residences and so we will strive to even in constrained budgets, strive to do what we can do ensure that they're supported.

>> Pool: I think that that verbal commitment is a really important message to carry back to all of the city employees, in particular our excellent and strong acsme's leadership. And also the city's willingness to go to the mat for the employees because it's the employees who do the day-to-day work including with the people in our community who we are targeting with a significant out lay of our budget this year and

those are people who are experiencing homelessness. We need our city staff members to be sufficiently compensated to continue to do the really important work that outlines their commitment to and loyalty to the city of Austin and so I thank all of them and

[11:20:26 AM]

everyone for all of the efforts. Councilmember Casar, thanks for joining me in this effort. And all the rest of my colleagues here on the dais. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Council, let's continue conversations owe.

>> Alter: The lifeguard situation. >>

>> Casar: Before you call them up, is there an objection to the direction as I handed out.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any objection to the direction? Hearing none, it's included. Staff is now able to respond to the questions from councilmember alter.

>>> Good morning, Joya hays, human resources director. I believe the question was relative to the current pay for open water lifeguards. And relative -- and in comparison to what we will be paying in the current proposed budget. And that answer is that currently our open water lifeguards are making between 5.25 and 5.50. All of those would go up to \$16.

[11:21:27 AM]

>> 15.25 and 15.50.

>> Yes. And that would go up to \$16. A.

>> Alter: And what happens with holiday pay.

>> Right now if an employee works a holiday they will receive pay for the day they worked. All employees who work that day will receive pay for working that day.

>> Alter: But do they receive extra pay on --

>> No. Regular employees and a full-time fte, if they work a holiday they receive holiday pay in addition to any pay for the work and/or they may receive comp time. So there is additional compensation for employees and regular ftes.

>> Alter: Could we maybe hear from acsme whether this -- what this proposal may be missing or if this is addressing the need that was raised here with respect to the life yards or if there's another we question need to be asking on that. I want to make sure that we're addressing it.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I want to

[11:22:28 AM]

clarify what I thought I heard director hays say is some lifeguards are at 15.25. I didn't see that reflected in the answer in our Q and a. It looks like most are at 15.50. Do you have a sense of how many are at each pay scale?

>> We do not. The park and rec team worked last week to provide us the numbers. So I wasn't able to confirm in this space who was at 15.25 and who was at 15.50. So what we are confirming is all of them would go to 16. But because I didn't have those exact numbers I couldn't speak to it.

>> Tovo: Okay. I've forgotten which answer it is, but it did suggest that the rate was 15.50. Thanks.

>> So as far as the holiday pay, it is my understanding that these particular employees even though they are temporary employees they work year-round. And so that's why we were requesting the holiday pay so that if they had to work

[11:23:33 AM]

on the holiday they would get compensated like a regular employee. We felt like it would be an amendment much like you all have done for the health insurance. After -- even though you're a temporary employee, after you're on the payroll for longer than a year then you're eligible for the insurance. And we felt that this would qualify in the same manner because these employees even though they are temporary employees work every year all year-round. And so they have to work every holiday being treated differently than the permanent ftes. So that's why we were requesting the holiday pay.

>> Alter: And then on the amount part? Was that a request to go up to 16 or was it a certain amount above what it was making?

>> I thought it was 75 cents for those particular

[11:24:36 AM]

individuals. So I don't know which ones are being targeted in the budget. All I know is that the compensation went up and that the compression issue was addressed, but I don't know specifics.

>> Alter: I understand the compression issue was addressed and I understand that there are folks that are currently at 15.25 and folks who are at 15.50, all of whom are going up to 16 and nothing was done with the holiday pay with this number. Is that correct, Ms. Hays?

>> That is correct. I would also point out that if we were to consider paying holiday pay for temporary employees in this space, we would probably want to entertain that for temporary employees who work holidays, not only just these temps, but there are other temps not only in the pard department, but across the city and we would have to do cost estimates on what the city would pay in order to provide holiday pay to temperatures who find themselves working those holidays. So that as articulated by Carol that would be a deviation. Currently right now as a

[11:25:37 AM]

temporary employee they don't have to go through the same competitive process as a regular fte. So we do not provide in our benefits package the opportunity for holiday pay. So if you would like us to entertain that I would just open that opportunity to look at all of our temps who would fall into similar situations having to work those days.

>> I think the way perhaps we distinguish that is that there is a personnel policy that talks or refers to not keeping temporary workers longer than a year. And so we're looking at those temps who are consistently working more than a year. And so that might not be the whole realm of every temp, but those temps who are working year after year in the same position without the same benefits as other employees. Does that answer your question?

>> It answers my question. It doesn't get me to a

[11:26:37 AM]

conclusion of what the right way to move forward is. It sounds like we probably can't address the holiday pay today, but it might be something that we want to explore looking at for the broader universe of employees who have been here more than a year and are in a similar situation. I don't know what the -- it sounds like if we move to 75 cents for each of them then we're going to have to deal with a compression part and the other. So I will have to think about whether I want to try to further add to this or not. But maybe some of my colleagues have thoughts on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I just want to make sure as we're sorting through this, I see in the Q and a response on number 47 the table is really helpful having it broken down into 25 cents and 50 cents, but the title talks about bringing everyone to \$16 an hour. And I just want to make sure

[11:27:39 AM]

we're paying head guards a little bit more than regular guards just as a matter of expertise and skill set and being able to retain the best people because it is dangerous work. I'm also concerned about the temporary status. I know that's a bigger question to unpack citywide. But I've also worked jobs where I was considered temporary even though I was working more than 40 hours a week and it sounds like we need to look at moving forward. I don't know how much work we can get done on it today, but it is something I'm aware of and concerned about given that it is long hours and dangerous conditions. But especially making sure we have the pay scale calibrated for open water guards in a way that isn't paying open water guards and the lead guards the same wage.

>> If I could clarify. In the recommendation you have before you it takes us back to a tiered approach for the classifications to eliminate the compression issue that had been identified.

[11:28:40 AM]

Historically when we went up to \$15 an hour, the department paid lifeguards at 15 to eliminate the additional potential costs that would come with moving our lifeguards up to the 15. So we lost the tiered approach. And in fixing this and bringing forth this recommendation we've adjusted that. We've done the market already. So our open water lifeguards are two to three dollars what we've seen benchmarked around the state due to the complexity that we know. And the hard to recruit concerns that were addressed at last council, we've addressed that. So right now what you see before you not only addresses taking your open water lifeguards up to 16, it addresses their immediate supervisors who will also then be moved and it creates a tiered system to ensure that there are no compressions. Not only with the open water lifeguards, but also with the regular lifeguards as well.

>> Ellis: I appreciate that. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I would

[11:29:40 AM]

have to either some confusion because I know a lot of our questions got consolidated into the one question on the Q and a, but what I had submitted and what we heard from testimony was both the 75 cents and the recognition of holiday pay and the fact that that didn't get posted out so we can't take action on it today is confusing to me about why -- unless it was costed out. I understand the concern of can we do recognition of holiday pay here without doing it over there, but I would have liked to have that come back to us so we could say well, if we want to do -- recognize holiday pay for our temps that are working year-round over a year, this is what it would cost, but now we have no option for taking

action before us unless it's something that we can quickly be whipped up. So I don't know whether that did get calculated and not communicated or if it didn't get calculated. So I don't know why and I would like for it to be as quick as we can because I think it was pretty clear and I have my messages here

[11:30:42 AM]

in pretty clearly asking what does it cost to do 75 cents and recognize the holidays?

>> I believe question number 53 in the bum packet at the very end of the question spoke to the cost of potentially providing life -- open water lifeguards. The additional Faye for holidays. I think it was costed out a little bit over 30,000. The concern that I brought was independent of that relative to if you're going to consider that. There are a multitude of other temporaries not only in pard, but across the city -- and that wasn't a question that we would want you to consider evaluating in addition to that if that was something you wanted to consider.

>> Casar: Got it. So it was costed. It was costed at 30,000 and there's an equity question of what if we did it there then what about all the other temporary employees that are working year-round, have been working over a year, et cetera.

>> Not only in the department, but citywide.

>> Casar: And we have just not costed that.

>> No. And that would be a larger project because as you know there's no consistent number

[11:31:42 AM]

to the temporaries, so we would have to look at at a full year of numbers and look at that for you. That would be a larger project.

>> Casar: What's the larger cost of doing 75 cents differential as opposed to doing it even at 16?

>> So it is going to be even at 16. I think the concern is whether some were at 15.25 and some at 15-point point. So the cost of 30,000 would be taking all open water lifeguards up to the \$16 in addition to the other tiered approach for the classifications and the adjustment and pay for the supervisors of those open water lifeguards.

>> And I know that it's a small amount. I don't want to take up too much time. What is the reasoning behind getting everybody to 16 as opposed to the other people making a little more making 1625. What is the reason for deciding to have them at 16 versus 16.25.

>> That was the question from council was to cost out the bringing one dollar up to the 16. We made the adjustments for the rest of the

[11:32:42 AM]

classifications based on that request.

>> Casar: I think the request from council if I'm reading it from Q and a says 75 cents an hour for open water certification.

>> My understanding is that was with the notion that they were at 15.25. So the understanding of the staff was that we were trying to get them to the \$16. I think it's becoming confusing because I think that when that was made it was with the assumption that they were at the 15.25. We since received information from pard saying some were at 15.50. So that was with the understanding that the open water lifeguards were at 15.25.

>> Casar: Okay. I'll think about it over lunch to think about the direction and the holiday pay more broadly through this year if we set aside the 30,000. We'll hey thy about it over lunch because what I thought was in the manager's recommendation covered it, but it looks like there are still a couple of little tweaks. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks. Thank you tell me how many of the lifeguards have the open water certification? How many staffers a we

[11:33:42 AM]

talking about?

>> I'll have to refer those questions to pard. They are the ones that created the costing. And I can get that information from pard. I don't know if they're available here to answer that question.

>> Pool: That's fine. We can take it up as councilmember Casar said, after lunch. I'm thinking that the larger project that you've talked about should be something that we should take up through the audit and finance committee to kind of look at the policies and procedures specifically targeting staff who may be part time, but they are regular part time. And they are working essentially year-round and missing out on benefits that at least to my mind that they deserve. So I'm with my colleagues here on wanting to dig into that in the next fiscal year to see if we can find some good solution to this issue. And then, yes, if you could let us know how many people we're talking about.

>> Okay.

>> Pool: Thanks.

>> Ellis: Mayor? Just one more comment.

[11:34:43 AM]

Question number 53 was from councilmember kitchen that had a 75-cent increase. 47 was from councilmember Flannigan that was talking about \$16 an hour. So we've got two different charts to kind of work off of depending on which one you're looking at. But I also noticed for head guard the increased cost at 25 cents is the same number at the cost at 50-cent increase. So I wanted to make sure those numbers shouldn't be the same and it looks like they were input the same and I want to make sure evaluating this correctly that we take a look at that.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. So we have a base motion in front of us. Does everybody just want to adopt it? Guess not quite yet. Just thought I would ask. Before we go to specific amendments let's talk to each other about what's important so that we can see

[11:35:43 AM]

where there might be items that have consensus on the dais so that we might know how to proceed. Maybe there are some things that we can handle quickly that folks seem to be wanting. So who wants to open that up? Let's go with Ann and then go to Greg.

>> Kitchen: I have a quick one. Do you want me to name all of them or just the quick ones?

>> Mayor Adler: Whatever you want to do. We're just going to discuss, not take motions now.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll just name the --

>> Kitchen: I'll just name the few I have and highlight the ones that don't have a fiscal impact and might be just direction that people are interested in. So I'll pass them out in a minute. So related to the customer assistance program, this one is simply direction and does not have a fiscal impact and it simply directs that the surplus funds in the

[11:36:44 AM]

customer assistance program be used to assist more customers. So there's that one. And then I have one for -- it does have a fiscal impact and this has to do with reducing the board of adjustment, residential variance fee. The purpose of reducing that is to implement the recommendations that we received from the board of adjustment commission that relates to the concern about affordability, an affordability for families to make these kinds of appeals. And I think it aligns -- I think from our perspective it aligns with the family homestead initiative that was brought forward that. Does have a dollar impact and there are some choices related to the dollar impact

[11:37:44 AM]

and how it would change the fees. So that was what I was referring to earlier and it has to do with targeting some dollars that can go towards the best single source plus contract for the purpose of asking our social service and staff to devise a funding target in a way to allocate some funds for people experiencing homelessness who score low on the vulnerability index. That's the third one. And then I have one other one that actually is not mine that I want to highlight that I would support. I think that councilmember Natasha harper-madison had highlighted it on the message board and that one related to the scooter fee. So I wanted to signal that I

[11:38:48 AM]

support that -- so that's five from me at this point. There's others that I support, but those are the five that I am bringing-- the four I'm bringing forward and the fifth one that illustrate to highlight support.

>> Mayor Adler: I have the customer assistance, the board adjustment, the single source contract and the scooter fee.

>> Kitchen: Say is again, I'm sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: The customer assistance program, the board of adjustment, the single source plus contract and the scooter fee.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Good. Those four. Councilmember Casar.

>> Kitchen: Not five, sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: That's all right. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: I've listed here some of my key priorities and also I know we're not going to tie revenue to our changes, reductions to additions, but I wanted to list them all here to show how they add up. There were a couple of

[11:39:49 AM]

gender equity and economic violence and reproductive asks and childcare asks. I think those are my main priorities that are left here. And so for me not ending the safe alliance bridge to safety relationship violation program is a priority. That's 130,000. I think the out of youth school programming that's been highlighted by members pool and harper-madison is important. The childcare facility in southeast Austin

I think is important, as is the abortion access logistical support, so I have those listed here. As the budget office mentioned there's 4 then thousand dollars of funds available within our financial policy still on the table. And in order to make all of that balanced and with consideration of what we've done with the police department budget, I'm recommending funding 26 patrol positions instead of 30 patrol positions on -- sorry, 30 police positions,

[11:40:50 AM]

which include detectives and patrol. The reasoning being a few. One, it still is a significant increase in police staffing of 26 versus 30. Number two, the amendments we just adopted in the base motion do increase the police department budget by about 400,000. So by funding 26 instead of 30, not only are we increasing the police department's budget, but we are still increasing the police department's budget above and beyond what the manager presented when he presented his budget. And then finally through the mental health first response program, we are going to be reducing the number of calls that police officers have to respond to instead of clinicians and ems. So we should be saving police time with that program, with that 1.8-million-dollar investment we will be saving police a time. So even with this proposal on the table of 26 versus 30 positions, I think we will still have more police time than we did under the

[11:41:51 AM]

manager's original budget. So to me it makes sense to fund to have this all at it this way. That is not my alien ringer. My ringer is an acoustic guitar. So then the last thing I'll say is on this that this covers the o&m costs of all of these programs. My understanding is that there's a remaining one-time cost for the childcare facility in southeast Austin. The balance of 50,000 gets us really close to covering those one-time costs. And I -- one potential idea for finishing the one-time costs is we're purchasing in this budget \$1.8 million worth of furniture for that building. If we could make the furniture still nice, but a little lit less nice by 150,000 of that \$8.1 million, I think we could finish all of that off and all of this would balance and hopefully cover a significant number of the the -- of people's

[11:42:52 AM]

priorities. So I list them like this just because I know that my colleagues have these as priorities as well and I wanted to show how this could all work.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: We don't have enough of these. Do you have another copy of this?

>> Casar: They can have my copy for me and I'll make more copies.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I had three amendments, but I'm dropping the second one, which is the pay raise to three percent, we talked about that previously. I'm passing out two. And number one is the out of school time childcare, which is an expansion of childcare services at rec centers and a cultural museum, two rec centers and one cultural museum. The item number three, let's see, and that is a total of

[11:43:55 AM]

onwestlake \$108,500, one time from the general fund. The programs bring in revenue on a sliding scale. Projected revenue from the expansion would be about \$106,000. And if you subtract that new income the total net request would be just shy of \$169,000. And then the additional investment in workforce training, which is my amendment number 3, Austin's workforce training, this is the ongoing dollar figure of 100,000. And this brings capital idea up to two and a half million dollars, I believe. And I see Mr. Jacobs out there. Is that correct? The additional investment in workforce training would ideally be applied to a program like capital idea. Around if it's applied toward capital idea then these dollars would fund

[11:44:55 AM]

workforce training for 50 more participants, is that correct?

>> Steven Jacobs, executive director of capital idea. There's a little bit of confusion over the amount of funding because your base budget has \$2.1 million ongoing plus \$300,000 from last year. So yes, you're correct, it will go to \$2.4 million in spending, but almost 2-point two million dollars in budget if things proceed with that. We would be able to increase the enrollments. We would need to find matching funds to bring it up to that 50, but I'm confident we can do that.

>> Pool: So you think 50 new participants could be covered by this? Okay. I was also interested early on in our conversations when the complete count census situation -- actually, I'm going to ask this of -- maybe it's fair to ask him this question. You can answer or not at your discretion.

