

City Council Special Called Meeting Transcript – 9/20/2019

Title: City of Austin
Channel: 6 - COAUS
Recorded On: 9/20/2019 6:00:00 AM
Original Air Date: 9/20/2019
Transcript Generated by SnapStream
=====

[9:27:14 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We have a quorum so we're going to get started. This is a special called meeting on September 20th, 2019. It is 9:27. We're here to discuss four items. There were two items that were ordinances. There were two items that were resolutions. If you've been watching the message board posts I think you can see that postdating these two different setups are another proposal that's out for the community to see. I'm happy everybody is here. It's my intent to start with the dais to talk about what we think are the issues and controversy here. There are six. And then I want to give the public a chance to speak. There are a little over 12 people to speak. Then back up to the dais before we start any

[9:28:15 AM]

ordinance or resolution let's talk about what it is that we hope or want to be able to achieve. I fell you to me, it's -- I tell you for me, it's my intent and goal to not respond expand on the work we did in June. I think the statement we made in June was a really important statement for us to make. I think in the intervening time since June as we had anticipated in June, some of the things that we passed are -- don't provide sufficient detail for there to be the best ability for enforcement on our streets for people to know what is illegal, what's not illegal. And I think we do a great service to the community if we provide that greater detail in an ordinance. As well as provide things

[9:29:17 AM]

like the ability for us to give the manager the ability to identify places that are not safe so he can act. So I think it's important that we do something here that advances and strengthens what we did in June. But in any event, I want to have us at the dais here to talk real briefly. I think that some of my colleagues identified what they thought was disagreement within that subquorum group that was working. I think

it would be important to lay that out. It helped me better understand at least where they were coming from. And then I want to go to the public and let them talk. And then my hope is before we pick up any document of any kind, we get back to the dais and talk.

[9:30:18 AM]

I'm handing out what was given to me this morning as areas that were in issue. >> Kitchen: Mayor? We have a document that has the detail behind this so people can see the areas of difference or areas for discussion and if you bear with us for just a minute we're getting that sent down here. >> Garza: Mayor, can I -- >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. I know there's been a lot of hard work from everybody, but this process has been incredibly confusing for us not in the fore. And I appreciate breaking it down into the areas to discuss of the main points of contention possibly, but it's my understanding that there are other documents that have findings that I do not agree with specific findings. So you know, we've just been passed this and I don't know -- there's no names,

[9:31:18 AM]

there's no -- and so as we're -- I appreciate the general discussion of let's see the disagreements and maybe going to the public. And I hope when we go and hear the comments, if these could be labeled possibly, if people could take these back up and label them document a, document B, document C, so as we go into discussing these we know exactly what we're talking about. I have concerns about some of the wording of findings and I don't know where the resolutions play into this and the ordinance changes play into this. And so if people could get together and label what we have so when we talk about it we know what we're talking about. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other statements before we go and talk to the public? >> Casar: Mayor, I would just like to lay out what those six areas are and then I'll do my best to label a document similar to what I had posted. But the six areas I think remaining are: How to treat

[9:32:22 AM]

areas along creeks and rivers, because I think we understand -- everybody concludes that there's some danger of being in them, but the question is distance from them. How to treat areas of high fire risk, whether it's banning fires in those areas or just banning camping in those areas. How to treat sidewalks and streets, which I think we've discussed quite a bit. The distance from the south Austin housing center that no camping would exist. When does signage get put up? Is it when people are offered permanent housing solutions or is it if we don't have the money the signage gets put up? And then finally, when we reach a 60-day waiting list, which I think we all want to get to, do new restrictions go into effect at that point or just as the council discussed new restrictions at that point, but they don't necessarily go into effect? My understanding is those are kind of the six areas

[9:33:22 AM]

where there is remaining issue. And for me my goal is to not do an expansion of what we did in June, but rather an explanation that clarifies what we did in June and identifies a small area around shelters. So that will guide me in these six areas. >> Flannigan: Thank you, mayor. As I said on wednesday, I think it's -- >> Mayor Adler: Hey, Jimmy, if I could, let me -- is it possible if the four people that posted things go first and then I come to you? Thank you. Ann and then Kathie. >> Kitchen: I just wanted to say two quick things. I appreciate the work that everyone has been involved in with this and it's a really tough issue. And I appreciate everybody's efforts as we work through this today. As we talk through this I want to say just one thing about what is the bigger picture to me.

[9:34:22 AM]

And that is the interaction between the proposed approach that's in the ordinance, which is the phased approach, and the resolution. I believe that in order -- if it's the council's will to go down this road with this approach, then a necessary component of it is -- at least some of the items that are in the resolution. So -- because the phased approach, the concept behind the phased approach is something that the mayor set out and others have discussed, and that is as we find -- as we connect people to housing, because housing is our ultimate goal, but as we connect people to housing, we then work towards less areas where people are camping. That's a phased approach. The first category is placed that become forceable immediately -- enforceable immediately. Of the second category is

[9:35:23 AM]

places that go into effect, but were only enforced after service and housing is offered and appropriate signage is in place. They've that category 2 for that to actually work, we have to address resources, and the resolution is important to that. And category 3 is at the end of the day we're all working towards a measure that relates to ending homelessness and it's at that point where we talk in terms of the rest of the areas becoming enforceable. So anyway, my major point here is I just think that -- I think that we have a real opportunity with this approach, provided that we also work with the -- provided we also commit the resources that are necessary to make this approach work. And I think the opportunity that we have in front of us is to take a more definitive

[9:36:24 AM]

path towards connecting people to housing. And addressing the areas in our city where we're having difficulties with people living outside because it's not good for them and it's not good for the city. And so the last thing I'll say is we just handed out -- thank you, Greg, for handing out your list. We have just handed out the backup to that list, which has the places -- the specific places in the proposed ordinance that are the areas that we need to discuss. >> Mayor Adler: Kathie dorks want to say something? Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: As I said on Wednesday, I think it's fair to us to be defining the ordinances because there's been debate on this and defining interpretations. I'll get into more of the detail later. I think the high fire risk is a good one to add to the

[9:37:25 AM]

list of restrictions. But as I said on Wednesday, I'm not comfortable with the resolutions being so prescriptive. I think we need to let the experts that we spent so long to hire and who have experts in this in multiple cities do this work and come back to us with their recommendations. So I can't support the ordinances today. Can't support the resolutions today. >> Tovo: Councilmember kitchen started to lay out documents you have that we just distributed. I'll just hit on them quickly. There is both a short list of six as well as the more extensive area that calls out the sections from the ordinance. Behind that is the phased approach that was on the message board earlier this week just to -- that again lays out the differences. The resolution behind that is iteration of the

[9:38:25 AM]

resolution that was posted when the special called meeting was initiated last week. The draft you have in front of you incorporates many of the edits that the mayor suggested in the version that he had posted last night on the message board. This is also for the public. Our version from councilmember kitchen and I is also posted on the message board. The resolution is sponsored by two other co-sponsors. This was done very late at night and so without the benefit of knowing whether they signed on, that's why I'm saying councilmember kitchen and I. And behind that document is the ordinance that reflects the phased approach and the different alternatives folded within it. So that you can see how the different alternative would fit within the ordinance. I think it's really critical that we consider the resolution as part of that. The ordinance does not -- the ordinance doesn't make sense without the

[9:39:27 AM]

representation that explains what we're going to do in the interim. Most of the changes are being -- most of the -- we are identifying the areas of very highest risk in the category one, areas around shelters. Many other discussions that we've had are in category 2 and depend -- depend on connecting individuals to housing and services. So I think it's very important that we send a message to the

community today that we have a plan, we're ready to execute it. It certainly doesn't describe how those plans should be implemented, but it does make it clear that as a city we need to immediately allocate the resources and the staff time to making that happen. And so I think it's critical that we pass the resolution today. >> Mayor Adler: Question,

[9:40:27 AM]

councilmember alter. >> Alter: On Wednesday I mentioned that I wanted to hear from APD. Would it be appropriate positive for me to call them down and ask my questions? >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to do it now before we hear from the public? >> Alter: If APD is ready I would appreciate that opportunity. Good morning, chief gay. Thank you for being here. So I wanted to -- thank you, chief, for being here, whichever one of you is appropriate to answer the question. You should feel to chime in. What I would really like to know is from APD's perspective can you speak to any concerns that you may have with the proposed resolutions or ordinances. I understand there's a lot of changing going on, but I think I'd really like to hear what the concerns are that you have since you will be enforcing any ordinance. And feel free to also speak to challenges that you're experiencing under the current ordinance. >> Yes, ma'am.