[11:46:01 AM]

The amount of money needed for the program to make sure we get our census really complete and I appreciate the mayor bringing forward in item 4 funding the complete count census program. I was

thinking that maybe capital idea would be positioned to do some of that training. It may be that that training needs to be done under the auspices of the complete count committee. And it's -- would you agree with that?

>> I would agree. It falls outside the scope of what we're trying to do, which is very focused on long-term careers.

>> That's great. And that brings me up to date from where things were originally to where they are now. So I am -- thank you, Mr. Jacobs, I appreciate that. And mayor, I'm also very much in support of the additional money that you are recommending for the complete count committee.

>> Just real quick. You had workforce training, the out of school program census. And what else did you have?

>> Let's see, the workforce training, which is 100,000.

>> Out of school census and

[11:47:01 AM]

I think you had two more.

>> Pool: Out of school time childcare.

>>>> Mayor Adler: So you only had the three. The childcare issue, out of school, which was the rec center, and then the childcare issue.

>> Pool: Let's try again, the out of school time childcare is my amendment number one. I'm dropping the numbered amendment number two. Number three is the increased investment in Austin's workforce training, which is \$100,000. I just simply noted my support for the amendment that you will bring, but haven't yet, but have talked about on the complete census, complete count census.

>> Mayor, just so it's less confusing, I think everybody on the dais has a copy of the amendments that you've proposed in a nice packet and I believe the ones you just passed out are duplicates of that.

>> Kitchen: Some of mine are different slightly.

>> So if we could just

[11:48:02 AM]

indicate when that is so that we know what we're working off of it would be helpful.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Your concern is we have two pieces of paper that have somebody's name in number three and they might be different and the question is how do we distinguish which page is which. So someone who did that is going to have to make it very clear so that the record is very clear on what we're approving or not proving.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion on the dais? >> Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I wanted to ask my colleagues if they're proposing additions, could they suggest whether they have any proposed reductions as well. I understand we're not doing cuts and adds, but it would help me to know when people are proposing amendments if they have any sense of where we might identify those funds.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, do you want us to speak to that or not? Because I didn't speak to that when --

>> Mayor Adler: They're not tied, but good you have

[11:49:04 AM]

places where you think you have funding, I think we're all looking for funding sources. If you have any you certainly could identify them. As we go through the dais, if people identify things they want to spend money on, people could also identify places we could save money.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Of the two -- the ones that I put out, one of them I've identified a need, but I don't have a source of funds for and that is the board of adjustment, fee reduction.

>> Mayor Adler: She's just asking do you have a funding source that you had that you could tell her. Further discussion on the dais from other people? Natasha, is your hand raised.

>> It is not.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: We haven't had you.

>> Pool: I had some direction that I wanted to note, I wanted some direction from the dais. And do you want us to indicate when we are speaking the items that we are co-sponsoring even if

[11:50:05 AM]

they haven't yet been offered, I realize it was a bit confusing when I started talking about the complete census count?

>> Mayor Adler: You can talk about the things that are important to you. It doesn't have to be thanks you are offering. It can be things that you think are important.

>> Pool: I'd just like to note my co-sponsorship with mayor pro tem Garza for the municipal court childcare and also with her as co-sponsor with her and councilmember Casar, the abortion access logistical support services.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further general discussion? Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Garza: Thank you to staff. So city attorney, you're saying that the staff provided this -- no, what was provided? Did my staff provide this this?

>> Each councilmember has in front of them the amendments that had been provided and then if you choose to distribute those amendments to your colleagues that will be the process.

>> Garza: That's what I meant. This was by city staff.

>> That was given to you by city staff, that's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: So staff gave to each of us

[11:51:06 AM]

individually our amendments. If you want to hand them out, you can.

>> Garza: That's the exercise we're doing right now, right?

>> Mayor Adler: But you're not limited to just announcing the ones that -- that you're handing out that you want. This is the chance to say what people support. I mean, it sounds like there's significant support for at this point for the youth program rec center for the childcare and for the abortion logistical support that's been mentioned by multiple people, probably areas. I'm trying to keep track of that as best I can.

>> Garza: Okay. I would -- I would first say that I support councilmember Casar's chart here, and then that includes the partial cost for the childcare. And I guess why don't we talk now about how we differentiate those two. I'm going to say childcare at muny court so we're not confusing that with Leslie's

[11:52:07 AM]

childcare.

>> Mayor Adler: The rec center childcare. After school.

>> Tovo: I would call councilmember pool's youth programs. Those are really youth programs, not early childhood.

>> Garza: Youth programs. So my first amendment I guess is about the childcare at the south muny court. Councilmember Casar's to councilmember tovo's question about reductions, councilmember tovo's accounts for part of that -- councilmember Casar's accounts for part of that. There is still 225,000 in one-time funding. There's still a balance of 48,000 on this chart that councilmember Casar provided. And I am also supportive of reducing the furniture budget if possible, but that might not be possible is my understanding. Or asking the muny court to look into vacancy savings

[11:53:09 AM]

they might have as well as another way that they can try to allocate this. It's a little under 200,000 in one-time costs for that. So I'll pass that amendment out in a second. Amendment number 2 is the staffing for the temporary fire station in del valle. I'm assuming there will be significant discussion about that and it is asking to delay the command tech program to fund the -- I mean, it offers suggestions, either you can delay the command tech or reallocate the way that Morris crossing station is supposed to be funded and is currently funded in the budget. The next one is included in councilmember Casar's matrix here and that's the funding for abortion access, and actually, I will not be offering the last one in light of what acsme's comments were. And then I support

[11:54:10 AM]

councilmember pool's youth programming. I already supported the ones that are in councilmember Casar's. And I have direction about parks lighting and that's it it.

>> Mayor Adler: So I understand the youth programming issue, is that -- it seems as if there's one proposal that's youth programming. It's one that funds the youth programs at carver and some of the other centers. That also showed up on councilmember harper-madison's. That's the one we're talking about when we say youth programming. Can we call it that?

>> Harper-madison: Are you speaking to me?

>> Mayor Adler: I want to be sure that we're tall talking about a single proposal?

>> Yes, making certain of the difference between youth programming and childcare.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Youth programming is at the rec centers and libraries. The childcare is at the many court. Okay. Got it.

>> Garza: One additional add. With the fire, any savings in the command tech would also -- I would also support being allocated to the

[11:55:11 AM]

wildfire mitigation.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Ellis?

>> Ellis: I'm only going to be bringing one amendment and it's going to be to evaluate the clean community fee. It would temporarily maintain the clean community fee for a short while until council can get additional information from staff about options for increased levels of surface so that we could have a discussion about that fee and its uses. Moving forward I think what they -- what was needed of that fee in fiscal year 2019 is going to be different than what it's going to need to cover moving forward, considering just some of the work that we've done as a council in these past few months and I want to extend my appreciation to councilmember Flannigan for suggesting a fee analysis, we were talking about drainage utility and community fee and we can reallocate what they're being used for to make sure we're on target to achieve

[11:56:13 AM]

our goals as a council. I'll go ahead and pass this one out.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Renteria: Mayor? I'm going to be supporting the staff recommendation and including the -- keeping the 30 police officers.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's keep doing this. We're close to noon. If we could have people daylight the things, then I would propose that we take our lunch break after we know where people are and then we'll come back after lunch. So let's keep going. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thanks. I am supportive of the youth programming, I'm supportive of the early childhood center in the muny court and thank you, mayor pro tem Garza, for incorporating my suggestion of including a drop in component when you distribute your sheets. I would just like to make sure that that's a component on it because I think that is important. I want to just note that I will be bringing some budget direction forward. I am uncertain as to whether or not I'm going to make a

[11:57:14 AM]

formal amendment today or not related to a couple of things. I do want to say one of the areas that I had been interested in relates to the membership fees we had asked for information from our legislative staff about what organizations were done at the capitol fighting to overturn portions of our ordinance,

of our ordinances and our regulations. And this weekend I did finally get back the membership fees I had asked about a month ago what organizations the city of Austin pays membership fees to. And there is correspondence between some of the organizations to which we belong. And those who are down at the legislature fighting against the city of Austin, including particular ordinances. And I think it's a bad practice to fund organizations that are -- to be a member of organizations that are then using our tax dollars to go down to the state capitol to overturn legislation. And so I don't know that we have an opportunity because it's taken a month to get back -- more than a month to get back that information, I haven't had a chance to look through and verify.

[11:58:14 AM]

What I probably will suggest is if it works for the manager that we just provide that as budget direction to please delay payments on those memberships to the extent you can right now. And we can bring forward an ifc to do that more detailed work and have a fuller conversation outside the budget process.

>> Mayor

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thanks. Other people want to talk to us? Yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. I appreciate all the work that went into the budget and welcome the amendments that were presented today. For me, my top priority is the wildfire, and there's two parts to that amendment. One is funding the wildfire mission and the other is to delay implementation of command tack one year in order for us to invest in what I believe are higher-priority public safety issues like the

[11:59:16 AM]

wildfire mitigation. There would also be funding from that potentially for the relationship violence, --which I also support and related I'd like to see a solution for the Moore's crossing issue. I support 30 new officers. I'm not comfortable with us taking that funding away. And I will have budget direction with respect to the homeless strategy officer. Sorry, I can't talk and have things thrown at me at the same time. And I would support the capital idea increase. I am wondering if there's a way to fund a portion of that through enterprise funds since that funds come out of economic development, which is funded in part by the enterprise funds and in a past year, when we increased capital idea, we didn't have to do the full amount from general funds. I have a budget rider that I

[12:00:19 PM]

will pass out that has to do with what I mentioned at work session, with respect to the opportunity to adopt some financial instruments that have potential cost savings for the city of Austin and its employees and retirees that have to do with payouts for accrued leave. It's simply providing direction to H.R. To explore whether there's an opportunity to save money through that. There is significant extra money after we delay command tack and I would support putting that into reserves and I also would like us to invest a little bit. Since I haven't added all of this up but I still think there's additional money that could go into reserves, depending on how some of the other public safety things are resolved. We have another budget rider related to vision zero. It appears that the traffic enforcement expenses haven't been expended fully and we

[12:01:20 PM]

want to make sure that that traffic enforcement is taking place, so I will have that shortly as well. And then I just want to flag that councilmember Flannigan and I have asked for an executive session on another item in the budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. For me, I agree with -- and would endorse and maybe we could come back and take a vote on some of the things it sounds like there's consensus on. For me, I also would support the bridge to safety, the relationship violence issue. Where we have increased violence in our city overall, our violent crime is not increasing in our city. It is with respect to domestic violence, so I would put resources against

[12:02:22 PM]

that. I also support the out of school youth programming that councilmember harper-madison had. I support the child care coming from councilmember Garza. I support the abortion access logistical support issues. I had two amendments that I laid out. The first one was additional money for census. I think we should consider doing that. If there was anyway -- anyway for us to get that done. We don't have any support for that other than bringing in an individual and I think that would be important. The second amendment I had was the person to make sure we had the expertise on staff to calibrate. Some of the folks on staff have recommended that now is not the time to do that, that we should wait until we go through the land development code process so that we see -- and, again, establish that need and then

[12:03:22 PM]

consideration can be made to taking that out of the development services as part of the -- that enterprise fund. So I continue to believe we do not have that expertise on our staff, and I want it. We're

constantly having to make decisions and choices about how hard we can push when we're making agreements to push for community benefits expertise would help on that. I do not support cutting into the 30 officers. I also would keep that. I think that's -- kind of a compromising consensus that we reached last year to roll that out. I think it's meant that we didn't have to focus on those issues. I think that's a good thing for us to do, and I think that overall we're -- we are in the city, as pointed out by Ed, continuing our movement to lower the -- what we spend on public

[12:04:23 PM]

safety down another percent this year as we increase funding on social services, that we're doing it at a great amount. So those would be my priorities.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I didn't catch. On the fte related to the ldc, did you decide to wait on that?

>> Mayor Adler: I think the thing to do is to wait on that and try to pick that up perhaps as a budget amendment as we take a look at the land development code because I'm working on the assumption that there's going to be a lot of affordability issues in that and a lot of density bonus issues in that, there's gonna be a lot of calibration things, but it's been pointed out to me we haven't taken that action, which is true, so I think we should take that action. At that point I think we have to make sure we can implement it well. I'm sorry?

>> Tovo: [Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm handing out the two because I think we should do the census. If there was a way for us to be able to do the census.

[12:05:26 PM]

Otherwise I'm looking at Greg's things, the things I had were also the things that are on Greg's issue. I'm fine taking the funds that were available on the financial policy issue. I'm not okay for taking the 30 officers. And, Ed, we have, what, about \$300,000 that's in the budget for clean-up that does not come out of the fee? The community committee?

>> We have \$300,000 in Austin resource recovery for the clean community fee and there's \$145,000 addition in health and human services to fund the social service side of that program and then there's \$95,000 in the parks department to fund a new position that both coordinate crews and help clean-up effort related to parks.

>> Mayor Adler: And all those things are related to clean-up operations?

[12:06:26 PM]

>> That's all related to the encampment clean-up, workforce --

>> Mayor Adler: Can we take all three of those components out of the clean community fee?

>> No. The only component would be the component that's directly related to doing clean-up, the nuance abatement activity.

>> Mayor Adler: Can't pay for the people?

>> No, sir.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I just wanted to ask Ms. Mcneeley to help clarify a little bit of the confusion when we worked with -- my fav and I worked with pard on the out of school time child care that was specifically called child care, so I recognize that some of the age ranges make some of the students youth, but could you clarify for us the name of the program?

>> Sure, sure. In the world of recreation, right, we use the word "Youth development" often, but we're talking about aftercare for children or child care after school and child care for children

[12:07:27 PM]

during the summer hours when they're not in school, for kids that are likely 12 and under. So when we say "Youth development" or "Youth programming" it's synonymous with caring for children under the age of 12 when moms and dads are not able to or caregivers are not able to provide that care.

>> Pool: I wanted to note that the rec center is participating -- and you can confirm these, Gus Garcia park and recreation center, gibbons recreation center and the carver museum and cultural center.

>> Those are the areas that have been -- more centers have programs but those are the ones that identified could benefit from additional funds.

>> Pool: From the expansion. Thank you so much. And I know that councilmember harper-madison was very supportive of this item, and she may have an opportunity to speak in support later or now.

>> Harper-madison: I'll take the opportunity later, but thank you, I appreciate you pointing it out.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Ellis.

[12:08:27 PM]

>> Ellis: Just real quick, before we -- sounds like we're taking a break. I just wanted to daylight my support for a few things that other councilmembers are working on. The wildfire preparedness and

mitigation, preserve land management planning, transportation and other things that allow people to access abortion and other health care services that they need, victims services counselors, programming for children and adults with intellectual disabilities. The census work, connecting homeless neighbors with gainful employment and there's probably a few others that I'll mention as we bring those items up for discussion.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So I have -- yes, Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I handed out three amendments I posted on the message board last night. You know, I'm really concerned about the five-year chart that our staff keeps presenting us, and I don't feel like we're really thinking about the long-term impacts of the

[12:09:28 PM]

financial decisions we're making. I want to thank afscme for keeping their head on a swivel about what the long-term decisions are going to be and being with us and acknowledging that this council is going to maintain their commitment to the staff, as much as the staff maintains its commitment to this city. But I don't think this process we're following is that great. I think we did much better last year. I feel like we're in a modified concept menu here, just handing out pieces of paper on the dais, this feels really uncomfortable given the really negative financial picture we're looking at in the future. So I don't -- given the conversations that happening I don't expect there to be support for my amendment number 2, which would not spend the 2.5 million that came out of the final tax roll certification, instead reserving that for future budget deficits and I know, city manager, that we've all talked about continuing to

[12:10:29 PM]

look at long-term budget impacts moving forward and I'm very excited about doing that and exploring all the different ways we can get some of this stuff done. I really worry about the rush to spend as much of the money as possible right now. I don't think that's the right move and I don't know how I'm going to be able to vote on this budget at the end depending how these amendments move forward. I was two amendments I handed out one related to Rainey street fund which keys off a discussion we had a couple weeks ago where we talked about not wanting to segregate funds so that would return \$100,000 in onetime funds to the budget and then another item related to the nonresident user fee for Austin public library, which would have both a fee item and a general fund budget question in terms of just the allocation of that funds. As we discussed at work session maybe two or three months ago, that fee is used by a very few number of people and there are other programs like techshare that people with can use to get around it. It just seems like a

[12:11:29 PM]

unnecessary restriction on people in this community who live just outside the city limits getting access to the resources at the library. So. . .

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That's everybody that spoke up. Councilmember harper-madison, do you want to go through what your priorities were?

>> Harper-madison: Unfortunately, I think some of it is redundant, so --

>> Mayor Adler: It's good to hear where the consensus.

>> Harper-madison: I'm sorry, say again.

>> Mayor Adler: It's good to hear where the consensus is.