[9:41:27 AM]

And mayor and council, chief gay, I'm the chief of staff for the Austin police department. And first I just wanted to say thank you for your leadership and commitment to ending homeless or attempting -- ending homelessness or attempting to end homelessness. I want you to know that our commitment at APD has also been to work and try to connect those that are experiencing homeless to the appropriate social services and connect those. And I do have chief Newsome that is probably more boots on the ground. But some of the challenges that I think chief Manley has put forth is that we need an ordinance that's very clear and defined for our officers that can enforce. And looking at the latest resolution -- the ordinance that I have is that some of the areas that mentioned approximations is going to be very challenging for our

[9:42:30 AM]

department to enforce. So something that we would like to see is clear distances or clear definitions of borders and streets. There is one particular area that is under the enforcement and engagement process. I think the one and two of that F you have that, are something we're already doing. When our officers, we reported here to council in June, is that our officers receive about 98% compliance when we ask someone to comply. And so in number 3 it's asking us to go an extra step, it's asking us to not only to inform the person that they had -- that had violated the ordinance or that they're in violation, that we're asking for their volunteer compliance, but then it's adding the and to

[9:43:30 AM]

also try to contact another entity outside of our department. One is host team, but realizing the host team is two individual officers that work 40 hours a week so there's 128 hours that were not being covered by the host team. So we would have to contact other entities in that arena arena. I believe for us in that area is our officers are ready. As for compliance. And they already ask them or try to connect them with resources. That's what we do each and everyday. So for us I think adding that extra pit in there as number Ta three is to be somewhat challenging, but in lieu of that, I think putting in there is when an individual does want to comply with us, I think it's reasonable that our officers will attempt to connect that individual with social services. So I know that, chief

[9:44:31 AM]

Newsome might want to talk. >> And chief gay got most of it. I want to clearly state that especially for the public, we don't want to issue eye stations. Don't want to make arrests. If you look at the numbers prior to the ordinance change there was some discussion about that, that we weren't always enforcing, you know, writing tickets and making arrests for what was existing in the first place, but having the ability to seek volunteer compliance in order to maintain public order is what is desirable. You know, it's not fair to discount the fears of anyone, and you heard a variety of fears here on both sides in this discussion. They're all valid concerns and all valid fears. And having the ability to ask somebody to not be in a certain location and then seek compliance is helpful. But as chief gay said, having to contact these outside entities prior to taking any enforcement action after 5:00 P.M. is

[9:45:32 AM]

just not doable. There's nobody to call after 5:00 P.M. And nobody on Saturdays and Sundays that can come out to fulfill that requirement. So that one is problematic. There's a couple of proximates in here that make it difficult for officers is to take enforcement action on a law that says approximate anything. So -- and I think the councilmember asked about what were the challenges with the current version of the ordinance, and it's an officer making a determination of what is hazardous or dangerous. If a person is on a tent in a sidewalk and there's no imminent threat, imminent danger, there's nothing inherently unsafe or dangerous about that. And that's why after, you know, since July 1st we've issued a total of 12 citations for all three of the ordinances. I think it was three camping the last time we looked ordinance under the current format. >> Flannigan: Mayor?

[9:46:34 AM]

>> Casar: Mayor? I wanted to hit on those exact points, if that's okay. Y'all mentioned two things. One, the approximate distance issue and two the contacting host issue. On the approximate distance issue, do y'all have a version that says that approximately within this distance, but the actual boundaries will be set by signage and by the city manager? Did you see that? >> The portion that we saw, there were some that actually had streets identified and if we missed it that there was approximate and also included a boundary, but on -- >> Casar: I want to make clear that I think on the approximate side we want to -- as of the version that got handed out on Wednesday and povertied on Wednesday and reposted last night, the reposted says approximate with the boundaries set by the manager and there has to be signs and then there's a process for setting up those signs. So I think that there was -- we had gotten that feedback from pd and tried to make those changes in order to address that. And second, I do think that

[9:47:36 AM]

there is a gap in language that we can clear up right now where I think the idea would be to contact host or social service area when you don't -- agency when you don't get volunteer compliance. And here it says whenever it's reasonable, if it's after 5:00 P.M. And there's nobody, it doesn't add anything, it helps show us that maybe we need to get somebody after 5:00 P.M. Because you're on the two percent of cases that you don't get voluntary compliance. It's after five. Maybe that teaches us as a community something about what's going on and I think your point is well taken. I think this section was only for if you -- if you don't get volunteer compliance so a person might need to get moved and go somewhere. I think that's an easy cleanup. >> That adds a second point to the discussion is you did not get volunteer compliance. You call a host member to the scene. The host member that's coming is more than likely going to be an officer. And so it would be interesting to know is that officer going to then get

[9:48:37 AM]

volunteer compliance when you didn't get volunteer compliance? And is that host officer going to take the person to another neighborhood and just drop them off because it's not included within the boundaries that are included here. So there's some -- there's just some operational questions that are really hard to figure out based on this language. >> Casar: Okay, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. So I don't have the ordinance memorized. I'm not in the group that has been working on it. So I don't have all of those details. But when you're given things like four feet clearance, I mean, I'm not sure -- you can't have is signage on every storefront, on every sidewalk in the whole city. So what kind of obstacles does it pose for you if it says four feet? We've been trying to come up with resolutions on lake Austin where you have a 50-foot and you can't

[9:49:37 AM]

enforce that wake because you don't know where 50 feet is. It's no different on the sidewalk. You don't have the water, but how -- >> We would have to measure. In order to enforce the law you would have to measure it. It would be no different than stopping a person for speeding, but not knowing the specific speed that they were going. So to enforce that four foot rule we would have to issue tape measures to stand up in a court and say it was less than 48 48 inches, you would have to -- 48-inches, you would have to have specific proof of that. >> Alter: Are there other -- are there other situations operationally where if you have folks blocking the sidewalk that create challenges from the enforcement perspective? I think we all aspire to have ordinances that we have clear direction on how to enforce or how to get volunteer compliance, but it seems like there would be a whole lot of other

[9:50:38 AM]

ambiguities that are created even with existing ordinance that I'm not sure are addressed in here. Can you spell a little bit to those kinds of things? >> You know, what's obstructing to you and I are different than somebody who is mobility impaired or in a wheelchair. You and I can walk around it, they can't. Just the term obstruction has some equivocation in it depending on what your situation is. That's one thing in the current ordinance. And again, I already spoke about with the health and safety aspect of it, you know, that's open to interpretation of what is creating a health and safety risk by a person who is in a sleeping bag or in a tent somewhere. So those are the two things in the current ordinance that make it problematic. >> Alter: Okay. And if you had to transport people according to what's in the draft ordinance, there are challenges besides the host team being

[9:51:39 AM]

available? >> Well, I think the current challenge is that currently if you have went to some of the camp sites and if we were to have to actually move an individual, we don't have the vehicles, we don't have the way to transport what someone may say is that this is my personal belongings. We have attempted to do that and it has taken hours upon hours of officers' time and vehicles to try to transport and then put that personal item into our evidence for safe keeping. It does raise a lot of challenges, not only with the amount of stuff, but also the considerations hazardous materials and other things that we may have to address. >> Alter: Thank you. I'd like to ask you to speak to APD's current approach to enforcing existing laws.

[9:52:40 AM]

Is APD experiencing difficulty enforcing things like assault, public intoxication, public urination, et cetera, following the ordinance changes in June. >> We have always enforced the laws that are on the books and do not have any challenges. I know that there has -- a lot of people are trying to associate this ordinance changes to some of the things that we have already and have always tried to enforce. There are limitations with our arrest authorities that the state has given us. And before these ordinances, we may or may not have had the authority to arrest, and it hasn't changed. The challenge is as we stated before, is that it was pretty clear on just the behavior alone before -- when the ordinances went into effect, just a person sitting on a sidewalk. So that was very easy to interpret. Now with the hazard, the danger or the impeding or

[9:53:42 AM]

the obstruction piece, it has added an additional layer to our officers that have to view that, which may be different. I think I heard one of the citizens who discussed about it's a perceptual issue, what's danger and what chief Newsome mentioned is that what is dangerous to one person may not be a danger to another. So our officers, I believe, currently, are interpreting the intent of the current ordinance and are trying to seek voluntary compliance, which I do believe that they are. But we've only written a very few citations when someone is actually in violation. I think we've been trying to track these calls that we have been on since July and we have responded to a little over 300 calls, and as we say, we have only taken enforcement action on a handful of items.

[9:54:45 AM]

Of items. >> Alter: You've taken enforcement action on a handful of items in the enforcement. Do we have other rules, how many citations have you given on public urination or on, you know, assault or -- I mean, those things are not in the ordinance. Those have nothing to do with being homeless. Those are just rules on our books and folks are raising questions about those and that's what I'm trying to understand the distinction. >> And we don't have that data handy. Obviously we can get it, but what it won't have is a breakdown of a person's status that got the citation for urinating. Was it on person in an alley on sixth street or was it a person under a bridge. There's no block on the ticket that identifies a person's status. So that data is really hard to drill down into and get in any confirmable manner. >> Alter: So I want to be clear, I'm not asking it to be done by status.

[9:55:45 AM]

That's the whole point of what the discussion is that we're having. >> Sure. >> Alter: But there's some confusion in the public about whether these laws still exist and whether they are being enforced. And no, they don't have anything to do with being homeless. >> Right. >> Alter: But that's what I'm trying to

understand, if those are being enforced. >> They are. When appropriate and able, you know, we are enforcing those laws. >> Alter: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: What I would really like to do, we have some people signed up. I would like to hear from the public, then we can close the public hearing component of this. That will get us back up to the dais. That's what I'm going to do now and we can come back and ask questions. Is Keri Roberts here? Do you want to speak? Come on down. You have time donated from Trey Salinas and Taya Hill.

[9:56:47 AM]

You have seven minutes. The first 20 people are given three minutes, then one minute after that. We're up to 25 people. I want to hear the conversation, then we'll close the public hearing and be up to the podium, to the dais. You have seven minutes. >> Kerry Roberts -- >> Mayor Adler: Actually, the way we were doing it with the donate time, you have five minutes. >> I won't even be close. >> Mr. Roberts -- Mayor, if I could please remind everybody to lean as close to the microphone as you can. >> Sorry. Mayor and Council, Kerry Roberts, executive director of the Greater Austin Crime Commission. Of course, it's a little difficult to speak not knowing exactly which draft of -- that we're talking about, but I will at least speak to one point -- or a couple points. We know that camping isn't the answer for anyone and it doesn't do any good to move people around in a discussion with one of you

[9:57:49 AM]

this summer I was struck by a couple of phrases about, you know, it's a discussion really about civic standards and social norms. And I think that it's been a difficult but necessary discussion this summer that we've had, obviously. And if we pass something today, if you pass something today that can't be enforced, it just settles the police up to fail -- sets the police up to fail. From our standpoint, clear enforcement direction is absolutely necessary. I mean, calling another entity prior to taking enforcement action is difficult, as you heard from both the chiefs. You know, many of these resources, you know, are not available, as they said. So, you know, the historic investment in homelessness didn't include a second host team or anybody after 5:00 P.M., for example. So I just want people, when we say whenever reasonable and you are giving that sort of latitude which has no

[9:58:49 AM]

real legal definition for the police, that everybody -- we're setting an expectation in the community about what whenever reasonable means and it's something that the police officers can understand and use to maintain public order. I think what we haven't seen is overenforcement. So despite the changes that we had in June, what constitutes a public health or safety hazard might look very different to different people. I think our police force is to be commended for the fact that those standards were not

interpreted in a way that has been overly punitive since they were changed. The -- the community, including the business community, has done everything they've ever been asked when it comes to addressing homelessness, and we'll continue to do everything that it's asked. We're a committed partner in that -- in that endeavor.