>> Harper-madison: So obviously I'm in support of the afterschool care initiative. I'm obviously also in support of the child care initiative, as well as supporting -- well, I have some -- I'd like to have some conversation around the scooter fee schedule, which has already been highlighted by some of my other colleagues. Some conversations around recommendations from our various boards and

[12:12:32 PM]

commissions. Oh. And then look forward to speaking to councilmember Casar's concerns around additional police resources and what funding looks like there. And I believe that's it for what needed to be highlighted.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Colleagues, it's 12:12. Do we want to take a break for lunch and come back at, say, 1:00? There was a request for an executive session, so let's go ahead and announce now we're going to go into closed session to take up that executive session item pursuant to sections 551.071, 551.076 and 551.089 of the government code. We're going to discuss legal issues on security audit matters related to item 1,

[12:13:32 PM]

which is the budget. Without objections at 12:13 we'll take a recess, go to the executive session and then depending on how long that goes we'll try to come back out here at 1:00 but if it goes on for too long we'll come back 1:30. Okay. We're in recess.

[ Executive session ]

[12:56:41 PM]

[Austin city council is in executive session]

[1:44:25 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. I think we're just missing two people. So we're close. We were out in closed session N closed session we took up security audit matters related to item number 1. And it is 1:44. We're back in continuation of our meeting to meet on the budget, item number 1. Based on the conversations we had this morning it looked like there was consensus maybe we could take quick action on some of these things. What I'm seeing is that there's sufficient support to vote yes on the youth programming care at rec centers and also the childcare at the muny court.

[1:45:25 PM]

Do we want to go ahead and make those part of the base budget. Yes, councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I support those things too, but I'm wondering what our process is because we had said before we were not -- I mean, those -- what we don't have in front of us is a list of what everybody is proposing in the cost so by doing that we're presupposing that we're using up dollars. So if that's the way that people want to proceed, that's okay, but it means when we get down the end of the list we necessarily won't be able to take up some of them unless we ask the city manager to identify additional funds.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we do what we did before is that we continue to mold as we go through so at the end of the process it doesn't stop anybody from coming back in and saying I want to blow this up or whatever you want to do. Anybody gets a vote on any concept they want to pitch out.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

[1:46:25 PM]

I wanted to make sure we weren't --

>> Mayor Adler: People have the opportunity to do that at the end. Yes, councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: I was wondering if whether you're introits the budget -- introducing the budget amendments if you could say who it's by and the number.

>> Mayor Adler: There were two things that had the most mentions. It was youth programming and childcare at many. Who brought those? Childcare at many, how much was that? Childcare at municipal court any was 178,966 and one-time funding of 225,000.

>> Garza: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Garza one. At this point -- we'll adjust these back, we may find ourselves we'veier spent and Ed tells us we need to find more money, but at this point are we good with making that part of the base

[1:47:26 PM]

budget? Yes, Jimmy.

>> Flannigan: So remind me, I don't know if staff can answer this question of the childcare facility at that location, will it serve more than just the municipal court?

>> Mayor Adler: I think the intent was for drop-in services.

>> Garza: The intent was to serve city employees at the muny court and the other offices that are there. And then there was a discussion of adding drop drop-in. Because that hasn't been discussed but it's my understanding if public health is here there's the possibility to add that as part of it, yes.

>> Flannigan: So my question is really that I think some of those departments might be funded in multiple ways so there might be a cost share for this that's not general fund. I think public works is there and public works distributes their costs across the full organization or they're funded out of the tuf maybe. I support this, but I think I'd want to know how this

[1:48:27 PM]

divides up across all of the departments and the source of funds for those departments if that's who is going to benefit?

>> Garza: So I will say that of the 225 one-time cost I've been having today and conversations with many court and also the other departments that will be housed -- that will be at that location and I don't know what the answer is yet, but the hope is that they will cost share foam that one time cost. We have heard concerns about subsidized slots and being able to increase those. The problem is we don't know what we can subsidize. I know there's discussion of subsidizing some of those slots, but to your point yes, there's the ability to cost share.

>> Is it fair to Shea that we could do this now and this is a general fund amendment, but that staff could bring back a budget amendment fairly quickly

[1:49:27 PM]

once it's figured out how it divides up across the different funds? I'm fine moving forward with this now. It should be a thing that we do. I want to make sure we're not going to punt that conversation for another year.

>> As long as we're funding it today with enterprise funds. We could certainly come accuse and amend the budget. We may not need to do a budget amendment. Until I see the details I can't answer that. But funding it today with general fund revenues gives you all the flexibility to identify other revenue sources should they pan out.

>> Flannigan: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. At this point is it okay to put this into the base budgets? Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I'm very supportive of putting it in the base motion. Because this arose I think at the court committee, the judicial committee, I don't have all of the detail and I'm not sure how much detail has been done in terms of the planning. So do the ongoing costs

[1:50:29 PM]

assume some degree of tuition? Do we know? I know childcare facilities aren't money makers, but I don't know if the operating costs we're looking at are assuming all of those costs or if they do assume some level of tuition from the employees who would be using the service.

>> I think we have staff here who could answer better than me and I'll ask them if they're listening to come down. But I believe that like the scholarships or discounted rates for certain people based upon income will come through the negotiations.

>> Tovo: You know, I guess I was really asking have you already calculated an on offset based on the tuition that employees would be paying for the childcare?

>> So we haven't gotten to -- this is Donna Sundstrom with public health. We haven't gotten into the real specific details, but there would be a tuition base for employees. Then we're looking at the business model to have 10 of the seats to be subsidized

[1:51:30 PM]

for children with families on childcare subsidies.

>> Tovo: And I assume if there were still spots left they would be available to the broader community as well.

>> Correct. But the -- there will be a portion of employees who will be market rate or community members who would be on childcare subsidies or the employees could also be receiving childcare support program from the city.

>> Tovo: And hadn't really had a Sans R. Chance to talk about the suggestion we had the drop-in care and I'm happy to take that offline. Perhaps you can update this at the public health, but I think it's an important component and somewhere in my files I think I could point to some examples in other states where they've offered that kind of drop-in care at their courthouse. I just don't know if it's -- I think in those cases it was actually free but we can look at the different models.

>> Let me clarify. For the childcare, for the waiting room childcare, that would be part of the municipal court piece of it. That we were anticipating

[1:52:31 PM]

that to be free cost.

>> Tovo: The models I'm familiar with I think typically are free. So that makes sense to me.

>> We're looking at those models as well like in I think San Francisco has some of those.

>> I think the answer is we're not sure how much of the operating costs could be -- that we're voting on here today could be offset by the tuitions. That level of calculation hasn't been done yet.

>> The level of calculation that we're doing in order to do the 10 seats for the families with childcare subsidies, it would just need to have the ongoing rent cost and operational cost to be offset. So to that detail we do.

>> Tovo: The market rate is offsetting the subsidized so we need -- the city needs to come up with the operating costs for the program.

>> And the lease cost, right.

>> Tovo: Okay, thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: As I understand it there's \$410,000 left in

[1:53:32 PM]

the amount that we could allocate without having to cut anything and this is already over that. So I'm not really understanding.

>> Mayor Adler: What we're trying to do is narrow it down. It's not like --

>> Alter: I understand that, but we have only two things before us that actually cut. And if we're not going to cut either of those things then we don't have money to do any of this so the process doesn't work. So if we cut command time we have 2-point one to work with. And if some other colleagues have proposed another cut, without those we don't get to balance -- we have to balance the budget at the very least.

>> Mayor Adler: But we don't have a feel for consensus on that. We have a consensus on these items. My suggestion would be if there's three or four items and then we know how much we have to raise as opposed to trying to raise in the abstract because had enough people showed up where there were six people that said that they wanted to cut command tech, then that's something we could move to right away. We didn't have six people that did that. That doesn't mean we're not going to consider it or discuss it, but I'm just trying to figure out what are the things that we

[1:54:36 PM]

had --

>> Alter: But there were people who signed on co-sponsors of things who didn't raise it. I don't know if I understand that.

>> Mayor Adler: Everything will have its turn. We're not going to cut anything off. Everybody who wants to consider any proposition for anything, either cutting money or raising money, will have the money to raise it and ask for a vote on it or to discuss it. Or to amend it.

>> Alter: But the things that you would choose if you had only \$400,000 and the things you would choose if you had 2 million for might be very different in how you're voting.

>> Mayor Adler: That's correct. Let's see how many things we want first and then we know what we have to cut or either we have to cut stuff or we'll have to raise money, one of the two. But we don't know yet the level to which we have that challenge in front of us. So we have agreement for that one. Let's see if we have agreement on the next one on the base budget. We will have some votes and some things will go yes or

[1:55:36 PM]

no. We also had six people for the youth programming at the rec center. I don't know whose number that was? Was that yours? Pool 1. At 168,000.

>> Pool: That's the one time funding, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Was there ongoing?

>> 109, 5.

>> 168 was the one time and the ongoing was 109.

>> Is there any objection to putting that on the base budgets for right now?

>> The 168,948 is the total amount that's needed.

>> Mayor Adler: How much of that is ongoing? I don't have the pool resolution in front of me. Pool number what?

>> Number one. The 109.5 is continuing. It's there. The one time that's needed is the 169 --

>> That's asking for a budget for 109,000 of

[1:56:37 PM]

ongoing money and 165,000 of one-time money.

>> There's revenue that offsets that about by

[inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: Would you say that again?

>> Pool: It's the ongoing funding.

>> The numbers are correct, \$109,500 of ongoing funding for the program. Solves thousand of one time, but that cost is offset by projected \$105,000 of program refusal. So the net of all that in regards to our bottom line would be 169,948. >>

>> Mayor Adler: So the other things that I had mentioned on the list this morning -- is there any objection that goes into the base budget? Jimmy objects. Anybody else object? That's going to go to the base budget. It can always come out later, be adjusted later. Right now that's in the base budget. Those two things had six mentions. Five mentions was the abortion access, county logistics issue.

[1:57:41 PM]

Was that someone's item?

>> Casar: That was mine.

>> Mayor Adler: Which number was that? It was number three. Garza number three. Which has one time \$150,000. Does anybody object to that going into the base budget at this point? Mr. Flannigan objects. Others no. So it's going to go in. Four mentions were for census. That was Adler 2. It was at \$200,000. Any objection to that going into the base budget?

>> Kitchen: I don't have an objection. I'd like to understand it a little better. Can you tell me more about what it is?

>> Mayor Adler: Right now our census effort is funded partly by the city and partly by the county to the tune of about \$100,000 each and it's done to hire a person. That person now has to go

[1:58:41 PM]

out and raise money to be able to fund the activity and they have a campaign that's estimated to be a little over a million dollars. Some cities have put in three million, four million dollars on this. And what they're asking for is \$200,000 so they have match funding to be able to raise money off of. So that's a \$200,000. Without objection, that one stays in at this point. We had three mentions for the wildlife mitigation issue. Wildlife. We don't want to mitigate our wildlife. Bad idea. Wildfire mitigation.

>> That is actually a thing.

>> I know.

>> Wildfire mitigation issue, what's the dollar amount on that one? Is that yours?

>> Alter: That's mine. It presumes -- I didn't do the total because I had

[1:59:42 PM]

actually come up with money on it, but it is off roughly 900 -- but it is roughly 900,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a subpart of that that makes sense at this point?

>> Alter: I've identified \$2.1 million which offsets it. So I don't see why I have to go down. And plaintiff also is a co-sponsor on that. >>

>> Mayor Adler: Do we want to keep that in the final group we're here talking about? Any objection to putting it in? Yes, Kathie.

>> Tovo: I support doing that, but when we start talking about that level of dollars I do start to get a little bit concerned about the extent to which we're not -- it made sense to me in the context of the proposal to make cuts within the fire department budget. I'm not objecting to it, I'm just noting a general concern that there are some -- there really are some items where -- this is potentially one and there's

[2:00:43 PM]

another one coming where I support the proposal as it's laid out to save funds here and use them in part because if we only pass the additions without the cut, then I'm concerned about the other places that would be cut to make up for that gap within that department. As I indicated in my work session conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Those are five things that had at least three people mentioning it. I realize there would be more people on things based on support.

>> Casar: The bridge to safety was mentioned by at least two people.

>> Casar: You, me and councilmember Garza. And as did councilmember alter, and --

>> Mayor Adler: I was going ask for a call for everybody here in a second. It will come up in a second. The question is now what do we add to that? Let's start with the bridge to safety.

>> Did we add that one. Scar number 1 -- Casar number 1. And what's the number.

>> Casar: 130.

[2:01:45 PM]

>>

>> Mayor Adler: Does that make it into our final group? Anybody object? Anybody want to hold off. That one makes it into the final group. Is there anything else that people want to put into the final group for a spending item? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'd like to suggest to put in the final group, unless somebody else wants to go first -- is there anybody else who wants to go first. You go first and then I'll go after you.

>> Pool: The \$100,000 for capital idea that would raise their total up to 2.2 million for workforce development, and that is pool number three.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Capital idea, the workforce training, which is pool three. Anybody object to that going into the final group?

>> Flannigan: Yes.

[2:02:45 PM]

I object.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody else object at this point? Okay. Let's go ahead and put that into the final group. That one goes. How much was that? 100.

>> Kitchen: Now can I go?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: So this is to reduce the board of adjustment residential. This is for residential variance fee. From 2,905, which is what it costs a family right now to try to get a variance for their house if they need to make a change on a land development code thing, to change it down to 500. And this was a recommendation of our commission, the board of adjustment. And the residential exception fee, which was also part of the recommendation from 2,146 to 500. And these reduced fees would be limited to a homestead that is a principal residence. So it would only be available to families who needed that variance for

[2:03:45 PM]

their own home. It's further clarified, principal residence is the person who has owned and occupied the residence since January 1st of the tax year in which the applicant files the request. Again, that language is to focus on this actually being for families for use with their own homes. The costs that I have right now is if -- at the end of the day if the council wants to accept this and we can get it down to 500, it's 153,453.

>> Mayor Adler: How much was it?

>> Kitchen: 143,453.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And that's kitchen one. Anyone want to speak on that? Delia.

>> Garza: I support lowering fees for homeowners, but I just want to understand the-- like the

[2:04:49 PM]

homestead exemption was about people trying to remodel and this was more specific to variances. I'm trying to understand the scenario where someone would be seeking a board of adjustment variance.

>> Kitchen: Well, I am -- okay. So you may know more about them than I do, but my understanding is if someone needs a variance to a land development code application, so for example, if they need to do something to their house if they've got an issue with their home, for example, that nonconforming for some reason and they need to do something to get it -- say they bought the house and it's an older house and there are some problems with the house, but they're going to fix part of it. They can't afford

the rest of it and they need a variance. That could be one example. There's a lot of different reasons why individual homeowners might need to get

[2:05:51 PM]

a variance. I don't know that this happens a whole lot, but it does happen. And so the fees are just really high and we wanted to -- if you need more specific examples we can ask staff to give them to us, but that's my understanding from the recommendation that we receive from the board of adjustment.

>> Okay.

>> Renteria: And mayor, I have an example. It really has to do with setbacks. And also depending on how your foundation is poured because I've had that where they said no, you can't have your foundation the way you pour it and we had to redesign the whole thing once my foundation had been poured. So in your setback also when you're too close to your front house we have a certain feet of setbacks. Another one that got me was they told me that you had to have 25-foot setback from the curb, which turned out to not be right, but they said if you go and you file your fee we're going to

[2:06:51 PM]

fight you. And you don't get your money back. That's -- the fee that -- it's the city's fee whether you win or lose and that's the whole thing.

>> Kitchen: I have another --

>> Mayor Adler: Is there further discussion about the 153451 for the board of adjustment fee?

>> Flannigan: Yes. So I'm in the sure that this is something that we take up at this moment because this seems to be a fee in an enterprise department. I think that seems to be the next thing in our process, because I think not a general fund impact.

>> Kitchen: It is. There is a general fund impact.

>> So we're taking action on budget prior to the fees. If you were going lower this fee it's funded through the development services fee, but when council waives fees or charges fees below cost of service in an enterprise department, the general fund basically pays the subsidy. So this was \$150,000 less revenue for dsd, they can't pass that on to other

[2:07:52 PM]

customers, other fees. We have to cover through the general fund transfer to dss.

-- Dsd.

>> So this amount was by the cost of service work that dsd does routinely to set their fees.

>> It's an analysis --

>> Flannigan: This would be a subsidy to homeowners from the rest of the general fund, that's how dsd works. Feet doesn't cover the cost.

>> Then the general fund subsidizes.

>> Flannigan: I take issue with that, but also in the additional information it says that the fee structure represents more than five percent of the 60 percent median income for four person households. But it's not clear to me that it's five percent of 60% median of homeowners. We're a majority renter city and I don't know that that's true for people who are the universe with which this fee would apply. So I can't support doing this now and if we want to take this up in October or November like we've talked about fee structures yeply I'd be willing to do that, but I can't support this now.

>> Kitchen: Just to

[2:08:52 PM]

respond -- could I respond to his question? So this is -- this was recommended to us by the board of adjustments. The language you read is from the board of adjustment and they're familiar with the fee. So I understand the concerns that people have and I've also -- I've also provided information on the back that if you didn't want to go down to 500 you could see what the costs would be if you adjusted the variance fee in certain ways. So we could deal with that when we understand what kind of dollars we might have available to deal with. But I just -- I think that this is -- I think this concept aligns with our support for families and with what we've wanted to do under the land development code, so I really would like to see it go on the list at this point.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Say it would rather not go on the list at this point?