[9:59:54 AM]

Please today help provide some direction, demonstrate there are things that we can do that if we do them right we can show the community that we can, you know, continue to make shelter, housing and services available and continue to address this challenge. We always say that we can't arrest our way out of homelessness, and I think we all accept that that's true. Yet somehow it's also the police down here that we're asking to somehow make this better. So thank you for all that you do. You know, I think this conversation has felt different this summer because it really is about what kind of community we want to live in. So we ask respectfully that the enforcement direction be very clear that everything is in the ordinance. They don't have to ask an administrative director of another department about lists for areas that cannot

[10:00:54 AM]

be camped in. Everything has to be in the ordinance in order for it to work, we think. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Is Bryce here? Thank you. Is Gus Peña here? What about Chris Page? Sharon Blythe? >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Is Paul Mullen here? You are on deck. Ms. Blythe, you will be up. >> Tovo: Mayor, while the speakers are coming up, I wanted to call my colleagues' attention to a document distributed earlier this week. We've had both the police and at least one of the speakers talk about what is a very real resource limitation right now of our outreach teams from integral care and host and others being under capacity. The downtown Austin community court issued their

[10:01:54 AM]

response to -- to the resolution that passed in June and they have suggested four different approaches to provide an increased outreach presence including some 24-hour teams. I think that is one reason why it is so critical to consider the provisions in the ordinance that ask for that kind of resource conversation to be happening right away because for our ordinance changes that we're contemplating today to have meaning, we really need that increased outreach and services and the dacc has laid out for us several different options to consider in that regard. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Blythe. >> Sharon Blythe. I live in far northwest Austin. We have a lot of homeless people out there too. We cannot get the city staff to do any services for us out here. Case in point, policemen were called out, my neighbor is other night, the other

[10:02:54 AM]

afternoon, a homeless person was camping in our neighborhood. The policeman said there's nothing they can do. Just left it, washed their hands of it. People are getting very frustrated in northwest Austin because of that kind of thing. Secondly, I called 3191 -- 311 the other day. Mr. Manager, I called 311 the other day. There is junk, unbelievable, Juarez Mexico junk between all the way up 183 frontage road south between about Duvall to capital of Texas. 311 tells me they cannot take my call. They are not allowed to take my call. And Mr. Manager, I want to know why your staff is telling the public that. Because it's junk, it's a roadway. I don't live in Juarez, Mexico. We can't even get our entrance mowed by the parks department in our neighborhood because parks

[10:03:55 AM]

department says it's not our job, public works says it's not our job. Nobody in your staff knows what they are supposed to do, and that's the problem, there's no direction out of your office. Can you promise me today that you will get some direction to your staff to get something done, some direction out of your office till they know what they are doing? This homeless thing is a complete disaster. You made it yourselves. And I don't understand when you take care of the first 2,000 or 3,000 group, you got another two or 3,000 that say I'm homeless, take care of me. There is no end game. There is no budget at the end. There is no physical responsibility on this council at all. Quite frankly, I think you are trying very hard to push the old white women out of this city as chas Morris said the other day, and I'm offended by these racial comments. It's not a racial issue, it

[10:04:55 AM]

is a public issue. Thank you very much. >> Renteria: Mayor, I find that very offensive at Juarez. Juarez takes care of their people and their homeless, not like this city does. >> What's that? I didn't hear him. >> Mayor Adler: People generalry. Chris page. Paul mullen. You have three minutes. Is Jamie Villarreal here? You will be next. Go ahead, sir. >> I'm Paul Mel Lynn. I've been working with homeless people 49 years in various different cities. -- Mullen. I've been living in Austin for the last 26 years. I work mainly with the homeless along Ben white, so some of my remarks will concern them. The first problem is that the city have constantly ignored the homeless problem. They have pushed them out of

[10:05:59 AM]

sight and underestimated their numbers. And so there was always a growing problem that had not been recognized until you passed the June ordinance. You made a mistake back in June. You abolished the ban on camping in public places, but you failed to address the city ordinance that bans private -- bans camping on all private property. It's a zoning ordinance, there's an overall ban on camping on any private property. Since June, code enforcement officials have been driving homeless people off private property and forcing them to camp in public places. Where, of course, they are more visible and then there is the outcry from the neighborhood. They were always in the area. We have in Austin almost 10,000 homeless now. Based on the latest data from echo. It's not published, but this is in the coordinated

[10:07:01 AM]

assessment data where you look at the number of coordinated assessments, the integrals between them, look at estimates in the numbers who haven't had coordinated assessments. There are almost 10,000 homeless in Austin now, not 2,000. So we need to get that number right. Finally, we've got to look at what we mean by safety. You talk about Ben white and manchaca, particular, which is a problem of visibility of the homeless. I've talked to all the people come under that bridge. They are camping there because they believe they are safer. The main safety risks for homeless people are sun stroke and assault. Under a bridge is a good refuge from sun stroke and visibility, camping in a very visible location is their best defense against assault. So we need to be careful that we are offering them an alternative that will be safer for them.

[10:08:01 AM]

In that -- for that reason, most homeless people come in the area would refusing to into a temporary shelter at health south. They are concerned that the problems of the front step shelter, of the arch, with robbery and assault are prevalent, they are concerned those problems would occur in any new shelter. So you'll have to look into the problems of running that shelter before you decide to set one up. [Buzzer sounding] >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. Before Ms. Villarreal speaks, is Susan spitano here? Come on up. You will be next. >> Janie Villarreal, business owner, property owner in district 5. I have 11 brothers and sisters and they probably have property and businesses in every one of your districts, okay? Since we've always had a homeless problem, but since June I can tell you that our small businesses, my tenants

[10:09:05 AM]

have had homeless people defecate, urinate, masturbate. I was attacked by a homeless person, cost me \$500 in E.R. For antibiotics for the cut that was caused. And I'm just -- I was born in Austin, I've been

here 62 years, love this town. Some of you are probably too young to remember don't mess with Texas, but that's gone out the door. It is completely trash. I mean, it's so embarrassing to have people come into town, now I've gotten to the point I say let me go and see you because it's shameful. My question is how did you all come to the conclusion that other people are more worthy than our neighborhood? [Applause] It just doesn't make any sense to me that our businesses -- sense to me that our businesses, our

[10:10:05 AM]

properties -- and I can tell you between me and my siblings, we probably pay every one of your salaries so we should have a voice, okay? [Applause] Our businesses are struggling and ashamed of what is going on. I work with children, I teach martial arts, I lock my door for safety reasons because I've had homeless people come in there. Fire department says it's against code. Hmm, okay. So I have to decide do I want to keep my kids safe or break code and get fined? I don't understand how you think that those people on congress or wherever you are going to ban the camping are more worthy of safety and all these health issues that we're having than we are. How does that make any sense to any of you? I don't get it. I don't understand, Mr. Mayor. I know that they have bigger properties, they pay more dollars, you know, and that may pay -- maybe that's

[10:11:06 AM]

something. But my business, my property, all of our businesses owners on pack saddle and I think Ann kitchen is our representative, we need your help. We need your help. Those businesses are just as important as the ones on congress. Think about it when you vote on this. Think about what you are doing. What about the rest of us? You're saying that camping is a safety and a health issue she yes, it is, but what about protecting us? I mean, how do you come up with saying congress is more important than my property? How do you say that whatever other street you are picking -- [buzzer sounding] -- You know. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Is Cleo here? You have time donated from April Smith. Is April Smith here? Is Jessica cox here? You will have five minutes. Ms. Petaro, you have two minutes. >> I would like to continue

[10:12:07 AM]

where Janie -- can you hear? Where Janie left off, and that is that I think you have recognized that the change in the ordinance has caused some serious health and safety problems in the city. But I think it's unfair to say, well, it's okay for some people to be safer and we'll take care of them but not others. I think the people in south Austin have every right to wonder why they are considered less important than anyone else. It is not fair. There is no question that everyone's safety needs to be taken care of.

And when, in fact, you do things like drive down the frontage road of Ben white, you have to remind yourself don't drive in the curb lane because if you do, there is very likely a panhandler that's going to come up, pound on your car, expose himself to you or make lewd comments. That's Austin today. And probably there was some of that someplace, but not like today.

[10:13:08 AM]

And when you look at a phased approach, I think you do need a phased approach, but not this phased approach. I think you need to go back to the law you had and then I think you need to look at the vagrant and homeless population and decide what are their situations, is it a mental health issue. We have people that this government is paying to deal with that. Why aren't they? Look at that first. The same thing with drug addiction. Using drugs is not legal, selling drugs is not legal. But separate them out. And I don't think they -- people should be living on the street, but I also think, and Mary you always use this as, you know, when the police try to move someone, they say where will I go. The idea then I guess is they get to stay there. If I had \$100 in my pocket and someone comes and tears it off, it doesn't mean that it's not a crime or I can't

[10:14:10 AM]

have my hundred duels until I figure out how to give that person \$100 because they want it. That's what you are saying. It's not right. So I would suggest that you get the ordinance back to what it was, have a reasonable approach, separate the different factions, decide what they need, and the community is one of them. The community at large. So I hope that you will, in fact, consider that. It is going to be very difficult for you to put the genie back in the bottle, folks. Very difficult. Please try your best. Everyone in this room wants a good, safe Austin. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Is Kathy Mitchell here? You'll be up next. Go ahead, you have five minutes. >> Hi, Cleo patrucik. Is this camping? I place this very question squarely before our leaders. Tell us, wise one, is this

[10:15:10 AM]

camping? Four groups in Austin have rallied with 43,000 members and petitioners in less than three months, two months exactly. We've created a website is this camping.com. This page in the collaboration of multiple community groups who want the city council to be accountable for the impact they've made on their choices on the citizens of Austin. Our primary goals include city council must twine what constitutes camping. Tents, mattresses, couches, pallet structures, constructed buildings. City council must create rules to govern what is allowed under the camping ordinance. Councilman Casar says opening of a new park, ahh, the reason why we love Austin. What a great place for families. But in our park, Joycelyn park, not such a beautiful community atmosphere. This is what we have to

[10:16:13 AM]

clean up. Sex on Joycelyn park. Some kids deserve to play and pee, tell us which ones, please, we are confused. After they had sex, they Peed on the playscape. Drinking on children's playground during the day. They've basically given up. They don't even care anymore. It makes every parent feel like this is a great park, right near a school too. Structures determined to be a hazard must be removed immediately by the occupant or the city. The intention of is this camping is to demand council respond meaningfully. To be define -- to define what is camping, where is camping and the behavior allowed in these encampments. If not, we are prepared to repeal this ordinance and recall each of you one by one. This is a unified effort that crosses party lines,

[10:17:15 AM]

socioeconomic backgrounds, moms, dads, professional, working class, doctors, teachers, retired, homeless people, prior homeless people and all races. We all want the city to meet our demands. After Wednesday's council meeting, an individual recounted a conversation she had with another participant from northwest Austin. They stated they had been coached to engage in race baiting when commenting on homelessness. The individual that was coached admitted she had never been to south Austin to witness anything nor could the person advise on any factual element of the race argument. Strange that in the same meeting councilmember chided a citizen group as not having people of color. I am 100% Mexican America, fought all my life against systemic racism. Only the mayor was brave enough to show up at Galindo

[10:18:16 AM]

elementary, 86% hispanic, where there were people of color in the audience, some who didn't speak English. It is disgusting if any member of this council degrade the real suffering racism has inflicted by trying to catcall the uninformed with race arguments. Forced compliance. We need you all to explain your plan to house and rehab that segment of the homeless that is not willing to voluntarily present themselves to services, programs, environments that gets them off the street and face to face with those that can help them. Put on the path to address their problems. Did you seek input on decriminalization from the Austin police department or the police officers union before this decision? If yes, with who did you meet with and what did they say? Environmental. Human waste, drug needles

[10:19:17 AM]

affect our rivers, streams and communities. Economists and the tourism and small businesses are impacted. How is this population being audited and tracked? Sex offenders and convicted felons living near schools, homes and businesses. Where is all the data and the tracking for this? Taxes. You told the -
- mayor, you told the Austin chronicle in 2017 hotel taxes would pay for homeless services. Now you have stated all Austin taxpayers will bear the burden. What happened? What changed? If the city owns \$4.1 billion in real estate and assets, why then is the city spending \$8 million to acquire more land -- [buzzer sounding] -- Rather than spending on interim shelters, Bridgers and shelters and supporting the homeless community in its entirety. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Mitchell, you'll have three minutes.

[10:20:20 AM]

Is Kerry begavich? You will be next. >> I'll be brief. Some of the concerns about vagueness related to things like measuring distances strike me as selective. Police officers enforce traffic laws that are generally vague and require them to make judgments all the time. We have traffic laws that say things like you have to signal a turn 1,000 feet before an intersection. But we all routinely ignore. Officers make decisions about what they are or are not going to decide to enforce on a daily basis. I think that the -- to the extent that you are trying to provide clarity, that's a good thing. I'm actually delighted that APD has a sudden interest in bright line rules for police officer discretion. I do think that you should be careful, though, about

[10:21:23 AM]

not overly stating or thinking that you need to state every single detail about this. I believe that in many respects this debate is being driven by hyperbole. I am also an Austin resident. I've also been here most of my life. I also drive and see homeless people in places that are or are not safe, and I am shocked, frankly, at the amount of sexualization of this debate. I'm shocked that apparently select individuals are seeing homeless people's genitals all over town. I am on all those same streets. I drive past those same under passes and have never seen anything like what they are claiming to see.

[10:22:25 AM]

I believe that these kinds of acts are already occurring and that police have the ability to enforce existing crimes and response respectfully to Alison alter, thank you for asking those questions because nothing that you did changed state law or local ordinance with respect to criminal behavior. So again, we are in a place now where there is a lot of falsification of a picture going on. And I just want to a investment R for myself that as a person who lives and drives and spends my time speaking to people all over town that we still live in a safe city, that this apparent hoards of people behaving terribly are pretty hard to find. And that I would ask that you do those things that you've put in front of you,

[10:23:27 AM]

clarify four feet, that's fine, clarify in these areas I'm going to say I'm in support of the Greg Casar version. [Buzzer sounding] Clarify the things you need to clarify and allow us to move forward fixing the homeless problem. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Kerry Abraham begovich. >> You got it. >> Mayor Adler: I knew I could get it. Emily is on deck. >> I did have a question directed to councilwoman alter around the policing. I live in south Austin off the Ben white, manchaca stretch, and I see everyday people with open containers and public intoxication. And so I don't feel that they are enforcing the laws. They are also running through traffic. And it's nerve racking sometimes almost hitting people even after being very cautious. I don't believe these laws are being even, toed and I

[10:24:28 AM]

don't understand why because I think that causes more public safety to the people that are following the laws. And secondly, I just have a question of, you know, this whole ending homeless is a huge thing and I don't think it's feasible or possible because what are we going to do with the people that refusing to to shelters or don't want to go to shelters? And do we have answers for that yet? Anyone? Or if they are drug addicted, are we going to have shelters that allow drugs? Have these issues been thought out at all? >> Mayor Adler: And you should be speaking to us. We don't really go back and forth. >> I'm wondering if all these questions are -- if people are addressing these questions, but what if they are not, so what do we do with these people who don't want to be rehabbed and they really do want to remain homeless? And so is there going to be

[10:25:28 AM]

a plan of maybe a safe place to put them with facilities that they have access to bathrooms and showers so that they are not polluting our environment and our creeks. And so I just wonder if you all could look at that too. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Kitchen: Thank you for your questions. My aide, Ken Craig, is here, would love to talk with you more so we can have that conversation with you. >> Great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garrett. And then on deck is Chris Harris. >> Thank you, mayor and councilmembers. Emily Garrett, staff attorney at the Texas fair defense project, member of the homes not handcuffs coalition. I want to start by saying there's been talk about money in politics and I want to thank you for what you did in June. You stood up for the constitutional rights of people who don't have resources and therefore all too often don't have a voice in spaces like this so thank

[10:26:29 AM]

you for that. I also just want to -- you've heard theft, assault, all these things are still crimes and I want to say again that people experiencing homelessness are much more likely to be victims of crimes than any of the house people speaking today. And so I hope that you keep that in mind today as you hear this testimony. The current version of the ordinance that you passed in June does say that it's also still an offense to camp if it's not in a way that's dangerous and obstructive. Then I don't think it should be a crime. APD has the discretion to determine what is unsafe or obstructive. I think that's quite a lot of discretion. To the extent they want additional guidance, we think that's fine and support the version of the ordinance that was posted by councilmember Casar. I also want to address some of the things that were said about whether or not APD would need a tape measure to

[10:27:29 AM]

be enforcing the ordinance. Currently they have the discretion to be enforcing something that's obstructive whether or not they have a tape measure, whether or not it's four feet by adding something saying it's per se obstructive if you are not leaving four feet of clearance. That's not taking away any discretion so they would still be able to if they think something is destructive use their discretion to enforce the ordinance. Although I think that the version that we're talking about of the ordinance is doing is clarifying that some things are per se obstructive. They are so clearly obstructive or dangerous we can provide additional guidance to APD. And if we're going to be doing that, I think we need to make sure we're doing that as narrowly as possible. We don't need a huge list of individual streets or really -- really broad rules about what is going to be dangerous or destructive. And I think that the version

[10:28:30 AM]

that councilmember Casar posted does a good job of balancing the need to clarify and provide additional guidance with the need to show commitment to offering permanent housing solutions to folks and I think that we need to just make sure that we're as narrow as possible when we're saying what is per se violating the ordinance. And I think I agree with a lot of the testimony about making sure that we're offering permanent housing solutions to people before we're saying that they have to move from where they currently feel safe. Right now people are going where they feel safe and those places are like under overpasses and sometimes within -- [buzzer sounding] -- The shelter. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Harris. Is Celest Wiley here? >> Do I this any donated. >> Mayor Adler: Give the clerk your time.