>> Casar: It's lower priority for me than other things on the list, but once

[2:09:53 PM]

we have enough revenue lined up I would be interested in seeing where the fee could probably land. So I'm not saying that I don't want to talk about it, but for me it's lower priority.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go ahead and put that in at this point. Kathie?

>> Tovo: I wanted to ask, in some years we've had an ongoing tally and I don't know if that's what Mr. Van eenoo is doing. Okay. That's great. At some point we could ask him and he could tell us how much -- where we are in the total. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: So I think we have the clean community fee assessment issue, which I think we can handle independent of this conversation right now. So let's bookmark that for the moment. We'll come back to the clean community fee. Do we want to talk and see where we are with respect to the two possible sources of money, one with the command tech postponement and one was the 30 officers.

>> Garza: I have another thing that wasn't on your list, but I know I mentioned it and councilmember alter mentioned it, the del valle fire station staffing. It's not on the list.

>> Mayor Adler: I didn't have it with as man people.

[2:10:55 PM]

Del valle fire station staffing. What was the cost of that.

>> Garza: Well, I believe we never got our budget question answered. There's differing amounts and that was kind of to councilmember tovo's point, in the broader bucket of reallocating AFD's budget. I don't have the answer, but I thought we would have a discussion about command tech and wildfire and staffing the station.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's have that conversation because I think it's a threshold.

>> Casar: Before we kick this off, we said that we would try to get Kathie Mitchell and the mental health folks out by seeing if folks were okay with the metrics that we had been working on for some time. If we could call her and others up. We tried to make sure that there's good reporting that shows that this program is implemented with fidelity

[2:11:55 PM]

given that it was the biggest new thing.

>> Mayor Adler: Have people had a chance to look at the mental health first response projections? Councilmember Casar and kitchen.

>> Casar: Councilmember harper-madison has added her name to the top.

>> Kitchen: I have a question. I just need to make sure because we had some back and forth on the language. I'm not sure if I have the latest language in front. Yes, that's fine.

>> Okay

>> Okay okay with including this budget direction. This is the budget direction on the mental health first response improvements submitted by councilmembers Casar and kitchen and harper-madison.

>> Renteria: I have a problem if any of that money is going to come out of the existing police officer

[2:12:55 PM]

fund, but if it's not then I don't have a problem.

>> Mayor Adler: It's a separate question. We're going to fund it from some degree somewhere. We'll talk about the police officers here in just a moment. Okay? So this then gets included. In other words, if we do this program this is the instruction of how this program should be done. We'll have a vote and a second about whether or not we should go under 30 officers.

>> Tovo: So I guess I need to clarify that same question with the sponsors of this budget direction. I thought I saw the opening line talks about city council intends that funding is allocated by amendment. And I wasn't sure are we talking about by an amendment that you're bringing or by the amendment that the staff brought?

>> Casar: No. The idea is that we have to amend the city manager's August budget in order to have this program. This is not -- this is not asking for any more money other than what we have in the base motion.

>> Tovo: This is what I

[2:13:56 PM]

was trying to clarify. Are we talking about the manager's amendment that they brought at the beginning of the day. Not any future amendment, but to councilmember Renteria's point that as I read this and again we just got it and I'm reading it here on the dais. As I read this it is just outlining -- it's outlining a response that we can handle within the city manager's recommended budget as it was amended this morning. Not wh additional funds.

>> Casar: Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: I apologize if I didn't understand the full extent of your question before. Okay. Any objection to this going in? Councilmember Flannigan?

>> Flannigan: It talks about the city manager directed to conduct three community meetings. It's not like three community meetings in June. It would be with the reports.

>> Casar: It would be as the program develops.

>> Flannigan: Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to this being included? Hearing none this gets included. Let's have that conversation

[2:14:56 PM]

about additional money to the budget. We had two things that look like they would be significant adds to dollars in the budget. One is the concept of going below 30 officers. And the second one is delaying the command tech decision for the chief. Do we want to consider both those and see where the will of the council is on those? Let's look at the -- let's look at the police officers first. Let's have -- let's entertain the question of whether there is support for amending the budget to have less than the 30 officers as recommended by the manager in his budget. I think Pio has indicated he's not going to support that. I'm not going to support that. Councilmember Ellis?

>> Ellis: I would like to keep it at 30.

>> Mayor Adler: And councilmember alter, I think you had earlier said that as well. Any further discussion? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I had a

[2:15:57 PM]

question. Is the proposal authorizing 30 and funding 30 or is it authorizing 30 and funding 26.

>> Casar: That's right. Authorizing 30 positions, funding 26, understanding that unless our attrition rate drops very substantially we likely would not even be close to hiring that number within the next fiscal year, understanding also the 400,000-dollar increase to the police budget that we just made this morning, this would still be a net increase in the police budget above the August proposal.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: The concern I had with that is even if we don't fill the position somebody has to do that work on so we're backfilling with back pay.

>> Casar: And that's why we would be getting -- which is also part that I didn't want to rehash is that we're going to be backfilling less work because we're taking cops off of calls also with the amendments we just did this morning. So I believe that this proposal still results in more police officer time than even what was proposed

[2:16:58 PM]

in August. But we could have a vote on it. You I just want to lay out in neither proposal do I think there is actually a decrease in the time.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: I'm not comfortable with that argument. I just don't see it happening. S and I-- we need to keep our current numbers that we have and I would love to see that happening, but every year we've come down here and we argue that it's going to reduce the calls. We put more money here and there, it's going to reduce the need for police officers. We can see that there is not a reduction in need. There's too many calls. I try to implement community policing here and there is not enough officers out there to be doing community policing because we have cut the numbers down so far. All they're reacting is to calls, to calls, to calls. I know the community like we had planned in the beginning, I can't support

[2:17:58 PM]

that argument.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Are we ready to take a vote? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I would actually like to call up our police chief and ask him to help us understand how this could impact the department. I share the concerns, councilmember Renteria raised and also the point that you made earlier, mayor, about this was the conversation we had last year and this was the plan that we set up for our community and I was just trying to pull up I think it was KXAN did a report over the weekend of one evening of the different incidents that happened that night and the response. And as we know we had an upswing in violent crime in our downtown area this summer and the police chief very rightly allocated additional resources. At least some of which are being funded through over time. So I on owe while I understand the point about the additional money that

[2:18:58 PM]

was added to the budget this morning, I agree that we're likely going to be filling those positions with overtime and we're just at a time where we are seeing an upswing in crime, least in our downtown area, I think it's critical that we stick to our plan to move forward with the funding that the manager has been recommending. And chief Manley, I wondered if you could talk about the difference as you see it between 26 and 30. And I know we asked you at our work session to address the issue of whether these slots could be filled and so could you address those two points, the capacity -- the difference between 26 and 30 in funding and the real consequences of that given that you may or may not be able to hire for those positions this year.

>> Certainly. Good afternoon, mayor and council. Brian Manley, chief of police. Specifically with funding I know we had an opportunity to discuss I believe it was last week the funding for these positions and the need for backfill overtime in the department right now. The fact that these

[2:19:59 PM]

positions that we have in the department as of last week it was 103 are vacant, the need for those officers still exist. And often times we're filling those positions with officers on over time and that exceeds the overtime budget that we had this year and we were able to cover that with the salary savings. And remember we also discussed the issue that we are in a way credited with the understanding that these positions will be vacant at certain times through the year. So the funding is important because although we will not fill these positions during this upcoming fiscal year, the money that supports those positions will be used towards policing initiatives, whether it be the backfill that we need to have the appropriate number of officers on the street at any given time or the initiatives like we're doing in the downtown entertainment district right now to address the spike in crime that we've seen. And it is important that we stay at the authorized number of 30 again sticking with the resolution from

[2:21:01 PM]

last year because that will be impactful this year. We need the authorized positions this year because the recruiting cycle will hit this year for these positions. So even though we will not fill them this year we need to have them authorized in our budget so that we start that recruiting process this year and they're ready to go next year. In other words, by the end of this fiscal year if these positions were not approved in our budget and we did not know that we had them, we would not be recruiting for them. I hope that's clear.

>> Tovo: It is. And thank you for addressing the downtown initiative and some of the additional staffing that's been required. I know when the mayor and I, and I guess we were the only two councilmembers, were at the red river merchants association, that was a filled room of businesses owners in that area who have been I know communicating with your officers and with our offices and across the council about the need to as you put it restore a sense

[2:22:02 PM]

ever cyst in that area -- sense of cyst in that area. The article I was referencing from this weekend is called Austin police respond to multiple assaults downtown over the weekend and it was on KXAN and it gives a timeline. I think what was what really struck me when I spent the night probably a month or so ago downtown on sixth street, just the number of events that were averted balk we had that police presence there. There is a lot going in that downtown area that doesn't hit the newspapers it seems to me. And the incidents that have been hitting the newspapers are of concern and so again, I can't support reducing our commitment with regard to the officers. Thanks for that additional information.

>> And specific to that, I would say the downtown initiative, one of the things that will come out is these officers that have been working this initiative over this past month we have removed 15 guns off of the street as a result of this initiative, two of which this past weekend were in the hands of felons and were felons arrested in the possession of firearms.

[2:23:03 PM]

So this is having a significant impact on safety in the the downtown area.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and take a vote. Ready? Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I just want to add that I'm also supportive of the 30 officers. I feel like we had a very long conversation with the community and amongst ourselves during the contract negotiations and did some very great work, helped a lot of our future budgets through that work in the association with others. And I think we need to stick behind that work that we did over the last couple of years.

>> Mayor Adler: We have now a majority of the council hat's indicated that they're not going to support this. Are we ready to take a vote?

>> Kitchen: I have a quick question. I'm sorry. So chief, I heard you say we needed to authorize, and I don't want to redo the conversation we had at the work session. But in your mind is there not a distinction between authorizing and funding later, you know, understanding that we'll authorize 30 now. You won't be hiring 30 but

[2:24:06 PM]

does not authorizing them give you the same authority to proceed with hiring at the point that you're ready to start a cadet class?

>> The authorization would give us the ability to hire them. But the distinction is first of all these are only funded as in the proposed budget for six months with the anticipation that we wouldn't. And then remember we've got a credit built into our budget for \$17 million this year so that's why I talk about the importance of these dollars, although they're not needed for these positions because we won't feel them this year, we flow that we will have overtime needs throughout the year to backfill for these vacant positions and so these dollars would help us cover that budget because our overtime budget is not enough to address that.

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

>> Alter: I had a question for Ed. We've only had a calculation from one of our colleagues on how much would be saved. What Mr. Casar wrote down

[2:25:06 PM]

was \$265,000. Is that the correct amount?

>> Casar: That's a combination of one time and general.

>> We have it at \$227,012.

>> Casar: Do you have the one time cost?

>> One time is included in there as well.

>> Alter: Okay. I'm not going to reiterate what's already been said. I agree with my colleagues who are not supportive of this will change, as Mr. Flannigan mentioned, we have went through a challenging set of conversations with our community and our police and I believe that part of the promise that came out of that was the 30 officers. And I think at this point in time it sends a wrong message not to fund them.

>> Casar: Mayor, last thing I'll say since it looks like I don't have the support on the vote. One thing is part of what we have committed to here where we're trying to do is the whole argument is that we want to have a certain amount of police time. Not necessarily a certain amount of police officers. What we're trying to do is get to certain outcomes, not

[2:26:07 PM]

just to certain numbers. If what we're trying to do is hire clinicians to do some sets of this work, then I think that it is a very clear argument that that backfills a portion of that work. That we're sending clinicians to do certain work. So I hope that we, as we move forward in this community, that we try to get to outcomes and not just get to numbers and not just say we're putting a certain number of people on the street, but are actually trying to make a certain change in the community. Also the audit on the community policing side emphasizes what I've been asking for and I think many folks have been asking for the entire time I've been on the dais, which is to quantify what the community policing time is intended to actually produce and to do. Our goals are actually to reduce violence in the community. And just folks having time is important, but I want to know what we're going to get from that time, the audit points that out, and I hope as we go into future budgets we try to focus on those outcomes rather than just a number because the number is important insofar as it gets us to a certain outcome. And last thing is I want to

[2:27:07 PM]

say potentially that is the chief's staffing plan or individual commitments to 30 officers, but there is not a -- the council did not adopt and endorse a specific plan on how many officers would be hired every year. We heard that report, a resolution was passed saying we recognize the report existed, but especially now as we head into a world of revenue caps, we have to try to get to the best and safest outcomes for the community as we can. And I appreciate the support from some of these other items that also improve public safety. I think the difference between 26 and 30 positions is that the 30 positions there will be even more police time given that we had the clinicians taking some of the calls and the 30. But I recognize where the vote is going, but I think that's an important things that I wanted to express as we move into future budgets.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's good. Do you need a vote on this one?

>> Casar: I think the vote already happened.

>> Mayor Adler: I think so too. We just go on to the next thing. Let's go on to the next

[2:28:09 PM]

thing.

>> Garza: I just wanted to express that kind of ditto to what councilmember Casar said, but it is also the policies, the freedom cities that we have implemented that has reduced things like arrests, and I agree it's hard to understand numbers versus time. In addition to we have a policy right now where we are still ticketing people for low levels of marijuana possession when those cases are not being filed. So as we move forward, you know, I understand we're a growing city, but we're also implementing and trying to advocate for things that reduce the time that police officers are having to do things that essentially turn into them being -- saying don't show up to court because this charge isn't being filed. So we weren't asking for -- this request was not asking

[2:29:09 PM]

for all 30 officers, it was asking for four. And I just want to be on the record saying that I support it going to 26.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. I would point out to the chief just by part of the conversation, we passed a resolution last year that we're trying to get to metrics, real outcome issues and I know you're working to that and trying to establish that so that we crack those numbers that way. I don't think we've quite gotten there yet. So I think it's important for us to be able to speak to the metrics that were passed by the council in terms of what the outcomes were as opposed to the I don't wants. So we need to continue working on that. Let's move on. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I wanted to weigh in too. I think with all of the work we're doing on both sides of the decriminalization issue, the work that our officers are doing in the field in our community and the work of the social justice folks and the advocates have come to us repeatedly with with

[2:30:09 PM]

legitimate concerns and the let's dents specifically in my -- residents specifically in my district, I think we are striking a good balance here and I actually agree with pretty much everything that is being said on this dais no matter which side of the vote they would be on and so I will support the 30 officers. Because I think that we have also included and increased the amount of outreach for social services and mental health practitioners and that's a huge change and shift in our policy direction and our program direction here at the city.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Let's move on to the next item, which is whether we delay the command tech issue issue. The command tech issue from the fire chief. Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So my amendment proposed about \$900,000 in

[2:31:11 PM]

wildfire mitigation and suggested that we delay the command tech program for one year which frees up a minimum of \$2.1 million for necessary and urgent fire safety needs. I have worked hard with the budget office to get a full understanding of the true cost of this program. The proposed budget was proposed to cost a little over 200,000, that was the part that was made evident to us. That information did not reflect the true cost of the program, which come in at an additional 1.3 million. By the time the overtime was calculated, we discussed this at length at work session. I believe that these funds are best allocated towards high priority fire needs. I've identified the wildfire Ms. Garza has identified the staffing of the del valle station. It's my understanding there will still be a surplus left after these two needs are met and I'd like any remaining funds to go to other fire programs or be placed in reserves.

[2:32:13 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on the one-year delay. Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Garza: So it's

[indiscernible] Too. And I believe the 1.3 million is from their overtime budget. I -- I'm happy reallocating the money to the staffing of the -- temporary staffing of the fire station and the wildfire mitigation that councilmember alter has asked for. But I do not see any excess as I don't want to raid their overtime

budget so I'm asking that we use you -- was it 2.1 million to fund the 900,000. And I believe it's about 685,000 for the temporary station and then leave the rest for fire to return back to their

[2:33:14 PM]

overtime budget. And I want to express that I believe the command tech is important and would support it in subsequent years, but both of these asks are -- have been needed for awhile and again I want to start that iso ratings clock as soon as possible for the families in del valle who I guess we're both experiencing constituents who have higher insurance rates because of not having placed fire resources in the right place. Not through anyone's fault, just because of our limited resources.

>> Mayor, maybe I can clarify. Just to make sure that if we do use some of the money that would be for the command tech program on ongoing expenditures we're not delaying the program, we're just not funding the program. It would have to come back at another point in time

[2:34:15 PM]

with those additional revenues. Just want to make sure that that's a correct assumption that I'm making.

>> Garza: And I understand that my costs are one-time costs. I don't know about councilmember alter's.

>> Mayor Adler: Chief, you can come address this if you want to.

>> City manager, Mr. Mayor, mayor pro tem, guys, good afternoon. The funding for the wild land fire is an ongoing cost. The funding for the del valle station is a one-time cost. So if we was to fund the wild land fire, I'm not 100% sure we'll be able to move forward with the command tech program. The command tech program was funded through salary savings to begin with.

[2:35:18 PM]

And moving all the monies around. So standing here I'm not sure we'll be able to have the command tech program with the ongoing cost of funding the wild land fire. I had to work with the budget team to find out how would that happen in the future. Because we came up with the decision to do the command tech program without asking for money from the city, put additional money to our budget. We were trying to use the money we already had in your budget. If that make any sense.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember pool and then Mcraven.