[10:29:30 AM]

You have one donated person. Four minutes. >> Great. Thank you for the time. >> Tovo: Mayor, I thought I saw someone else had donated time to Mr. Harris. Holly Kirby has also donated -- okay. >> Mayor Adler: Then you have five minutes. >> Thank you so much for the time. Chris Harris. So before I get into kind of general -- >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. >> [Inaudible] >> Mayor Adler: I have April Smith and Jessica Cox -- no no, Holly Kirby and is anyone else donating time to Mr. Harris? You have four minutes. >> Great. Thank you. -- Four minutes. >> I'll get into the specifics which is I think unfortunately there is a lot of clarity that's very much needed around what was going on June 20th which, of course, I salute you all for. And that clarity is needed for a variety of reasons, but it is important. And so I -- I agree with the

[10:30:30 AM]

phased approach that's being proposed in so far as immediately it clarifies what was passed on June 20th as far as where is -- what is a health hazard, what is a safety hazard? And it's important for our community to know that, it's important for people who are experiencing homelessness to know where they can and cannot be to have law enforcement to approach them and it's important for law enforcement, quite clearly, in order to know more about where they should and should not enforce camping and obstruction restrictions. Within the proposals that are outlined, there are a handful of distinctions and I want to talk through those really quickly. As it relates to creeks and banks, again we generally support the least restrictive restrictions possible. So while it makes sense fully to clarify that it's unsafe to camp inside of a creek bed or a bank, the

[10:31:31 AM]

area right along it, again, as long as there's no hazard that's created by that, I don't support the restriction of camping there. -- Restricting. Fires create a fire hazard, not camping. I do not support restricting all camping in high fire risk areas, only creating fires in those areas. It makes sense to do that. We have a lot of property owners in those areas as well that are free to light fires and do whatever they like. Sidewalks and streets. Obviously do not support overall ban on people sitting, lying in sidewalks and streets. Camping. Only to the extent that it creates a safety hazard. I think the four-foot approach, six foot from doorjamb makes sense as far as restrictions that are enforceable. The examples brought up earlier about changing lanes 1,000 feet, signaling a lane change 1,000 feet, there's a lot of distance embedded into police enforcement.

[10:32:32 AM]

They don't have a tape measure out to measure when people signal lane changes. If they can do it there a road with people going 60 miles per hour, they can do it on a sidewalk. Obviously the distance from the shelters is the main area tough for us. This is a brand new restriction that is something that we don't necessarily support. That said, to the extent that the arch is repeatedly brought up both by folks experiencing homelessness and the broader community as a reason not to invest in more shelter space, as a reason not to have more shelter across our community, it makes sense to the maximum extent possible to ensure that we eliminate that excuse, that we make the arch a welcoming place for folks experiencing homelessness and a place people in the broader community feel safe in the vicinity of. And when to put up signage. I think it's important signage not be put up until an offer of permanent supportive housing is made to anyone impacted in those

[10:33:33 AM]

areas. It's important the signs not go up until we've addressed those that would be impacted by the new restrictions. And lastly on the implementation of category 3, I think it's really important, again, that we -- that this council and this community come back to this topic at the point that we get -- [buzzer sounding] -- To a place we all want to be which is no -- effective zero homelessness in our community. I would encourage you to reconsider those items at that point, not have anything automatically go into place. >> Casar: Quick question for Mr. Harris. You have reviewed the proposal that I posted on Wednesday and then the legal language cleanup by law yesterday to do that proposal on Wednesday on those -- that it seemed to match up in the six areas as you describe with those options. >> Yes, it does. >> Casar: If we wanted to generally hit the six areas that is correct matches with

[10:34:33 AM]

what I proposed. >> I think your proposal from Wednesday is the closest one. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Thank you all. >> Celeste Wiley. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead, ma'am. >> Good morning. I've contacted Ann kitchen many times on may concerns about Joycelyn elementary school. I'm here to tell you that I have seen lewd acts, illegal acts, men expose themselves, drug deals go down, I see drug paraphernalia on the grounds. On the street adjacent to Joycelyn elementary and across the street. For two years I've contacted you, Ann, and asked you to do something and stated that I felt it was negligent on the part of all of y'all not to look out for the children at that school. Within that small area, we have Joycelyn elementary, we

[10:35:34 AM]

have sunset valley, we have Austin montessori, we have Ann Richards school and we have a senior citizens community center on manchaca road. We all want to see homelessness ended, but I'm with you,

Mr. Flannigan, we need a plan. We need a scope of the services. We need to have metrics that we can look at, not just a high dollar price tag. I don't think things will change today. I think you're going to go forward with some of these proposals. But what really disturbs me is there's no setback from any school here at all. There's no 100-foot, half a mile. You need to say you cannot camp within a half a mile of any public school. [Applause] That's all I have to say. We need to protect our children. Thank you.

[10:36:34 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, and then -- hang on just one second. >> I thank you all for being here and this is just an empty box I want to use to illustrate something. I'm coming through this situation -- as much as we can and I'm not going to let any human come here to intimidate these councilmembers today because they've shown a lot of strength trying to get these things done. It is not their fault we live near the border. It is -- city of Austin is the state capitol also. It's not an individual house, it's not a kitchen, it's not a racial place. The homeless people are part of this society. Some of them are. They worked hard for this society before they got sick, mentally ill, veterans. There are many people we are talking about.

[10:37:34 AM]

They are not a dish in our kitchen. They are not a dish in our kitchen. Gotten their own taste of everything going around. It's time for us to think together. It's not time for us to start whining over how we become white and how we become black. Everybody have had a taste. So now I have a solution. It's two dimension. I have a horizontal solution. This mostly with the categories that I have brought four or five years ago and we never paid attention to any time it comes down, that's where we need to start. We categorize these people and stage goals on those categories. The solution is well, we look at the economic game that we get and what they are getting. Which are the potentials. Now, we are going to look at the situation because we don't give them enough to work with.

[10:38:34 AM]

We don't plan to work against the law or the governance which are these people or the society or even the moralists. Who have worked so hard like the man who speak here. But thank you, Steve Adler, for even giving me a chance last time that I came here. I'm going to do good with it and I'm going to bring up a plan and that plan is going to work for you all. You have worked on this so relentlessly. You are just one man and you cannot be intimidated or disrespected here. We're not here as individuals, we're here as a team. Not a team only for Austin, but a team for the state of Texas that own this capitol. Homeless people are not -- some of them work so hard. All we need to create a pattern and a way. It takes ten years. It's not something we're going to solve tomorrow.

[10:39:35 AM]

So please hold up a little bit. Let me meet with miss -- and we can work from there. [Buzzer sounding] >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Heidi Sloan here? And then after Ms. Sloan speaks, is Monica Washington here? Is monk ponca. >> Good morning, Heidi Sloan. I live in district 1. Very proudly in district 1. I worked at community first. I've been there for the last seven years. And I am a member of the homes not handcuffs coalition. First I wanted to say that I am very excited to imagine an Austin where we have a 60-day wait list for housing. And I honestly have no idea what that will look like.

[10:40:35 AM]

And so I think that a recommendation to bring these ordinances back up through city manager before anything like signage is posted is the most wise course of action because I think that will be a pretty different world. Second, I want to acknowledge that you all have been through the wringer since June and I think that that pushback demands that we be very clear when we talk about criminalization and what public safety actually looks like and what harm actually looks like. Because when we negotiate beyond terms of public safety, providing clarity on what exactly that means, we are negotiating a way our ability for criminalization of any people, but most particularly the very vulnerable to be constitutionally and equitably evaluated.

[10:41:39 AM]

Therefore, of the options on the table, I'm in favor of the clarity offered on Wednesday night by councilmember Casar, particularly in regards to fire risk areas where the potential danger is not people but fire. Particularly in regards to creeks, which can be very dangerous, but in a limited capacity; otherwise we would be applying the move out of flood Zones to all entities and not just the homeless. Particularly in regards to sidewalks. Providing a standardized width for passage. I am pro tape measures. Thank you for your continued hard work. Thank you for the vision that you are bringing to this community. I am excited that every person standing here in the last couple of days has said that they are ready to end homelessness in this city. In the meantime, let's get

[10:42:41 AM]

some bathrooms, let's get some trash cans, let's get some storage, and let's be really clear to our neighbors that these outlying problematic situations do not have to do with these ordinances, but that

they can be resolved through other measures. Let's keep in conversation with each other because if there is anything that I know -- [buzzer sounding] -- Is that community actually solves homelessness. >> Mayor Adler: After Ms. Washington speaks, is Seneca Savoy here? No? Yes. Go ahead. >> Good morning. Can you hear me? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Okay, good. My name is Monica Washington and I'm here to evacuate on behalf of the residents of the heights on -- evacuate for the residents of heights on congress located on south congress avenue south of

[10:43:42 AM]

oltof. We're a low-income housing apartment community that serves 172 families. Those families earn between zero and 60% of the area median income. Many of them have been homeless previously or near homeless. But now they reside at our apartment community. We offer a variety of services to adults and children. We have after-school counseling and tutoring for students who are in elementary school. We offer summer programs. So we work very closely with families who are considered to be low-income. This community has been there since 1972 and has served low-income families the entire time and the owner of the community is committed to continuing to serve that very same community. In advocating on their behalf, since the ordinance changed in June, we have had a group of individuals who have taken up residency out

[10:44:45 AM]

front. They are occupying a space that is part of the right-of-way carved out to create an access point to lines for AT&T. But now it's no longer accessible because they have occupied that space. In the past when we'll have dropped off trash or taken up space there, capital metro had the ability to come and clear it out because it's -- they actually have two cutouts for access on either side of a capital metro bus stop. Since then, they haven't been able to feel comfortable or had the ability to clear that space out. For our residents, from a safety standpoint, we've heard from them. Several have said they don't feel comfortable at the bus stop anymore because there are times when there are people there that are barking out orders to the cars that are passing by and