>> Pool: Thank you, chief. So the two things that I would note is the -- maybe Mr. Van eenoo can help with this. If we fund command techs this year, it may be one time with savings this year, but that would then be ongoing. Is that correct?

>> Can you phrase the question again?

>> Pool: I'm thinking that

[2:36:19 PM]

there's actually a higher cost to the command program than what is being offered here. We're looking at first year, one year costs of \$800,000. But that would be ongoing. The command tech program wouldn't exist only for one year, is that right?

>> That's right. And it's really closer to 2.000000 because there's an overtime implication.

>> Pool: So the program is rather larger financially than we have been discussing. And frankly, the concerns that both councilmembers alter and Garza have brought with regard to a new station and the wildfire program have been in front of us for quite some time. And I am of a mind to address the issues that have been before us for quite some time and also that have a more immediate impact on our residents. So I would not be supportive of the command tech program for this year. Possibly in the future, but I want to take care of the more immediate concerns right now.

>> As we discussed in budget

[2:37:19 PM]

work session I'm not there yet on command tech. I'm not convinced it's not a program not now in the future. There's work to be done to get me up to speed on that. I thank you, councilmember alter, for really digging into the members on that and councilmember pool as well. I think of the wildfire money the 600,000 is a contract, it's not an fte, so that is very much easily something that we will be revisiting on an ongoing basis. You bring on an fte and you don't reduce the ftes, but I think there will be some more flexibility on that side. As I said in work session we're about to do a lot of efficiency study around fire and ems. And so it seems like we're going to really dig into these types of questions in the future. Like when we had the debate about four person staffing it became very clear that we have a rockstar fire department that does an amazing job, that does a safe job, that does it better than just about any other city in the country. So to add new programming, I need a lot more evidence to show that we're doing

[2:38:20 PM]

something wrong now in order to know why we have to do something different. I'm willing to keep having that conversation in the context of the efficiency studies that the manager has told us that he's going to do.

>> Chief, do you want to say anything else?

>> I want to say just in closing on behalf of all the men and women of the Austin fire department, this is still a win-win for us and I appreciate all the support, from the city manager, for you, Mr. Mayor, mayor pro tem, all the guys, for your continued support of the Austin fire department. Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. Let's take a vote on not funding command tech. Any further discussion before we take that vote? Those in favor of not funding the command tech please raise your hand. It's -- those opposed the other way? I think it's me and how do you vote, ping? , Paige? I think I'm the only one who

[2:39:21 PM]

voted no to keep the funding. It is not funded. So that returns \$2.1 million to the account, is that right? Ed? Okay.

>> That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the amount of money for the fire station?

>> So the answer is it depends a little bit. The way we've looked at this is that station 50 is projected to have two companies for three months of funding for two companies at station 50. Instead in the first year we're going to staff it up with a single company which gets the clock running on the iso issue. Then we really have enough money in the budget for six months of the station. And if you wanted the money for the full year it would be an additional 664,000.

>> Mayor Adler: 664.

>> If the desire is to keep both companies in for the full year then it would be a lot more.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter, you

[2:40:22 PM]

have the fire items broken out on your potential. They're all shown as ongoing expenses. Can we list those as ongoing expenses?

>> Alter: No, because three of them are staff and you need to have the funding for the staff.

>> Mayor Adler: What about the one item, the contract? Can we make it a one time? I'm trying to make it fit here.

>> Alter: It fits just fine because the 2.1 is all ongoing money.

>> Mayor Adler: What are the totals? Where do you think we are now? Do you have a feel for that?

>> Yes, I do. By my accounting you would be \$272,000 out of balance right now in the red.

>> Mayor Adler: 272. Is that one time or ongoing?

[2:41:26 PM]

>> I think you would be -- I mean you would be fine on the ongoing side. It's actually with the temptation being the heavier amount of the one time funding.

>> Mayor Adler: So 272 of one-time money.

>> 272,000 of one time money to close this.

>> Mayor Adler: If we're that close on everything that we have, can you find \$272,000? Rather than us having to cut programs? At that close can you find that?

>> I mean, we could. I think we would rather actually do the work and come back and tell you what it's going to look like.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's hold the 272 for just a second and let's take the issue of the clean -- clean community fee assessment issue. Is there something for us to do?

>> Garza: I'm sorry. What -- what's the 272 do?

>> Mayor Adler: We are overbudget by \$272,000 of one time money.

[2:42:26 PM]

That includes us funding the youth programming, the childcare, the abortion access, the census, the wildfire mitigation, the workforce training idea, the bridge to safety, the board of adjustment fee and the fire station. And has us not doing the -- has us not doing funding the command tech. And with those we're \$272,000 over on one-time funding.

>> Flannigan: Mayor, should we keep going through amendments?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Are there other amendments. Let's keep going.

>> Tovo: I just want to verify that we have voted or incorporated in the wildfire and the -- we did that. Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any objection to including the -- [overlapping speakers]. Any problem in putting in the wildfire and the fire station into the working budget we have at this

[2:43:27 PM]

point?

>> Pool: Question. Tell me what level of the staffing? Because there were a couple of different levels that Ed had told us for the staffing of the fire station. Is it the six-month for full staffing? Is it -- full staffing? Is it for one engine?

>> So the way we're projecting the staffing for the temporary station it would be one fire company beginning on October 1 and then that would run out for roughly nine months, and then that unit would transition over to the newly constructed fire station. First year would just be one company and the second year would still be the two that we had planned.

>> Pool: Okay. Is that what you were expect okay, great. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other amendments people want us to consider at this point? Councilmember Flannigan and then councilmember harper-madison.

>> Flannigan: Just so that I have it on the record, mayor, I did bring an amendment to reserve all of the additional funding for the budget stabilization

[2:44:27 PM]

fund since we are already projecting deficits two years out. I don't know if anybody would like to support that with me.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan is asking if there's interest in just taking the \$2.5 million and putting -- increasing reserves by \$2.5 million, which will require us then to make adjustments to free up that \$2.5 million. Anybody else joining him on that? I think you're alone on that one.

>> Flannigan: I have another amendment with B the Rainey street fund based on a conversation we had a couple council meetings ago. That would be a hundred thousand in onetime funds. It would help get us to where we need to be.

>> Mayor Adler: Interest on the dais at this point in getting that money into the Rainey fund, pulling it in? Hearing none that doesn't move forward. Further discussion on additional items?

>> Garza: Mayor, does your tally include the onetime cost of 225 for the child

[2:45:30 PM]

care?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, it includes the 225 onetime cost and the 278976 ongoing.

>> Garza: It's my understanding and budget can verify that muni court has found that money within their budget so it shouldn't be a subtraction. It's already existing money that they've been able to reallocate.

>> Mayor Adler: Tell me that's true.

>> That is true. We had heard from --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> It's a combination of real estate services and community court, there's funding in their budget this year related to some moves that they're not going to utility and so they said they could use \$225 of this year's money related to onetime cost of the child care center.

>> Garza: I want to thank, thank, thank muni court and real estate for working with us to find that.

>> Mayor Adler: Does that mean we'll hit 47?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: How hard do you want us to work to fund 47?

>> Casar: What if we made the board of adjustment fee

[2:46:30 PM]

600 instead of --

>> Mayor Adler: Did you have another amendment, councilmember harper-madison?

>> Harper-madison: I can't hear.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you have another amendment?

>> Harper-madison: I do. And for my colleagues, you guys, I struggle with hearing the chatter up here on the dais really makes it difficult for me. So if you could keep it down or pass notes or something.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll speak louder.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. So my amendment is to move to approve the \$60 per vehicle fee and -- per trip fee -- no, the \$60 per vehicle fee but then to change the 40 cents per trip to up to 40 cents per trip. And then direct staff to not begin to collect these fees until we have the opportunity to have some stakeholder discussions and really deliberate on dockless micromobility regulations in October.

>> Mayor Adler: I've heard this being discussed.

[2:47:31 PM]

Does staff have a challenge with this?

>> Mayor, council, Robert spillar, Austin transportation department. Assuming we're coming back in October to have a conversation with council about that, we have been doing a lot of stakeholder discussion, I think we can accommodate this for about that time period. We can manage our costs until then. But then at that point should we not go through with the fees somewhere on the order of these we'll have to adjust our budget later, but we can do that. So they're fine. This amendment is --

>> Mayor Adler: This will be fine?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: With that does anybody have objection to this being included? Come to.

>> Tovo: I have more questions for but that. Just so I'm clear, these are the fees that you would use to support the staff who are working on micromobility?

>> Yes. And the infrastructure associated -- excuse me, associated with the micromobility, for instance

[2:48:31 PM]

we know that those devices make ahead of use of the sidewalks and we've noticed that there's infrastructure investments that we need to make railroads with regards to that so, yes, there is a nexus between the costs and the fees.

>> Tovo: When those costs aren't being borne by the companies benefiting from those services, from staff and the infrastructure they're using those get passed along to other use -- other people paying fees?

>> Yes. Or the services don't get rendered. For instance, the additional sidewalk improvements and stuff would be delayed, as would other bicycle-protected lanes would be delayed until we could fund it by other sources, yes.

>> Tovo: But your staff are gonna continue working. We're just helping subsidize that industry?

>> Yes, we would continue with the pilot until we could come back to you next month with a sustainable long-term plan.

>> Tovo: So I can't support this for the -- I can't support this for those reasons. I think we have an industry that's operating and they

[2:49:31 PM]

need to bear their costs with the fees. I appreciate that we're only taking a delay, and so that assuages my concern to some certainty. I still can't support it. Can you help me understand, we have delayed affects some of the measures that a brought forward with regard to micromobility. Is the fee piece connected to that or will it appear -- will it definitely appear on October regardless of whether or not we have hammered out the other issues?

>> I think that would be up to council action in October. We hope to be back with a management proposal in October that would essentially extend the pilot and make it permanent as a permit-type system. We heard council when we were heard before, that the management proposal we had brought previously which built around a new use of franchises probably wasn't appropriate, and so we're coming back with what I think will be a permit system that will essentially extend the current pilot and

[2:50:32 PM]

make it permanent. My understanding is the scooter companies we talked to, that that is an acceptable management style approach so these would be the fees that would enable that long-term. Through the pilot process, madam councilmember, we have also better understood what the impact on infrastructure is and the need for continued improvement of the infrastructure to support those new technologies.

>> Tovo: So I think for me, now I have two concerns. One is that it's tied to that proposal coming and being acted upon in speed and I think it's gonna take some conversation and I don't want to have -- I'm not at all comfortable having a situation where our fees are dependent on our finishing our work, our deliberative work on that. I also want to highlight the proposal that commissioner from staff was not voted on by this council so that means -- and I heard several of my colleagues expression concern but at the end of

[2:51:32 PM]

the day we didn't vote on it. It concerns me if the concern -- if a couple council members speaking up and offering concerns about a management proposal leads to a postponement and then not a bringing back of that proposal but a whole new proposal to meet the concerns of, again, what was not a majority of council necessarily. I don't know whether it was or not because we never had a vote on it. So that's just a policy concern I'm going to air, city manager, that I don't think that's the way we should make decisions here as a body. And then, again, my concern about the fees remains, and, you know, we receive lots of emails about scooters and the regulations people would like to see us enact and the infrastructure they would like to see to support that industry, and so the fees are one way to do that.

[2:52:34 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks. I wanted to ask Mr. Spillar when you were talking about the -- trying to cost out the impacts of scooters on our community, we've got a sidewalk situation that those fees would help to fund, and we today or yesterday got a recommendation from the pedestrian advisory committee that spoke very eloquently about the fact that we really have some deficits with regard to funding for our sidewalks. So I would not be in support of anything that would be taking money away and not adding additional money to our sidewalk fund, which is a high priority for everybody. I was wondering if the cost of retrieving the scooters from the river is part of the cost of service study that you all are looking at, both the employee cost of even finding them and retrieving them and also the environmental costs of having those vehicles in --

[2:53:36 PM]

being deposited in the river.

>> Yes. Councilmember pool, the companies themselves are required to retrieve those devices from the river so assuming we're getting 311 calls, which is typically where we get those calls from or concerned employees when we do see them, we immediately call the companies and then we have an incentive inducement policy to encourage those companies to get them out of the river.

>> Pool: That's great. So are we calculating the environmental costs for however long, short or long, those vehicles are in the river?

>> Not directly, councilmember. It's part of the overall program. But, no, we're not --

>> Pool: Okay. Why don't we look at that and devise a way to measure that so that we can capture that cost. It's a real cost. It may take a little bit of time but I would urge and you city manager to look at that. I also don't support the city continuing to underwrite this for-profit

[2:54:39 PM]

endeavor, and I know the pedestrian advisory council as I mentioned already has noted the derth in sidewalk funds, and if this is keeping us from adding to that funds that a chief concern for me too. I think they're suggesting, if I'm remembering what I read right, that we have a sidewalk bond, and if the community finds out that we have lowered or not imposed some fees on some vehicles that are having a financial impact on the community that we're not going to collect those or we're gonna dries them and

yet we're going to go back out to the community and ask them to support a bond, there could be a little bit of friction in that presentation of that issue. So what I would ask you -- so I will not support this either, but to the extent that this does pass, if it does, I would ask our staff to bring that proposal back to us with all due speed and care. It already took us months,

[2:55:41 PM]

months to get the regulations on the books for micromobility, considerably longer than any of us either expected or desired. So please let's not -- let's not delay on this either.

>> Yes, ma'am. And just to make sure everybody realizes that the companies that are participating now are paying a fee to participate as part of our pilot. This is really right-sizing that fee based on the studies we've been doing. So it's not that they're operating --

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison and then councilmember Flannigan.

>> Harper-madison: For what it's worth, I just want to be very careful about unnecessarily making this an adversarial discussion as it pertains to what the concerns are for the community. Of course I care about the sidewalk fund. Of course I care about the time and the effort and the

[2:56:41 PM]

necessary compensation for the people working on the issue. So I just want to make certain that if for anybody the interpretation was that was the case it's certainly not true. What I'm asking has more to do with not an indefinite suspension of the considering consideration of these fees just take a little longer -- I mean we've invested this much time. I think it's important to take a little longer to have it be part of a complete package of points of consideration and I might have pointed this out before, I can't remember if it was in a closed-door meeting or in the public setting, but I know that for me and for folks in my district, these micromobility driveways have very unexpectedly provided transportation to people who historically have been underserved either by our transportation infrastructure or frankly their lack of affordability around being able to access transportation. And so I really just want to

[2:57:43 PM]

make certain that we don't complete the process by way of, you know, taking all of the information into consideration when we come -- when we come back to what is inevitable need to address the fees for for-profit companies to pay for the use of our infrastructure.

>> Certainly.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I agree with councilmember harper-madison on this. I think -- I don't know that makes sense to approve the fee and delay it as opposed to just adopt a fee at the time we adopt the management plan because it seems like if you're going to have a cost of service study related to a fee, you should know the management plan and it should be approved to know what it's going to cost. I feel like we're one month out of sync. Do you know off the top of your head the expected collection total?

>> Yes, sir. The fee is contemplated, is anticipated to represent about \$3.5 million of my revenue this year.

[2:58:45 PM]

375,000, roughly, or 350,000 a month. If council decides to delay adoption of the fee, then we would probably need to adjust our current budget spending so to allow you to adopt a balanced budget and then come back for a budget amendment when the operating plan is adjusted.

>> Flannigan: So that is including the fees we currently charge now?

>> Yes. Yes. So --

>> Flannigan: What is the delta between that -- I think that's what I'm getting to.

>> I hear what Uber saying. I didn't pick up on that.

>> Flannigan: To be clear, this is not 3 million plus?

>> No.

[Overlapping speakers]

>> Mayor and council, Peggy McCallum, chief administration officer from Austin transportation. We expect the delta between those two is about 2.5 million from what we're

[2:59:46 PM]

currently this year collecting to the change in the fee schule.

>> Flannigan: Okay. I mean, I think it makes more sense just to adopt this fee at the time you adopt the plan. Doesn't make sense to adopt the fee in advance.

>> Councilmember, one other thing I would also tell you we're anticipating new technologies that aren't scooters to be introduced in town as they come forward this year. I said that budget is also anticipating that there may be a new provider of some new type technology that's on the street that we don't know

yet this year. But we know the governor has given the ability for several new technologies to probably come to our streets.

>> Flannigan: Is it hover boards?

>> Jet packs. No. I don't know what they are.

>> Mayor Adler: It's 3:00. There's councilmembers trying to stop at 4:00 so let's keep trying to book

[3:00:47 PM]

here. We ready to take a vote? I support councilmember harper-madison your proposal here any further discussion before we take a vote? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I support it also. I want to thank you for bringing it.

>> Mayor Adler: Ready to take a vote? Yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I really appreciate the spirit in which this is brought, and -- but I'm not going to be able to support it. A few years ago we postponed stuff on development fees and ended up not fixing our development services for another year plus and this feels a lot to me like a similar situation so I'm gonna be voting no on this amendment. "Ready to take a vote? Those in favor of adding councilmember harper-madison's direction. Please raise your hand. Those opposed. It is altar, tovo and pool.