[10:45:45 AM]

they don't feel safe. And I think somebody has to advocate for those families as well. This corridor, even though in your new proposal you've carved out congress avenue, but the area that has been identified is just north of where our apartment community is. But that space is not safe for the homeless persons that occupy it and the families who live there and use the bus stop, some of them don't feel safe -- feel it's safe for them to use that bus stop area either. There have been a number of car accidents along south congress avenue. Just three weeks ago when I was there, a gentleman was trying to cross south

congress quickly -- [buzzer sounding] -- Oh, god. He had to be transported to the hospital because he hit the curb. Ambulance, fire department, police all showed up to help him, one of our residents called -- >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> -- The police to help. It's not safe for them and our residents don't feel safe. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. [Applause]

[10:46:46 AM]

>> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Is Jackie -- come on up, sir. Is Jackie Bouchy here? Go ahead, you have three minutes. >> Previously experienced homelessness. And I've been working on the issue of decriminalization for quite some time as well. The few things I wanted to really stress were that we don't have measurable public health data that would give us a reason to believe we have created a crisis solved by the first two versions of this ordinance, right? The main indicators there are, one, have we seen any up tick in violent crime since the implementation of the repeal, no, no detectable even as submitted by chief of police. Second, has there been displacement. Has citations that normally would have been part of

[10:47:51 AM]

sit/lie or public intoxication, it's easy to find out when officers make a rest, they code if the person is -- the answer is no. This is keeping in mind this is during the summer when violent crime tends to tick up anyway, right? When there's already a defalculty tick, we have nothing. Is there such a large impact on businesses that we're seeing the general economy go down? No. We can detect that pretty easily by looking at zillow prices. People are still selling their homes, and no, prices are not deflating. Property values are continuing to increase. So is there actual measurable statistical data that would lead us there is a crisis? The answer is pretty emphatically no. Can you detect it in three months? Probably not in the effects are small. Can you -- if you make a very large change to those

[10:48:52 AM]

changes you made three months ago, are you going to be able to tell if they are more effective? Probably not. So I would urge the council to, one, take small incremental steps to clarify, and two, to pay attention to the actual data. Right now we know the core problem the previous ordinance was driving people away from the city core, where it makes them harder for them to access services and exacerbated all the problems we saw before. The visibility of homelessness increased during the period of largest enforcement between 1997 and this year and tourism in increased steadily over THA time. I don't think it's so effective people didn't know there was homeless people in Austin. So the question is what do we do. I think the amendment by Casar clarifies, allows us to make measurements. We have very good data on what crimes are associated

[10:49:54 AM]

with homelessness. Forever the most part it's not violent crimes. We know that it's not sexual assault. That takes place almost exclusively with the social networks. [Buzzer sounding] People get assaulted by friends and families. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Steven Harrell here? Come on down. Go ahead, ma'am, you have three minutes. >> I am a homeowner and I live and work in district 35. I've been in Texas pretty much my whole life, since I was six months old, raised in Temple and in Austin the past 30 years. I have a daughter and I am very upset about what has been going on and that is obviously why I missed a whole day's workday and missing work again today. I'm an hourly employee, I'm not one of the privileged people that so many people think all middle aged white women are. I'm upset with the fact this whole issue has been to

[10:50:54 AM]

debate whether or not to fully repeal the resolution, and I think it needs to be repealed because there's a lot of clarification that needs to be made. The proof is in the pudding that there are illegal criminal acts going on and if you don't want to repeal it, then that's fine, but you keep the vagrants out in the open under the overpasses. I have no problem with that. But you keep them away from the schools and the businesses and our neighborhoods. Because the crimes are being committed, lewd acts are being committed, drug use. By the time you call APD, they don't get there to view it and that's the problem. They have to see it. When we pick up the phone to call, the perpetrator has already gone. So it does no good to call. These people who are not seeing any of it don't want to see it. There are plenty of Austin residents north and south,

[10:51:56 AM]

east and west, plenty of color, of all races. It's not a race or a color issue, it's a safety issue. And there are plenty of us who are seeing it. Just not everybody can afford to miss work to come tell you about it. So I think it needs to go back to the drawing board. If the city owns property, then give them a safe camping spot. Nobody is against the true homeless. They need their area. There's nothing -- no one does not want to not help them. But we don't want our children compromised and we don't want businesses losing business because it will lead to affecting the bottom dollar for Austin. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. [Applause] Is Lee Ann Land here? Why don't you come on down. Mr. Harrell, you have three minutes. >> Okay. Good afternoon, hi, Steve Harrell. Where is my tent? I need a tent. I'm a homeless back.

[10:52:57 AM]

I'm back at the arch. The problem is the arch you put 130 guys there. I've been homeless for three and a half years on the streets. There's no confidence the arch is going to help me because I'm the middle class homeless. I'm not sick. How sick do I have to be to get a home. I'm not a vagrant and I'm not a teenager. I'm just the middle class. I don't tick all the boxes. How much longer do I have to wait? I'm back at the arch. I got to obey the rules, do this, do this. What am I getting? I don't like my case manager, I just need stuff. How long are you guys going to put me out here until you handle us, the middle class homeless. I appreciate it. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. Is Phillip gore here?

[10:53:57 AM]

Why don't you come on down. >> Lee Ann land from western trails neighborhood, and of course we've had speakers before me reference Joycelyn elementary and the issues associated with that. But what I would like to point out is that I know there's folks that don't want certain areas to be dealt with as far as the no camping Zones, but let me point out that we have pack saddle pass to the west, we've got manchaca to the east, and to the south kind of this point of the triangle is sunrise church. Let me tell you, sunrise church is a mini arch and I don't think anybody is looking at that. Right across from that arch is Joycelyn elementary. We have seen murders, well, at least one murder, and just this week a teacher --

[10:54:58 AM]

I mean the kids are out there all the time in the park at Joycelyn. This week there were three homeless men, one was sitting on the stones that bound the playscape, and then two were at the picnic table. The teacher approached the two on the picnic table and said would you mind moving because the children want to use this area and the picnic table. She was then verbally assaulted. This man just went off on her. Of course, I'm sure it was very disturbing to her and the children who witnessed this. Okay? And I'm just saying these kind of things I think make south Austin and the area at manchaca to Ben white -- I mean over Ben white a priority. I know we all have issues with where these encampments might be, but this is really serious and sunrise church has contributed to bringing those folks there. And it's very frustrating.

[10:56:00 AM]

And I live in western trails and it is one of the few older neighborhoods in the city that has not been destroyed by people coming in, tearing down our homes and that kind of thing. It's a nice community. It has always been that way. When I got back from college, the first thing I wanted to do was buy a home in this neighborhood that I coveted my whole life living in Austin. I graduated from Crockett high school

and it was important to me, I love this neighborhood. And I wanted to stay safe and I just -- I care about my neighbors, I care about their kids and we've got a lot of new families that do have kids and they are scared. I know they are scared for their kids to go to Joycelyn, but a walkable neighborhood school like that is critical to our neighborhood. And the folks that are moving in with small children and new families. So I just -- you know, don't

[10:57:00 AM]

say that we're being -- [buzzer sounding] -- Special, getting special treatment, but I think we need to really look at that. Thank you. [Applause] >> Mayor Adler: Our last three-minute speaker. Is Chris page here. >> Mr. Mayor and council, thank you for your time. I moved to Austin in the mid 80s and then I left after a couple years and went to Chicago for 26 years. Came back in 2012. It's kind of disheartening to see what's going on. It's kind of sad to see how Austin has changed. Some think it's for the better. I've seen what happened in Chicago. People told me in the '90s Chicago would never be Detroit, today Chicago is Detroit. You've got a host of issues. Homelessness leads to other crazy stuff, drugs, on and on. My real reason for speaking today is my daughter came down from Chicago to go to U.T. I've never heard one psoer

[10:58:00 AM]

talk about the issue over there. She has been verbally assaulted on numerous occasions. I called the president's office and they said if it's at the half center of the street, it's our side, on the other side it's the city, the police. They said call the mayor and call city hall. Call city hall, nobody picks up the phone. So my question to you ladies in particular, in light of this whole issue about sexual assault and, you know, women being abused in the workforce and so forth, why don't these young -- my daughter has been verbally assaulted more than once. This man that talks about only in your net, would, she's been verbally assaulted on the city buses coming from U.T. Down here on second street. I live right around the corner. She's been assaulted on second street more than once. Any of you have a daughter, any of you women, if you want some man to walk up to you and tell you what he wants to do to you from the back side, and you think

[10:59:02 AM]

that's appropriate and acceptable, these kids -- fortunately my daughter grew up and spent time in Chicago. She can kind of handle herself, but there's girls from small towns across Texas at U.T. And they are going what's going on. They've never been around this stuff or seen it. I think it's a crying shame you are letting this stuff happen. The drunks are on the buses, the drug addicts are onist street. You call it homelessness, I call it bums. Drunks and alcoholism and drugs have taken over downtown Austin. You

can clean it up wherever you want, but it needs to be stopped and now. [Applause] >> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead -- I think the next speaker is Chris page. After that Michael Juarez. Is Michael here? No? What about Mario Cantu? >> Over here. >> Mayor Adler: Come down to the podium, please. Go ahead, you have one

[11:00:03 AM]

minute. >> In 16 years of my education, I was taught to be a man for others often to try to treat others as yourself. And I think the same principles are pretty uncontroversial and should be applied here. At no points should the city of Austin codify the privilege of its wealthy corridors by offering them greater or less protection than others. Its policy should not be steered by the downtown Austin alliance, which is consistently advocated to push the homeless crisis that they fueled off their door step. It should implement policy that allows APD clarity and protects housed and unhoused equally no matter where they exhibit in the city. It should be more responsible to the homes and buildings it is creating and protect them equally no matter where they exist in the city, whether they are a new shelter in district 5 or some collaborative shelter opening in district 1.

[11:01:05 AM]

The triage system should be adjusted to resolve as many easy cases as possible so that you can -- [buzzer sounding] -- Focus equivalent resources on the hard cases and put a real dent in the 2255 that are out there. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, sir. Is mark shallberg here? No? What about Lee Ann starky. Come to this podium, you have one minute, sir. >> How long do I have? >> One minute. >> One minute to speak? >> Mayor Adler: That's correct. >> I thought I got donated some time. >> Mayor Adler: You have two minutes. >> I'll make this really fast. I think every one of you have seen every one of my emails so I'm not going to focus on the homeless situation. You've seen multiple Emmitt mails. I want to focus on the affordable housing. If we don't get true and real affordable housing here in Austin, it's going to be a spiral effect.

[11:02:06 AM]

It already is a spiral effect. The second thing is that the future of teenagers and children is in jeopardy right now. We keep this up with the cost of living and everything, you might as well build shelters for child and teenagers are mental health and suicide prevention. Just add it to the side of the homeless shelter because we're going to need a lot of those. The second thing is, actually the third thing is we need to hold property owners accountable for their property. In every part of Austin. When it comes to the lot being vacant, it needs to be boarded, monitored, the grass needs to be cut so we don't provide shelters or off shelters for homeless individuals. This is how we got to this point. And the last thing, it's

probably going to pop up pretty soon, a plan does not work, you have to have an idea, but planning is very essential. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[11:03:08 AM]

Come on up. She has one minute and then -- Lee Ann Starky. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: And then Robin Fox. What's your name? >> Mark. I was outside. >> Mayor Adler: Mark Shellberg. Why don't you come up? You have one minute, ma'am. >> All right. Hello, good morning, Mayor Adler and City Council. My name is Lee Ann Starky and I've lived here since 1977. I've been a teacher -- I was a teacher for aid for 25 years and taught world cultures. I've taken students around the world from Egypt, China, worked in Africa, et cetera. Excuse me. Yes, sorry. The point is, I'm white and I have spent my life trying to pull people up, of all colors, races and disabilities. That's what gives me purpose, that's why I'm here

[11:04:08 AM]

now. I had to retire a couple years ago because I have a spinal cord disease so now I'm a teacher who can barely afford to live on my little pension and social security disability. I'm in one of those places I'm looking at being down on Lamar and 290. That's where I'm looking at. I want to get to a couple things quick. Quit pitting us against each other -- [buzzer sounding] -- And I refuse to accept we have 25% of the people living like they are living now unit near 290. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. >> There's a whole lot more but stop it. Casar. Stop it. >> Mayor Adler: Excuse me, insurance time is up. >> First of all, I'm definitely against taking back the resolution made in June. And if anything, we shouldn't be making any more restrictions on camping

[11:05:10 AM]

because really if we're talking about public safety, public safety as a community, how can we say that it's safe for people to camp underneath a highway bridge? I think we really have to come together and we need to put more resources into these agencies that serve people experiencing homelessness. And one of the problems that law enforcement did Friday bring up was that -- did bring up, how are we going to call these police officers and expect them to comply. I think if we put more resources into these agencies and we have more people staffed in those, then we can call those because I don't think that police departments are honestly the best agencies to really address this issue. And so I think if we're talking about the community -- [buzzer sounding] >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: The last speaker is Robin Fox. Is Robin Fox here?

[11:06:19 AM]

What I would propose is this. It's just after 11:00. We have some folks that want to leave at noon. We have the six items. I would suggest we go down the dais, with try to limit ourselves to a couple minutes each. Also so we can get a feel for where people are. Mr. Casar, why don't you go first, then we'll go Ann kitchen and then Kathie tovo. >> Casar: I'll be faster than two minutes. I'm supportive of moving this ordinance forward on creeks and banks, doing in rather than near. If you are near and it's a hazard, that's covered, but keeping it to in. On the high fire risk areas, just not starting fires. On sidewalks and streets, not naming streets but leaving a four-foot clear zone. Having the smaller distance from shelters. Putting up signage only with permanent housing is offered

[11:07:20 AM]

and having the manager come back about additional work, but only when we have gotten to a housing wait list of 60 days or fewer. And I understand my colleagues that worked on this phasing approach wants us to have the manager start thinking about H to implement this whole thing with a -- with an encampment strategy and I think we should move forward with this and we can write that do direction. When I posted on Tuesday and Wednesday and handed out on the I do I can't say and what the legal department cleaned up yesterday, I would appreciate support. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Thank you. I'll be quick. Basically as I said before, what's fundamental to me is that I think -- I support the phased approach but only if we are going to also adopt an encampment strategy because I think that is necessary to make category 2 real. If we don't put additional

[11:08:21 AM]

resources into the area around the arch, in the area under the benefit white overpass, we will not accomplish what we're trying to do. So I see -- I see our efforts in the resolution specifically to the encampment strategy as necessary to make the ordinance work. So going through the areas with around creeks, rivers, I support. Both in the bed and bank and along the top of the bank and that is for environmental issues and public health safety. On the wildfire areas, I support areas of high fire risk designated by the city. I understand the concerns about lighting fires -- actually I don't think it's more direct. If someone is living and camping in a high fire risk area whether they are starting a fire or not,

[11:09:22 AM]

their safety is at risk. On the sidewalks and streets, I support -- I support -- for sidewalks I think we need to say on sidewalks. Sidewalks are established according to standards. Transportation standards. Safety standards. About how wide they should be and the width that is necessary for a wheelchair, for a

mother and a kid, for people to walk along it. I don't think it makes any sense to designate an area that has to be measured on a sidewalk. A sidewalk is set, the distance it is for safety purposes under transportation standards. And that includes someone -- people have mentioned schools. When we talk about sidewalks, this is sidewalks throughout the city so it includes sidewalks around schools and it's the sidewalks around schools that are important for the kids on their way to school. And so I think --so in my mind those two

[11:10:25 AM]

things work together. In terms of the streets that are mentioned, I support the streets that are mentioned. I also support an alternative that's mentioned that says along high pedestrian and vehicular traffic roadways identified by the transportation department. What that means to me is that we're not just talking about streets in the downtown area. Those areas are important, but we're talking about streets where we have high pedestrian and vehicular traffic because that's where there are safety issues. Distance from shelters. There is language in here about an alternative for the south Austin housing center. I strongly believe that the area that is written in here for the boundaries along the south Austin housing center a minimum. The others don't even take in Galindo school so I don't think they're appropriate. Installation of signs, I do

[11:11:27 AM]

agree with the phase 2 approach, which is the areas that we mention under intersections and on slopes that we need to go through the process of connecting people to housing and putting up signs in those areas. And again, that does not work if we don't go forward with an encampment strategy where we are actually committing as a council, that yes, we are going to do this. Otherwise we're just saying one piece and we're going to be in the same place that we've been with for years. I'm as frustrated as many of you in the audience and many of the people I talk to. We've been trying for years to take care of nears south Austin and we're not good getting anywhere because the bottom line is we have to connect people to housing. That takes a commitment of resources from this council. Finally on part 3, I agree with I think what councilmember Casar said in

[11:12:29 AM]

terms of we have an alternative to put those areas into effect right now, but the bottom line is they won't become effective, that category 3, again, unless we do something real in terms of getting down to addressing our homeless issues. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you. Speeding down the list -- just to back up, when the council unanimously passed the resolution in June to ask the manager to report back on recommendations for potentially limiting are clarifying the

camping ordinance, the manager came back with a memo that outlined different areas of focus, and so all of the clarifications offered respond to those. With regard to creeks, rivers and areas along them, I support the limitation within the banks and the beds as well as a geographic

[11:13:30 AM]

distance. And I think we named it as five feet, from the bank of the creek bed. The clarifications are intended to address health and plate for people experiencing homelessness as well as the general public. I think having some said set back from our bodies of water is an important safety and health concern. Areas of high risk, high fire risk, I support banning camping within those. It is in my opinion, and I would look forward to hearing the opinion of individuals from our fire department if we have any represented here today, it is a concern of public safety to have individuals camping in areas that our city has designated as high risk fire areas were were a fire to begin in one of those areas, they don't have the protection that a house would afford them. And I think it is a high risk appropriation. -- Risk proposition.
>> Sidewalk and streets, for

[11:14:31 AM]

the reason that councilmember kitchen may have mentioned while I was off the dais, we are undertaking this as many of you said to clarify the rules for individuals who are experiencing homelessness who are camping, for the general public and for our law enforcement. And we may need to ask the police department to come up and identify whether this was one of the areas of vagueness that they suggested would be challenging to enforce. But as I understand it, it is -- it would be challenging to enforce the four-foot restriction unless we issue tape measures and then have that conversation. You know, sidewalks are an important part of our mobility network and I believe they should be clear. And I don't support having our police enforce or be guided by a certain foot restriction. I think it should just be sidewalks and provide that clarity. Distance from shelters. I believe we have agreement on all but the south Austin

[11:15:31 AM]

shelter. I support councilmember kitchen's identification of the streets there. You know, I want to be very clear. Category three prohibitions on camping are only going to be enforced once we effectively end homelessness in this community. And there is a measure for that, 60 days on the waiting list. So it is important to me to make sure that in addition to the ordinance that we pass today that we pass a resolution that really lays out our plan for doing so. Several of you have mentioned the arch and you know, it has been -- I want to step back and say homelessness obviously is not a new issue in the city of Austin, nor is it a new issue of city focus. I mean, this has been the highest priority certainly in my office

and in the offices of others on this dais for the time that we've served in office. We have made good strides as a city. We have taken some very