[3:01:47 PM]

Others voting aye. That one is in. Okay. We're still \$47,000 in the red. Let's take care of some of the other things we have. Councilmember alter has a budget direction on vision zero enforcement. Is there - do people have that one?

>> Alter: So it's alter budget direction to -- I think I've got four of them here. Now I don't know how you want to do this. Since we're on transportation, so in fiscal year '19 budget for A.P.D. Traffic enforcement and vision zero was \$1 million. The fiscal year 20 proposed budget is also \$1 million. However, for fiscal year 2019 year to date expenses for vision zero total only 616,389. I would like to know whether atd anticipates reimbursing

[3:02:47 PM]

A.P.D. \$1 million in enforcement costs for the fiscal year 20 and what changes in traffic enforcement programs are anticipated for the upcoming year. My district has been, as we've had conversations about Mr. Spillar, has experienced plots of issues with a lack of appropriate enforcement and this was

supposed to be one of the mechanisms citywide to address that. So I have some budget direction that hopefully gets us in that direction but I would like to hear you comment on how we're spending this now.

>> Councilmember, again, Robert spillar, Austin police department. Our expectation is to deploy the \$4 million because vision zero and safety and traffic enforcement is all part of vision zero, is our first priority. So the answer is yes, that's our anticipated goal, and we work with the police department to make sure that we have resources to be out there, but that's part of the balancing is when there's not resources we

[3:03:48 PM]

can't assign them, but our goal is to do that and where possible to use those funds to supplement other educational process because that's much of our enforcement is in fact education as opposed to tickets.

>> Alter: So this is a fairly simple budget direction, can be I hope --

>> Yes.

>> Alter: The dais will accept, city manager is directed to evaluate vision zero enforcement policies, determine approaches to optimize \$1 million fiscal year 20 traffic enforcement program to reduce the number of people who die or seriously injured in traffic crashes to zero. Do you have any concerns about that?

>> No, ma'am. Thank you.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection? Any objection to budget direction to being included? Hearing none it's included. Mr. Van eenoo, do you have an update from the

[indiscernible] Board?

>> Well, an update and then somebody up there will have to do the work of making a motion, but as part of

[3:04:48 PM]

staff's motions we propose moving roughly \$548,000 from our general fund to our reserves. Part of the conversation you all have been having is about pulling back some of that money we had put to reserves to fund other needs. Nobody has made that motion yet. The amount you would need to do to bring us to balance -- that amount would be \$458,550. So that would be staff's proposal was to move \$548,352 of the additional \$2.5 million of revenue to reserves. You would need to lower that amount by 458,550. That maintains our 12% and it would balance us out to zero.

>> Mayor Adler: We lower it to the 458 or lower it by --

[3:05:50 PM]

>> 548,352 needs to be lowered by 458,550.

>> Casar: Mayor I thought I heard him say that but that does keep us within the financial policy.

>> It does keep us within the financial policy and we would have a balanced budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Not only do we have a balanced budget. Do I understand correctly what we have is a balanced budget with \$411,000? We were 47 off before. We just changed the number by 458,000. Or changed it to 458,000?

>> I would have to -- you were lowering it by \$458,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So if I was \$47,000 over budget a moment ago --

>> No.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. I'm missing.

>> You've never undone that action. The motion was made to accept staff's proposed amendments, that proposed amendments included transferring 548,000 to

[3:06:50 PM]

reserves. We've been assuming in all this you would pull back 410,000 of that. Nobody has actually made that motion yet.

>> Mayor Adler: I see.

[Overlapping speakers]

>> If you make a motion to bring back 458,550 we would be balanced and still within our financial policies.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And then we're -- what's then the number? We go -- we pull back the 410 -- pull back the 458 instead of the 548, but did the 47 --

>> Staff's proposal was to transfer \$548,352 to reserves.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

>> Your motion would be to undo that and instead transfer \$89,803 to reserves, you'd be balanced and still within your reserve policy.

[3:07:53 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there any objection to making that change? Mr. Flannigan objects. The others do not object. That change is made. Okay. So what is our net position right now?

>> The bottom line of that position is you have a balanced general fund budget for fiscal year 2020 that adds the variety of things and I'd be happy to walk through them.

>> Mayor Adler: It's roughly zero?

>> It's exactly zero.

>> Mayor Adler: Exactly zero, got it. Thank you. All right. Continuing on discussion. Yes, councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I have two items for budget direction.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: If we're going back to that. One is direction for expanding programming and improving access for people with disabilities. So better access to city hall, directive one to staff, provide regular training and guidance for city hall facilities to staff to provide consistent and prompt assistance for people with disabilities seeking access to public areas in city hall,

[3:08:55 PM]

directive two is to explore the feasibility of installing automatic door buttons to the interior and exterior of the boards and commissions room and other public workrooms to ensure equitable access for all. If anybody wants to get some background on these two items of direction, you can connect with the mayor's committee for people with disabilities. And then bathroom accessibility at zilker park is the third directive under the expanding programming and improving access for people with disabilities, and that is to include plans to locate, design, and fund an accessible bathroom for teens and adults with disabilities in the ongoing zilker park master plan. And the second item of direction is to pilot a small business cooperatives program. We heard some really good testimony from the community

[3:09:57 PM]

in support of this budget direction, and my staff has worked with economic development department on this program and how to -- and on this direction that I'll provide here now. The city manager will use EDD's operating budget to establish a small business cooperative pilot program and report to council on

its progress by December 5 of this year, 2019. And I just wanted to voice a really sincere thank you to Ryan mills and Hannah frankle in district 7 at the co-op and the folks that they worked with at the co-op, working with my staff and with the economic development department in support of this pilot program. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Ed, are you okay with these, that they don't have a budget impact? Yes? Any objection to including these directives? Councilmember Flannigan.

[3:10:57 PM]

>> Flannigan: So I'm not entirely sure how this is budget direction when it seems to be -- something that should be a resolution at a council meeting. And, like, direction to amend this -- or to require something in the zilker master plan doesn't seem like budget direction. And if EdD is going to establish a pilot program within their current budget, then are they gonna be not doing something they were already planning to do? Stuff sounds great, but --

>> Pool: May I? Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Pool: With regard to the 75,000 that is designated sum that EdD staff indicated they wanted to put toward this pilot. They simply needed direction to make that allocation. They already have that budget and the desire and the support in the community to move forward with that. So the -- my understanding of the budget direction is to do exactly that, to

[3:11:58 PM]

direct that available -- the available funds to that effort. And I say this for Sonya here -- here she comes, she can probably speak more eloquently than I can.

>> Flannigan: Manager, is there a reason that wasn't in the base budget, if starch wanted it and they had the money for it? I don't understand.

>> Director of the economic development department. We do have the ability to find other areas of our budget to redirect towards this program. We have had conversations with the organization working on co-ops and we have an interest in looking at what more we can do with co-ops and small businesses. So there is an interest. It's just not outlined currently in our budget towards this pilot program.

>> Flannigan: So why wasn't it in the base budget if nobody disagrees? If staff wants it -- it just seems weird there's a stack of direction up here and I'm nervous and -- sorry, thank you. This isn't about you, anymore. I'm concerned about turning the budget into a way to slip in resolutions instead

[3:12:58 PM]

of going through the regular process. Budget directions being handed out right now, I've got a stack of budget direction, it's not going to go through the regular process and yet will be cited in the future as evidence for decision-making. So I'm really concerned. Now if it's direction about a thing we just did maybe I can understand that but this new stuff does not seem to be appropriately done during this process.

>> Renteria: Mayor? I also agree with Jimmy. I'm getting all these -- I don't know what they are. I haven't had any conversation about them. But, you know, it sounds good, but I wish that we had gotten them a little bit earlier, that way we could have looked at them and found out more about what kind of money that's already programmed is gonna be moved to wherever, to something else. We don't know what that money that they were intending to use it but it seems like they have a change of mind and now we want to take it, look at another program. So it's very hard for me to make a decision.

[3:14:01 PM]

>> Pool: Mayor, I just want to remind my colleagues, I put out the budget direction a couple of months ago on the message board and we've had at least these out there for some time. And my understanding from staff is that it doesn't cost the departments anything in addition and they were looking at these issues and this puts a finer point on our support for that work in the departments.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and take a vote. First the direction for expanding programming improving access to people with disabilities. Those in favor of putting it as part of the budget please raise your hand. Those opposed. Those abstaining? Mr. Flannigan abstains, others voting aye. It's in. Direction to pilot a small business cooperatives program, those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. Renteria votes no, Flannigan abstains. It goes in.

[Indiscernible] I want to confirm this for you just

[3:15:02 PM]

for the record, Ed, that the changes to the staff's recommendation include that change in reserve for the 410,000 it also includes the youth programming care rec centers at the 109 plus the 168, net 105. The child care muni court, 178, 976 and 225, the abortion access logistical support 150, the census of 200, wildfire mitigation at \$900,000. Workforce training at 100,000, 130 for the bridge to safety, 153 for the board of adjustments, and then the 664 for the fire station. Those are the items I had?

>> Could you repeat the number you said you had for the change in the transfer

[3:16:02 PM]

to reserves?

>> Mayor Adler: Whatever it was.

>> Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: 415 or --

>> Okay. That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: 458.

>> 458,550 was that number. Wildfire mitigation the exact amount is 877,386.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> 225,000 for the child care center will not be part of the fy20 budget, it's funded out of 2019 savings that have been identified so the 225,000 will not be an amendment to the fy20 budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I have a quick direction.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: This one is one I put out before related to the customer assistance program. It's direction to allocate surplus revenues from the customer assistance program solely towards utility discounts for qualifying customers. It's to assist more customers or to -- either more customers or to a greater extent those customers already enrolled.

[3:17:03 PM]

It doesn't specify. And it says the funds should be used towards utility discounts by either expanding the number of enrolled customers or by increasing the amount at the discount benefits. This is a onetime deal and it just has to do with over -- with dollars that are available right now in the customer assistance program pot.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any discussion? Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: So I agree we need to address this remaining funds. I'm not prepared to know that this is the right way. It's not even clear what we're actually deciding.

>> Kitchen: I could -- do you want me to speak to that?

>> Flannigan: Yeah. Seems like you've given options but they're very different.

>> Kitchen: Well, the main point is they're keeping those dollars in the customer assistance program instead of using those dollars for something else. It's making that clear, but it's leaving direction to the program about whether they can use those dollars either for more customers, more customers that qualify of course, or for a greater

[3:18:04 PM]

discount for those customers that are already enrolled.

>> Casar: Mayor, I think I can clarify this. This isn't changing anything. This is what Austin energy is already intending to do, frankly we can vote for it or not vote for it and my understanding from Austin energy is what councilmember kitchen has written is exactly what's happening and in fact we can't spend this on other stuff anyways.

>> Kitchen: It's important just for clarity for the public, I think.

>> Flannigan: I would like to have a conversation with staff about what the rules are around spending this money and thinking a little broader about how we can assist low-income customers instead of just utility discounts. There may be other ways. I'd like to have that conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you bring that back to us, Ed? Would that be something you want to do here? Jackie?

>> Mayor, councilmembers, Jackie sergeant, general manager of Austin energy. I'd just like to note that Austin energy has collaborated with our electric utility commission and included in this year's budget and in our tariffs is

[3:19:04 PM]

a recommendation or an opportunity to expand the program. So that we can bring more people into the customer assistance program. Previously you had to qualify for one of a number of programs and now we're going to expand that to include income verification up to 200% of the fpl. We want to see what happens with that and that's one way we want to address utilizing those funds specifically for those customers who need it. And that's a way to expand the program.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Any objection to this going in? Hearing none it goes in. Let's keep going. We might be able to actually get out of here by 4:00. We have tons more motions left to do though. Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I have my budget rider one, I mentioned this morning with respect to cost saving solutions for accrued leave. This just is asking human resources to explore financial products that may provide savings both to the city and to our retirees

[3:20:07 PM]

related to leave.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there objection to including this direction? Hearing none, it's included.

>> Alter: And then budget direction number 3 with respect to the homelessness strategy officer, I passed this out earlier, recognizing the imminent arrival our new homelessness strategy officer the city manager is directed to work with the appropriate staff to examine the resources available in and proposed expenditures from the housing trust fund and provide council with recommendations on whether addressing our priorities around homelessness and affordable housing would be best served by transferring an amount of funds out of the housing trust fund and deploying them in a different manner and fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: Staff should examine and provide recommendations on advisability of how we have reserved multiple years of funding for the pay for success program, whether we are maximizing efficiencies in our current multi-year approach and whether any of those funds are better deployed to provide immediate services while maintaining our commitment to pay for success.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to those being included? Come to.

>> Tovo: Yeah I have a couple questions.

[3:21:10 PM]

So the easiest one is the last one, the last sentence about maximizing efficiencies in our current multi-year approach, does that apply specifically to pay for success?

>> Alter: It can apply to both of them. We were trying to get both of those in there and I understand this is not the paragon of pros.

>> Tovo: I guess I'm trying to -- I assume from the way it's situated in that sentence we're talking about the issue [overlapping speakers]

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on, hang on.

>> Tovo: About prefunding the pay for success but that's what I'm trying to determine, if that is what you're saying there.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Tovo: That you're asking about prefunding.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I'm asking -- I want the homelessness strategy officer via the city manager to be able to determine if we shouldn't be prepaying pay for success because we could be using that funding better to

[3:22:11 PM]

provide immediate services.

>> Tovo: I wanted to be sure -- [overlapping speakers]

>> Alter: If you have another way to frame it --

>> Tovo: As long as we've clarified on the dais that that's what that refers to.

>> Alter: This is not about taking away programs that we have all agreed on, although we might hear that from the homeless strategy officer, but this direction is not about that.

>> Tovo: I really appreciate that direction and the additional clarification and the work that you've done to kind of address the concerns that some of us raised earlier. To that end I want to just verify one other thing in the first part of your direction, the housing trust fund is pretty general, and as I heard you say earlier you weren't interested in -- I mean the housing trust fund is being used in such a variety of ways, many of which are allocated already. As I heard you indicate earlier you were looking specifically at gap

[3:23:12 PM]

financing and home repair services specific to displacement mitigation. Is that still the intent or are you asking -- are you asking the homeless strategy officer to really make recommendation -- or to -- potentially transfer money out of some of these other programs?

>> Alter: So the intent was to look at those programs, but I was trying to say this in a succinct way, which was essentially that we have transferred a whole lot of money from the budget stabilization fund to the housing trust fund and we are directing the city manager that should he or the homeless strategy officer find that this money should be better deployed for immediate needs that they should bring those amendments forward to us.

>> Tovo: I understand the intent. It still makes me nervous to be leaving at the end -- I mean, some of these are very specific programs, plaza saltillo match and others

[3:24:13 PM]

and --

>> Alter: I'm happy to have.

>> Tovo: I want to be extremely certain we're not leaving the manager in a position where he feels he can't take action on some of those very specific commitments, and so earlier today when we talked about it and you had kind of those two general pots of funding, neither of which was going to be spent right away that -- that was sort of the direction I thought we were going. I can be comfortable with this language if the city manager assures me that we're not going to be -- what will not be up for question are those specific contracts and the specific allocations of funding or, councilmember alter, would you -- is there an amendment that might work for you that suggests that we're just looking at those two particular lines of funding?

>> Alter: I would be happy to add a line right before we say staff should also examine that says the particular places -- or the particular pots in the housing trust fund or the -- we can come up west Austin with language there and I'll work on that.

[3:25:13 PM]

>> Tovo: That would be great like transferring amount of funds out of the, and then name those two lines of funding.

>> Casar: Are those the two newly expanded programs?

>> Alter: Yes.

>> Casar: Is that what we call that?

>> Alter: Ms. Truelove --

>> I have a recommendation, perhaps. I think if you could refer to it as the amount transferred from the budget stabilization reserve fund. That's the only two areas, it's a definitive amount of money and areas of programming that we were looking at so that at least puts a cap on what they're looking at.

>> Renteria: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: How much is that transfer?

>> 7.7 million.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, Mr. Renteria.

>> Renteria: I really feel uncomfortable, you know, opening that up, especially the housing trust fund. I just don't feel like it's the right way to go about it. Once we start raiding that fund and I've been working very hard to try to get

[3:26:15 PM]

these home repairs programs going. You know, a lot of these nonprofit groups couldn't complete their projects because they didn't have the ability to get their programming program inspected and now we're catching up and we're gonna be able to use that money. I just don't feel comfortable at all raiding the housing trust fund, opening it up for other kind of use, especially that all these years that we have been struggling to build affordable housing and returning people to their housing by home repairs. And I just don't feel like we're at that point where we have met our needs that we can start raiding and taking money out of the housing trust fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion of the tovo rider? Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: I absolutely echo the sentiments of my colleague, Renteria. Because I definitely recognize that our homeless strategy officer is gonna need the tools that we can provide her to do the best

[3:27:16 PM]

job possible. But I strongly oppose taking funds away from home repair programs because what we're talking about with the home repair program is displacement mitigation. So it's very important to recognize, you know, that this -- well, for me, this is problematic and I think some of my colleagues might share my sentiment. When we're talking about displacement -- when we're talking about homelessness the step before that, you know, is the displacement piece for so many of our families, especially in east Austin. And if what we can do to mitigate homelessness is helping to avoid the displacement part, then I think it's counter productive to move money from a resource that helps to prevent homelessness, that helps to prevent displacement. Also, the university of Texas uprooted study and the anti-displacement task force both recommended home repair programs as a tool to help vulnerable residents to resist the pressures that are forcing so many people out of our community.

[3:28:18 PM]

I had a conversation, Kathie is gone now, I had a conversation with her today. She lives around the corner from me and we were talking about the median home price in our neighborhood. I'm a renter in our neighborhood because I can't afford a home in my neighborhood, so I recognize that I have the privilege to continue to rent in my neighborhood but there are lots of people who will be displaced out of the neighborhood that I live in if they don't have access to programmatic efforts that can help them stay put. Diverting the funds to the homeless strategy could exhibited a message to residents throughout Austin that the council will only support you after you lose your home. And I want to make certain that we stand up for people prior to that happening. Lastly, I'd like to say that I want to see the home repair program remain fully numbered -- funded to ensure east austinites have the resources they need to continue to add to our community's diversity and economic growth.

[3:29:18 PM]

And so I'm opposed to any money being moved. Then also if my colleagues will bear with me for a moment, you made a pointed clarification that I'd like to ask you. You said I prefer you refer to it as the surplus fund?

>> Budget stabilization reserve fund. That's where the funding is being transferred from.

>> Harper-madison: Okay.

>> Into the housing trust fund.

>> Harper-madison: So when we're saying -- when I'm saying -- my opposition is to remove -- is removing money from the housing trust fund. Are you saying that's not the case?

>> No. It is. It's the -- it's the initial source of funding is the budget stabilization reserve fund and I think through the proposed budget it will transfer 7.7 million from that fund into the housing trust fund.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: So I understand, just make sure, I think we maybe all on the same page here. We're not talking about raiding the corpus of the housing trust fund. As part of this budget

[3:30:18 PM]

process the manager identified money that he wanted to put toward homelessness and it's being parked at this point in the housing trust fund. So my understanding is the language that's been suggested doesn't relate to the corpus of the housing trust fund or monies that otherwise move into the housing trust fund. It's just saying that money that the manager identified for homelessness, that's being parked in the housing trust fund, is the part that we want to hear from the -- that's close?

>> Casar: Close. I think that councilmember harper-madison is right to identify --

>> [Overlapping speakers]

>> Harper-madison: We definitely are not in agreement.

>> Mayor Adler: I want to find out what it is then.

>> Casar: Yeah. One point is that we are not raiding the existing allocation of the housing trust fund. We have significantly increased home repair through the bonds by multiple times, and this investment proposed by the manager would increase homelessness funding and

[3:31:19 PM]

even further increase home repair. I think what is being mentioned here is that those new increases, which are significant and important, that some chunk of them, if the homeless strategy officer says we could potentially use some of that for a key program that we should hear that, but I think just like we want to make sure that we're always clear about what we're voting on just like police officers, just like anything else, this would not be what is -- if it is written right to talk about at the new funding for budget stabilization reserve, that would not be taking from any existing home repair which we have significantly increased this last year and no matter what the homeless strategy officer does this budget would significantly increase, again. The question is is there some chunk of the psh money and increased new home repair money that we want to just look at between here and when any of that money could be spent anyways because it's new program?

>> Sure. And what I would say, of the

[3:32:21 PM]

7.7 million that is coming from the budget stabilization reserve fund, the rest of the housing trust fund transfer is just under general fund dollars that are going into the housing trust fund in accordance with council resolutions that have been passed. Of that 7.7 million there's 5 million that we anticipate deploying through the rental housing development assistance program to get us more permanent supportive housing, and then 2.7 million of that is for the home repair program that we've been talking about potentially, details of which have not been scoped it's very conceptual in nature right now in anticipating it would be deployed over more than one year.

>> Casar: That's on top of the home repair program in the capital budget from the new bond.

>> Correct, that is on top of the general obligation bond home repair program.

>> Casar: Right.

>> Renteria: Mayor, I would feel very uncomfortable. It will send the community the wrong message, that, you know, we really didn't need that much housing bond money and repair money because, you know, now we're not

[3:33:23 PM]

gonna invest our money into this program, we're just gonna rely strictly on the bond. I just don't like that message.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I agree with councilmembers Renteria and harper-madison on this. I would expect as we talked about before our new homeless strategy officer will take a look at everything we're doing, however it's allocated. But she's also not a wizard, so I also worry that we have put so much on her shoulders in the next month that we're gonna be a little disappointed about what she can wave a magic wand and do. I don't know that this is even really that necessary given that the expectation is that we brought in this strategy officer specifically to look at the whole portfolio.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen and then come to and then let's vote.

>> Kitchen: Well, I have another amendment that I can tell from the way this conversation is going is probably not gonna move forward so I'll have another

[3:34:23 PM]

suggest with regard to it. So maybe I'll just wait until this plays out. I do really want us to look at how we can -- how we can target at least some funds for people experiencing homelessness who score low on the vulnerability index, who are suited for rapid rehousing. I agree with everything that's been said about the importance of prevention, which has to do with housing -- home repair and other kinds of things. But the other -- and it's not a but, and the other things that going on in our community is that folks have to score have to score high on the vulnerability scale once they're homeless, which means if they're not really, really vulnerable when they first come in but by the time we get to them to help them they are. So I think that that's one of the things we really need to work on, too.

[3:35:24 PM]

So I had -- was thinking in terms of taking some of the some of -- reallocating some of the dollars, some of that 7.7 million towards this, but I think I'm hearing everyone probably wanting more conversation about that. So wherever we end up on this direction I may have some language to add to it.

>> Casar: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes -- wait, wait. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I wonder -- I was the first to kind of raise a question about this, and then thought maybe I could find my way to supporting it if we had a time frame around it but I really appreciate councilmembers Renteria and harper-madison and others chiming in on it too. I think that -- and I kind of -- I haven't landed sort of on where I am on this, but I think for me, to the -- the fact that it's kind of an open-ended situation is of concern. I mean, if there were a time frame, if there were a time frame for that analysis and getting back to us, that

[3:36:25 PM]

would be helpful, or some limitation on what of that 7.7 would be being evaluated so that we can still show the community that we're making a significant investment and commitment in home repair and permanent supportive housing gap financing, but basically can we arrive at a different number? And I would welcome the feedback from my colleagues who also had concerns about it, would be a lower number of that 7.7 allow some consideration, say, if we did 3.35 million instead of the full 7.7 then we're still making a strong commitment to those two pots of funding funding and set a very clear timetable for that report back. I don't know if that addresses the concerns or not. As I said, I'm kind of struggling with this item as well.

[3:37:26 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I think the question that I'm hearing, what I didn't say right, is that this is new money and a lot of it is dedicated to homelessness. And so I think -- what I hope would fix this for everybody on the dais is for us to not talking about the housing trust fund or even the 7.7 of the new bsr funds but actually just the money for homelessness. So that the new homeless strategy officer, when she takes a look at this, can look at the money designated for homelessness and determine whether it's best to be in the housing trust fund or best to be provided as service dollars so we can decide whether it should be capital dollars or service dollars and it's not about changing the funding. It's that our homeless strategy officer should look at our homelessness, new homelessness money, and maybe report by the end of November on the potential ways of using that and that's not actually -- in keeping the housing department from using it quickly, using some of it

[3:38:27 PM]

quickly if it comes up. It's just to provide that level of authority to say, hey, look at this, and if it looks like we actually need some of this for immediate service dollars, let's do it. So the way that that would be -- the city manager is directed to work with appropriate staff to examine the new homelessness funding resources available in -- and propose expenditures from the housing trust fund from the bsr does that make sense?

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion.

>> Casar: 5 million of the 7.7 are for homelessness.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter, did you want to speak?

>> Alter: Yeah. I mean, first of all there were two parts of this direction. One had to do with the pay for success, putting that money away and just essentially sticking it in the bank and asking whether maybe we ought to be spending some of that sooner so that we can be more

[3:39:27 PM]

successful overall. And then there was another part on the housing trust fund. So, you know, however this vote goes, perhaps folks are willing to support that part and not the housing trust fund. As has been established, the housing trust fund money that we're talking about, there are two parts of it. There's the part of the housing trust fund that is the amount that comes from the general fund that is via our resolutions fully funded this year and last year I think for the first time. In addition there was seven point something million from the budget stabilization reserve fund that was parked in there and it's a portion of that that we wanted to talk about. I was never talking about \$5 million in terms of my mind of what I was thinking about might be done in the short run. I was -- you know, wanted to make sure she had access to something on the order of \$2 million that could be deployed in a more easily -- easy manner. So I wanted to kind of just point both of those things out so that we were all sort

[3:40:29 PM]

of on the same page. Then I do believe that the repair programs only work if you own the house. I don't know if they're available for renters. In my understanding, so just we keep that in mind as well.

>> Mayor Adler: I want to try -- my hope is for us to move along here because -- I go back to where Jimmy was initially, I expect our homeless strategy officer to come back to us with whatever recommendation she wants to make, regardless of what it is, as anybody in our staff can come forward at any point through the city manager with a budget amendment during the course of the year so I don't want this to be a limiting conversation in any way. Does it help us to move forward on this if we take Alison's -- councilmember alter's proposal and say that it's only the money that is at this point designated for homelessness, as Greg just described? Does that get us -- it's, like, \$5 million.

>> Harper-madison: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Harper-madison: You said does it help us? And I want to just be very clear about what my intentions are here.

[3:41:30 PM]

I just -- pay for success is a wonderful program. It's great and I totally appreciate, you know, the desire to make that be a more robust program. But just to be entirely clear, as long as not 1 dollar is diverted from efforts to do home repair and displacement mitigation, that's my biggest concern. Actually we posted on our Facebook page today just because it's so unbelievable, but home prices in my zip code,

78702 have literally more than tripled since 2011. It's unbelievable and unprecedented. Yes, the dollars only go for homeowners, but in my mind's eye we've neglected those homeowners for so long.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's figure out what that number is.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the number being put into the housing trust fund that is not devoted -- this category that's not devoted to home repair or displacement?

>> \$5 million.

[3:42:30 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: \$5 million, okay. Is there an objection to adopting alter's deal but limiting it to that \$5 million that has nothing to do with displacement or home repair? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry I'm not following -- so we are talking about two different budget lines. Which budget line are you talking about? That 5 million, is that in the gap financing for permanent supportive housing?

>> It's a piece of the gap financing for permanent supportive housing. It's not the entire line. That's I believe 8 million something and we had 5 million that we had -- that was coming from budget stabilization reserve fund and then we were layering an additional 3 million on top of that, of general housing trust fund.

>> Tovo: Okay. This would be to reserve 5 million of that gap financing for permanent supportive housing, but I heard councilmember alter say she was talking on the order of 2 million. So --

>> Mayor Adler: Again--

>> Tovo: Again, I would just

[3:43:30 PM]

say there needs to be a time line. We are in a place where we need -- we need to invest in effective programs and I don't want to spend a lot of time waiting for answers back about, you know, evaluating when we -- as councilmember kitchen really articulated the other day, we have lots of terrific staff who have been working in homeless services and housing and, you know, for years, and so, I mean, I just think at some point we also need to recognize -- I know we all do. We all recognize the importance of their advice and expertise as well. So can -- councilmember alter --

>> Mayor Adler: I think she has an idea.

>> Tovo: If we got it down to a smaller amount with a time line and it's limited in the ways that are discussed, I think that would be a different order.

>> Renteria: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter, do you have a proposal?

>> Alter: Yes. I was trying to just provide some flexibility to the strategy officer. I think that is provided if we simply focus on the pay for success portion and city manager and all the folks who are dealing with

[3:44:31 PM]

homelessness understand what might be available in the housing trust fund and any of those things that would come from the housing trust fund or pay for success for that matter all have to come through us but we can still send the signal that we want to provide some flexibility by just doing the bottom portion of it that staff should also examine, provide recommendations on the advisability of how we have reserved multiple years of funding for the pay for success program, whether we are maximizing efficiencies in our currently multi-year approach and whether any funds are better deployed to other services while maintainion pay for success.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any objection to that? Councilmember Renteria and then councilmember Ellis.

>> Renteria: Yeah. You know, it's a sad day that we're sending out a message to the citizens of Austin that we can't spend that money because we're not gonna be able to spend it quick enough. Why did we go out there and ask for \$250 million in bonds if we can't build affordable housing for our people and home repair? That's just -- it's not

[3:45:32 PM]

fair, and I just can't believe that we're gonna go that direction, where we're sending the message that, you know -- we'd rather put money in programs instead of building houses and repairing houses.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I just wanted to mention I just -- I believe in all these programs we've been funding. I think we all really want to work on this homelessness issue together and put the funds where they really need to be. But I feel like as we get closer to the strategy officer rolling out whatever her plan is gonna be, we've all been holding really tight to fix it but don't change any of the stuff we've been doing, and I feel like we need to provide her the space to really show her expertise and to guide us through this process that's becoming increasingly difficult and while I support what's going on here and I want housing trust funds able to be used on homelessness to be used in that I really want to see her recommendation as the true expert in this. While firmly believing in

[3:46:33 PM]

the work we've been trying to do and all the people working in this space in our city. I think everyone is doing a really good job but I don't want to be overprescriptive in exactly what buckets to use and what tools she's gonna have available in her toolbox. I really want to let her be able to do these things.

>> I can tell from you the housing department's perspective in our work with the new homeless strategy officer if there's any recommendation that would necessitate doing a budget amendment and shifting funds out of the housing trust fund to some other purpose I will be the first person to recommend it. We want to make sure we're able to meet all of the very real demands for mitigating displacement in our community but we have to -- and we'll weighing be weighing those accordingly but we are completely supportive of the efforts she's gonna undertake so, I mean, there's plenty of commitment from the housing department that if a million, 2 million, whatever comes up that would be better deployed in another way, we'll work to try to make that happen.

[3:47:34 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Given that conversation do we just want to pull this down? Does anybody object to what Alison suggested, just relating to the pay for success money? Ann?

>> Kitchen: I don't object, but -- and you can tell me what the best way to do this is. I don't have to have it in this language, but I just really want to get on the record my desire that we -- that we look at how we can address, you know, people who are experiencing homelessness who are scoring lower on the vulnerability scale. I don't want to slow down this process but I don't want to lose this thought either.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's important that you and the strategy officer in looking how best to spend our money, that you can come back with a budget amendment for any reason, include in your ask to take a look at the best way to spend money, to take a look at the pay for success model, to take a look at funding. We've discussed several different things, funding

[3:48:36 PM]

folks that are not scoring highest on that grade. We've talked about getting an army of people out to talk to people. We've talked about emergency solutions and emergency shelters, whatever it is we want you to come back with that, whatever that recommendation is. So councilmember alter has in front of us a proposal to say -- and specifically in that regard take a look at the money that's been earmarked for pay for success and tell us if that's the right thing to be doing but don't hold off doing it. As you do it just take a look at that. Is that right?

>> Alter: Yes. I want to be clear with pay for success we are paying -- with this budget we will have paid five in advance for a program that will be launched that will be a fabulous program that we absolutely need but we don't know if paying off that fifth year now we could be better off --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's table it. Those in favor of --

[3:49:39 PM]

councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Sorry, we need to get very clear about what we're doing. As I understand Mr. Van eenoo's description today we're not paying off that obligation at all. We're putting it into a bank account.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Alter: Yes, we are putting it in the bank.

>> Tovo: But a couple times today the language has suggested we're prepaying our obligations and I just want to be very clear.

>> Mayor Adler: We're not.

>> Tovo: We are putting in a bank account.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct, putting it in a bank account. Those in favor of the alter resolution as modified please raise your hand. Direction --

>> Kitchen: I just want to make sure that I'm -- we're keeping all these sentences in here, right? Except that somewhere in here we're writing that we're only looking at the 5 million.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to the second part of it.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry you're only asking about the second part.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Those in favor of the second part please raise your hand. Those --

>> Harper-madison: I just want to make sure we're all on the same page. What exactly are you asking us to vote on right now?

>> Mayor Adler: The second part of what councilmember

[3:50:39 PM]

alter handed out, which says that in addition to the full discretion that the strategy officer has to look at anything and everything, one thing she's being asked to look at specifically is whether we should be putting aside all of the money we're putting aside for pay for success.

>> Would you like know read that?

>> Harper-madison: No. I'm looking at it. I guess --

>> Mayor Adler: Just the last sentence, very last sentence.

>> Harper-madison: I'm still struggling with this. And part of the problem that I'm having here is I'm operating under the assumption, especially because we've talked at length about the level of expertise that the homelessness strategy person will have, and I think what I just heard Ms. Truelove say is that when she gets

[3:51:39 PM]

here, if she needs for us to make an amendment she's got to come before council anyway, correct? In which case I'm not certain why we need to do anything today, if she has to come before custom to get what it is that she needs. I'm trying to figure out what is the purpose of this even the pay for success part that we're proposing to do today. I'm not certain I understand why it's necessary today.

>> Garza: Mayor, may I suggest, because this has created so much confusion, it's not affecting our bottom line, if we move on and maybe this comes as an ifc at some point. It doesn't seem like we're getting to a point where we can agree.

>> Mayor Adler: Are you okay with that, councilmember alter? All right. We'll put that one aside.

>> Garza: That being said, I have direction, if there's any controversy I'm willing to pull it back.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's hear it.

>> Garza: Mine are --

>> Mayor Adler: Remember we still have all right of items we have to vote on.

>> Garza: I know.

[3:52:39 PM]

It's just the specifics of the abortion access amendment, the same thing we discussed at press conferences and what the purpose of this. That's all it is.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have objection to the policy direction on the abortion access? Allocations? Hearing none, that's included.

>> Garza: Second one is for parks lighting. We heard significant concern about the allocation. This is simply saying, parks, if you happen to find extra money and are able to get these parks -- all the parks that need funding funded quicker, please do that. That's all that one basically says.

>> Mayor Adler: Prioritize the areas that are issues of greatest need.

>> Garza: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that being included? Hearing none, that's included.

>> Garza: Lastly I didn't pass it out because I didn't want everyone to get mad. It's short, already been talked about -- in the municipal court child care staff include the feasibility of subsidized slots at that facility.

[3:53:39 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Garza: Subsidized slots.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to staff considering whether there could be more subsidized slots? Hearing none that's included as well. Councilmember tovo I think you have the very last two budget directions in front of us.

>> Tovo: And I'm almost ready but not completely. I'll do what I think is the one that's not evolving --

>> Mayor Adler: We still have also the clean community fee assessment.

>> Tovo: Yeah. I handed out some budget direction that responds to some requests that some of the advocates have made really for several years now that we adjust some of our performance measures to include -- to include these two elements, and this comes in part from conversations with pat. This would incorporate two additional performance measures, the number of 87-pounded animals returned to owners intact and the number of dogs housed on campus receiving daily walks or out of kennel enrichment. We've had lots of citizen communications among other things about these two

[3:54:40 PM]

issues over years so I think that would help us tip

--continue to track those.

>> Mayor Adler: Any discussion on this?

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, one other. Then there's one other element on that, something that's already our staff practice, which is to get community engagement to do community engagement on how to use the donation fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there any objection to these items being included? Hearing none, they're included.

>> Tovo: Then the next is budget direction for the police department, and this one is -- I'm working on some language that I think is more --

>> Mayor Adler: Let me come back to you.

>> Tovo: About the various financial challenges we have before us. The budget direction provided -- right now we have 24 hour officer presence in the area of seventh and red river.

[3:55:41 PM]

This has been an effective strategy in the past. It is an expensive one. I would like to provide some budget direction. Right now our police chief has allocated the resources in that area, again, to do what we talked about earlier, to restore a sense of security and safety in that area, especially, and in our downtown more generally. I am mindful of some conversations I've had with the city manager about that being real -- having a real fiscal impact were we to direct the manager today to do this, and so I am open to language suggestions here. Let me make one that has been made to me that I think is an easy one to incorporate, after it says retain the two designated 24 hour public safety officers in the red river street, seventh street area, and I would add the language as has been suggested, taking into consideration A.P.D. Staffing and budget. And then I think the

[3:56:41 PM]

language I might be comfortable with instead of is directed to retain, should strive to retain. Which is not directive, but I think accomodates the concern that obviously we want them to undertake efforts for which they have appropriate funding and wouldn't want for them to have to dip into other departments or other sources of funding.

>> Mayor Adler: So city manager --

>> Tovo: Does that work for you? I know I -- we've been talking about a little bit about language but should strive would be the changed language.

>> Councilmember, I appreciate the additional flexibility that language provides.

>> Mayor Adler: Should strive and taking into consideration a.p.d.'s scheduling budget. Any objection being included? Hearing none it's included. I think the last thing in front of us on the budget is the conversation about the clean community fee assessment. Which I guess is partly this and partly in the next item

[3:57:43 PM]

which are concerning fees. So do you want to introduce a conversation on this?

>> Yeah. I'll reintroduce my -- it's a budget amendment. It's with the clean community fee. This amendment would temporarily maintain the clean community fee until council can get more information from staff about options for increased levels of service. So that we as a council, as a whole body, can have a deliberative policy discussion. This came through me and my staff asking questions, seeing that there was a staff recommendation, therefore, to decrease the fee by 65 cents a month. And we noticed that in doing the cost of service analysis, that we weren't confident that if we had given direction as councilmembers to really make sure that the clean community fee was encompassing all of the resource recovery projects that we might suggest, it

[3:58:43 PM]

seemed like I was trying to figure out if the cart was before the horse on lowering this fee without really feeling like we had completely addressed our litter abatement concerns. So weso we wanted to look at options, just maintain the fee for now until the end of the year, so that we could reevaluate our success in providing litter abatement and nuisance abatement services. I'm thinking of increased levels of service for trash and recycling pickup in parks, more litter abatement from parks grounds and outdoor facilities, additional homeless encampment cleanup, additional street sweeping service, outreach prevention and new and increased litter abatement or prevention services that staff with recommend. So I wanted to make sure that even though the cost of service analysis has been working off of information that was directed by the code department for 2019, I wanted to make sure we

[3:59:45 PM]

weren't shortchanging our policies and our policies and the programs we need to run moving forward in fiscal year 2020. I wanted to maintain that for at least a couple more weeks at the current level that it is -- so we could ask for a new cost of service analysis and look at it as a council to make sure that each of our districts is fully up to the services that we feel should be provided given that we are collecting a fee for litter and nuisance abatement.

>> Mayor Adler: So the suggestion is to keep the clean community fee assessment where it is and not reduce it.

>> Ellis: Just delay the increase.

>> Mayor Adler: Have a cost of service study and take a look at the increased performance that we want to have done.

>> Ellis: I know there was a cost of service done, but when I think about my district I can think of numerous parks that aren't getting their trash picked up on the weekends and it creates not only more issues

[4:00:45 PM]

of litter in the park spaces, but then it ends up moving down during rain storms into a watershed protection and drainage utility issue. So I know councilmember Flannigan in a previous work session had asked about kind of doing a fee study to make sure we know what all is being charged and what all we're accomplishing with those fees, and I feel it's a bit premature today for me to feel comfortable voting for reducing that fiat this point during budget adoption. I would feel more comfortable just delaying the decrease until we can reanalyze what it is that the fees are going toward and performance measures for each individual district.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on this item?

>> Renteria: Mayor, I'm going to support that also. With the estate deciding not to clean up under their bridges and streets and asking us to pick up all the trash pickup that we're having to do, we really need

[4:01:46 PM]

to look and see if we are -- to keep that fee going right now until we can really figure out how much we're really going to need in the future.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I'm going to support this too. I think this is always a chicken and egg problem. Do you set the fee before you do the study or do you do the study before you set the fee. I think there's more study that needs to be done in this bucket. I got contacted by a constituent today who called txdot about litter she was seeing on the right-of-way. Not in the underpass where we already took over for txdot, but on the right-of-way on the side of the highway. And txdot told her that it was the city's fault that trash has gotten so out of hand. And she rightly noted that the trash has been there for months, if not years. This is not something that is new and in fact, the

[4:02:46 PM]

right-of-way is the responsibility of txdot still to this day. Yet they are telling my constituents that it's our fault and then refusing to fund the maintenance of their own property. So we are once again in a position as a city where we have to pick up the cost that the state is refusing to pick up, at the same time that they are blaming us for a problem that is their responsibility to solve.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Those in favor of -- yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I was the co-sponsor of Ms. Ellis' amendment. I wanted to add direction which would be the number two part on my budget direction four, just the part 2, not the first part. But that would say direct the city manager to conduct a fee study during this upcoming budget year related to the clean community fee and cost considered with clean litter abatement, increased street sweeping and the use of the fee for brush removal that would reduce nuisance conditions. Just clarifies some of the things that would be covered

[4:03:46 PM]

as we move to look to the next piece of it.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll append that to councilmember Ellis's issues that includes now number two. This is the study that you talked about. Any objection to those being included? Hearing none, they're included. I think those are all the discussions that we had with respect to a budget. Are we ready to take a vote on this budget? So are we ready to take a vote on number 1, approve an ordinance adopting the city's budget as amended? The law requires this to be a record vote. Will the clerk please read the roll so each of us can state our vote.

>> Mayor Adler.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor pro tem Garza.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember tovo.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Flannigan.

>> No.

>> Councilmember kitchen.

>> Yes.

[4:04:48 PM]

>> Councilmember pool.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Casar.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember alter.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Ellis.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Renteria.

>> Yes.

>> It passes.

>> Mayor Adler: The vote is 10 to 1. The budget passes. Congratulations and thank you, manager, for once again steering us to this place. Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I just wanted to thank staff for all your hard work that you did on the budget. I was prepared to adopt the budget that you he presented and I think my concerns remain that we are not making good decisions for the long-term fiscal position of the city. So I ultimately voted no on the budget. I continue to be frustrated that we can see charts that have deficits charted out three and four and five years, but we've done very little so far to adjust to that. So I just wanted to explain why I was a no vote.

[4:05:49 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Great. This was passed with 10 votes, which signals all three readings. So there won't be another vote necessary on the budget. Let's go to item number 2, to adopt an ordinance for fees, fines and other charges. We're now going take up number 2, an ordinance authorizing fees, fines or other charges to be set for fiscal year 2019-2020. Mr. Van eenoo, do you want to present?

>> Yes, mayor, just a few quick staff amendments to the fee schedule that was presented in your proposed budget document. So first of all, we would be amending the fee schedule to align with the various council actions that you took during adoption of the fiscal year 2019-20 operating budget. That was item number one that you just passed. The three areas where we'll be adjusting the fees based upon that budget would be the board adjustment fees that you discussed, the scooter fees, as well as the

[4:06:50 PM]

discussions that we're currently on the clean community fee. Second, there was a revised Austin energy electric tariff that was included as backup. It was also included as backup prior to the public hearing. So that would be a revision to the tariff that makes adjustments to the power supply adjustment as well as the regulatory charge. These next two I'm sure you probably have heard about the state legislation referred to as the shot clock, that is house bill 3167 that requires us to make some language changes to our fee schedule. You can see here in red these would be changes to what's in the proposed budget document. This was all just clarifying language to make sure we're in compliance with that new bill. Same exact thing here in the watershed department. Some clarifications, but also the need to increase the fee for general subdivision completeness checks from \$34 to \$100 because the work that's

[4:07:51 PM]

needed to comply with the shot clock is more staff intensive. So there will be an increase to that fee. And then finally in the parks department, we are under contract with the vendor, those fees are set to go up . Per contract in January 1st of 2020 so we would make that adjustment here today. The other two items are just cleanup items. Again, you can see the ~~strikeout~~ underline, one of them was just a transposition of numbers where we typed in 57 and it was supposed to be \$75. So just corrections, cleanups to the parks fee schedule there. And then finally similar in the water utility, just a correction to lower the photocopying fee from 1.25 to 1.05 that was incorrectly entered into the budget document. Those are all the staff amendments to the fee schedule. I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to adopt the ordinance for fees, fines and other charges with the staff recommended amendments

[4:08:51 PM]

and then the three amendments that we did here with scooter, board of adjustments and the clean community fee? Motion is by the mayor pro tem. Seconded by councilmember harper-madison. Any discussion? Those in favor -- we are now ready -- no? The law requires this also to be a record vote. We're now ready to discuss any changes. There weren't any changes proposed so we'll go to a record vote. The law requires this to be a record vote. Will the clerk please read the roll so we can state our vote.

>> Mayor Adler.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor pro tem Garza.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember tovo.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Flannigan.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember kitchen.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember pool.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Casar.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember alter.

[4:09:52 PM]

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Ellis.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Renteria is off the dais.

>> Renteria: Yes.

[Laughter].

>> Mayor Adler: Unanimously that's approved. All right. Let's move then to -- let's pull up three to five and handle those each at the same time concurrently.

>> Real quick there I want you to know that we have passed out a yellow sheet for item 3, the emergency medical services sworn classification that needed to change from what -- from what was posted to the action to provide seven personnel related to the community health care paramedic program. Item number four, the police classification stays exactly as we provided it to you. Item number 5, which has to do with Austin fire department's sworn classifications -- I'm sorry, I got three and five mixed up. Item number five is for EMS. Item number three is for Austin fire. And due to the change to the command tech program, we needed to update the classification ordinance for that. So the sheets being passed

[4:10:52 PM]

afternoon just true up the classification ordinance to reflect the changes that you approved in item number 1.

>> Is there a motion to approve items three, four and five? Mayor pro tem makes the motion. Councilmember Renteria seconds any discussion? Okay, all those in favor of the motion to adopt the Austin fire department, Austin police department and emergency medical services classification ordinances with the amendments that have been introduced, please raise your hand. Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais in favor. It passes. That gets us then to agenda item six, seven and eight, which are the reimbursement resolutions for general obligation debt, Austin energy and Austin water. Is there a motion on item six through eight? Does anyone move approval? Councilmember Casar moves approval. Is there a second in the mayor pro tem seconds? Any discussion. All those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais

[4:11:54 PM]

and those items are passed. All right. At this point I'm going to recess the city council meeting here at 4:11 so that we can move in to the meeting of the Austin housing finance corporation

[See separate transcript for Austin Housing Finance Corporation meeting]

[See separate transcript for Mueller Local Government Corporation meeting]

I now bring us back into the meeting of the city council here at 4:14 P.M. We're continuing on on September 10th in city council chambers. All right. Now we're going to consider item number 9. It's to ratify the property tax increase that's reflected in the budget. This is a vote that is required by state law. Our council must make this vote separately to make sure that we know it will take more property taxes than the city raised last year to pay for the budget that we approve this year. This is not a vote on the tax rate. We will take a separate vote on the tax rate on September 25th of 2019. Is there a motion to ratify the property tax increase reflected in the fiscal year 2019-2020 budget that was adopted by council earlier today? Councilmember Casar makes

[4:15:58 PM]

that motion. Is there a second in councilmember pool seconds that. Is there any discussion? We have a motion by councilmember Casar to ratify the property tax increase reflected in the fiscal year 2019-2020 budget. A second from councilmember pool. All those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais. It passes with a vote of 11-0. Manager?

>> Before we adjourn today, mayor and councilmembers, I wanted to thank the community and the rest of the council for supporting this budget. It was a work that over the last several months involved many stakeholders and we really organized ourselves around our strategic priorities knowing that we have a lot of work to do to address some of the financial challenges that we'll have in the future. But I did want to take a moment to thank our budget team led by deputy chief financial officer Ed van eenoo and the incredible work that his team has done to get us to this point.

[4:16:59 PM]

It's a big day for the city and I really want to show my appreciation for the support of the council on this budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Manager -- [applause]. Manager, thank you. You're 2-0 at this point so you need to keep that streak going. Ed, thank you, and your staff. Just really responsive in answering questions, which is necessary for us to be able to do what we did. Colleagues, I'd point out that one of the things we've talked about here obviously is how we deal with the challenge of homelessness. We've set a essential session for us to discuss that next week on the 18th 18th, possibly continuing on to the 20th if it's necessary. There's some items on the bulletin board. I would urge you to take a look at them. Some of them need other sponsors in order to be posted on an agenda that will then get posted for us to hopefully get everybody working on it over the course of the next week before we -- before we get to that council meeting.

[4:18:01 PM]

Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: I'd like to echo all of the appreciation expressed by city manager cronk. I think there's a group of folks who consistently get overlooked that I'd like to recognize today. So my colleague Paige Ellis and I are new to this thing and we had some of our friends on the council try to warn us, try to give us advice and tell us what to expect from our first budget cycle and that didn't even touch it. I mean, this is an unimagable task. And so -- unimaginable task. The folks that helped get us through this in so many ways, while my colleagues were so helpful and accessible, it's y'all's staff, the staff of every single council office showed us for my staff. We're all new to this. None of us have done this before and we have lots of questions so I just want to give a shout-out to all of your staff for being so helpful and available and

[4:19:02 PM]

they deserve a big pat on the back. Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. And with that we're at 4:18, this meeting is adjourned.

>> Renteria: Mayor, are we meeting Friday?

>> Mayor Adler: No. So we had yes? Yeah, there is. The tax hearing on Friday. Are we meeting on Wednesday or Thursday? Is there a land development code or anything?

>> Mayor and councilmembers, there's currently a special called meeting scheduled for 3:00 on Wednesday to talk about the land development code. We're hoping that will be a two-hour discussion from 3:00 to 5:00. That's what we have scheduled. And then as was said earlier on Friday, a hearing on the tax rates and moving to adopt the tax rate. This is again the requirement because we did not get the certified rolls in time and that's at 1:00 on Friday the 13th.

[4:20:07 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I thought we said we were doing the tax rate on September 25th. It's the hearing on it and then we adopt it on the 25th. Got it. All right. Meeting is adjourned.