[11:16:32 AM]

important steps and initiatives from the pay for success initiative to the increases in the budget that we've seen not just this year, but in past years. Not as much last year as I would have liked. We had a failed vote on this council to put three million dollars extra into it. We ended up with 1.5. I sure wish we had that additional funding now. I advocated for it, the vote lost. There are many other steps that we have taken. The transformation of the arch, the additional funding for the Salvation Army. Again, our city has -- and our city council, this council in particular, has taken some important strides over the last few years to increase the resources. But it is really clear that we need today to take firm action in terms of outlining a plan for addressing in part addressing what our outreach strategy is going to be. As I mentioned before, we've got a good suggestion from the dak, four options, one of which seems to be preferred to increase the

[11:17:32 AM]

outreach teams and I support that. I think that's what's necessary if we want to have non-criminal enforcement of our camping ordinance. I think the plan that the dark dac fits very well with the resolution. But we have to address the situation in some of our encampments, including the situation outside the arch. I know some of you said there's a situation that should get the first level of focus. Let me say that this is this is not a new issue either and it's not a new priority. So it's very important to me today to put some specifics around exactly how we're going to respond because we can sit and say we want this to happen, we want individuals who are currently outside the arch to be connected with housing. I see Mr. McCormick here. I know you are actively, you and your staff are interacting with those individuals. And as I understood, there

[11:18:33 AM]

are available shelter beds inside and continuing really providing the organizations that are doing such great work in our downtown with the resources they need to continue that work and be successful at it should be a commitment that our council is willing to make today. And I want to say that the arch and front steps along with their partners have taken great steps to transform the way services are delivered at the arch and I know we're going to be successful there, but I think it's really critical that we outline today what our commitments are with regard to providing additional levels of resources that are connecting people immediately with shelter. First of all the outreach services to get the individuals to emergency shelter and then the case management that leads to permanent housing. So I'll leave it there

for now. I'm sure I will have more to add later. >> Mayor Adler: Who wants to speak next? Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: So just

[11:19:38 AM]

quickly because I think that was the intent was to go quickly down the dais. As I said before, I don't think we should be doing resolutions that direct staff further. We need the staff to come back like the downtown community court staff has come back with recommendsings already. I think the high fire risk areas should just be ban camping. I don't think anybody should be camping there regardless their housing status. This isn't in the list of areas, but I don't support the section 9414354 which lists the areas that I believe are the dac boundaries. Where based on my reading of it, it says the entrance and exit of a building, the six-foot restriction, would only apply in that area. And I don't know why it wouldn't just apply everywhere. I would like to strike that section. I'll read it again. 94143 a 4. >> Is there a page?

[11:20:38 AM]

>> Flannigan: It depends on which version you have. >> Nine. >> Flannigan: I have it on page 10. >> Mayor Adler: The one in my hand is page 8 of 11. >> Flannigan: That section where it has I through XI. I think if we're going to do it it should be everywhere. That whole thing. And then definitely support the phased-in approach and the metrics for 60-day housing waitlist. I think that's going to be important. >> Mayor Adler: Do you have a feel for where you are with respect to four or five feet or fires? >> Flannigan: I felt that as others have said, the police department has discretion. They use it on a whole other long list of laws and ordinances. It's not clear to me why they don't feel they can use their discretion to clear the sidewalks of an obstruction right away.

[11:21:39 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Anyone else? Yes, councilmember Ellis. >> Ellis: I will do my best to jump in here. I'm having a bit of discomfort with kind of being triaged into six questions when there's one version of a four page ordinance, another version of an 11 page ordinance. So I'm going to do my best. I am generally in -- >> Kitchen: Could I just clarify. I'm sorry, councilmember Ellis. The document that we put in the packet earlier has both -- as all the alternatives in it. So you have one ordinance that is councilmember Casar's and you have one ordinance that has all of our alternatives in it. >> Ellis: And I've been making notes in the one that I believe you provided and trying to juggle some of the other versions that have come out when I made other notes throughout the week. >> Mayor Adler: I think generally speaking all of them are exactly the same except for how they treat these six things. >> Ellis: Okay.

[11:22:40 AM]

So generally I'm in agreement with -- I've approached this from a fires and floods standpoint. I think being in creek beds isn't safe. Being in high risk wildfire areas isn't safe. Especially if you have no place to go. It's extremely difficult to make sure that we can ensure safety and that people experiencing homelessness with make sure they're able to maintain their belongings in a way that doesn't completely destroy what they have. I am also not really in agreement on calling out specific streets. I see where the approach is coming from and I know that downtown areas and UT have very specific situations that maybe you don't see in other parts of town. But I think that Janie Villareal and Susan had really good comments that if it's not safe to be six feet from front of one door for a business owner why would why would it be any different for somebody in southwest Austin. I think it would be easier for police to understand if

[11:23:41 AM]

it's just six feet from a business exit or entrance, that's something that's very easily understood by all. And I think it also overlaps when we talk about distance from shelters that we have a concentration of resources which from my understanding is a best practice to have one place where people know they can go, but then to say they're not allowed to be near those resources when it is time to access them creates a situation where people are traveling away and having to find travel to come back. And I'm generally sure where I am on five and six. But I -- I may have some more questions too. That's kind of where I'm coming from on this one. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let me see where I am on this and I'll come back to you, Mr. Renteria. Generally speaking, I think it's important for us to adopt an ordinance that gives greater direction to the police force because for whatever reason, whether we would like the police to be able to use the discretion

[11:24:42 AM]

that was involved in the ordinances, it's apparent and clear that is creating enough uncertainty either on our police force or in the community as to what's illegal or not illegal. And I think that it's incumbent upon us then to step in and facilitate that because it's a practical issue for nothing else. On how to treat creeks, it not safe and best for anyone to be camping anywhere in this city, which is why we want to end camping, better places to be. That said there are places in our city that are less safe and more risky for others and I think that the attempt of this ordinance was to make sure we were taking care of the most risky and the most dangerous right away. And that we would be facing it in other places that were still not the best and safest places, but didn't

[11:25:42 AM]

present the same imminent risk and harm and I think that's what this tries to do. So I would like to see us pass the resolution today even if we don't pass the resolution -- the ordinances today, even if we don't pass the resolutions today and come back to do that. That said, I think it's really incumbent upon all of us to actually fund this in a way that enables it to actually work. >> Pool: Mayor, just a question. I thought you had opened it up and told us your position and then we were all -- >> Mayor Adler: I haven't gone through the six things yet. >> Pool: But I thought all of us were weighing in. >> Mayor Adler: I get to weigh in too. >> Pool: I don't disagree with that. It's a matter of order. And I think for the chair to speak in the middle when you had asked those of us who are not the chair to offer

[11:26:44 AM]

our position may be outside of just kind of an accepted protocol. And so I think it would -- I mean, okay, but it feels a little awkward because those of us who haven't yet spoken still haven't had a chance to speak, and a number of people who have spoken a lot have already spoken, including yourself with all due respect. [Applause]. >> Mayor Adler: I'm going to finish going through the list and I'll give other people a chance to go through the list as well. So with respect to the six things, I'm fine with saying the most dangerous places inside the creek. If the police say that they can't do the top of the banks because they can't tell if someone is in a bank or not in a bank and they need five feet beyond the bank in order to actually capture people within the bank, I think that would be important feedback to get back from our law enforcement officers. But at this point I would agree to list it at the

[11:27:44 AM]

bank, but I would want that feedback in order to get more feet to make that more effective. With respect to high fire risk areas, I think what is most risky are people sitting fires in those areas, so in this ordinance I would speak against people setting fires, but I wouldn't take that vast area and take it away from where people can camp right now because I'm not sure what that means in moving people elsewhere around the city. We obviously don't want anybody in a high risk area, fire area. But we don't want people in 100 year floodplains, we don't want people on our streets. So I would concern start with just where there are fires. With respect to sidewalks and streets, I know that the ava limit is three feet in order for A.D.A. Compliance to work. So there's an argument to limit it us justice to three feet. I know that four feet is what we had as our standard sidewalk distance. It was the distance required for someone to be able to be I guess two wheel R. Wheelchairs to pass each other or something like that. So I'm fine with using four

[11:28:46 AM]

feet. I'm perfectly okay with our police officers having tape measures the same way they have radar guns and other kinds of equipment. If our police -- I would have been comfortable with our police just saying, hey, if it's blocking then stop the blocking, but if our police need something that's more objective than that, then I don't have a problem with giving them an objective measure to be able to make that clear. You know, I was one that wanted to be able -- I think it's important for us to identify pedestrian high traffic pedestrian streets, but as we get into it every time we come up with names at this point, we're arbitrarily picking names, I don't think it's right. I tried to use the 2010 map. There are problems with that. So I think in the resolution we should address our staff coming back and identifying those streets, but at this point in time I don't think we identify streets because we don't have a basis to do that. Distance from the shelter, I'm fine with the quarter mile from properties not in the city and the downtown. I'm fine with the three

[11:29:47 AM]

block area that I think we've all agreed with. Putting up signage I think is an important thing to do. I think it should be after we made an actual offer people accept where the manager believes that there's an exigent circumstance or a safety issue and I like that the ordinance gives the manager the ability to just go out now and put signage on medians or islands that are believed to present undue risk or harm, danger. And then implementing it I think that I don't mind us coming back after we get to 60 days if for some other reason that gives us a chance to celebrate and then see what the world looks like then. Who else would like to comment? Councilmember harper-madison. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. I'll start by saying something that has absolutely nothing to do with what it is that we're discussing right now. And that is I really admire being able to be a part of a

[11:30:47 AM]

body of people whose experiences and opinions are so very diverse, but to watch us all work equally hard while we're getting our teeth kicked in. So I appreciate having that. I would also like to say all of this is difficult for me and I think -- maybe to make it less anecdotal I'll point out some specific points of difficulty. How to treat areas of high fire risk. In fact, I'll send this to my colleagues. Have you seen the map of high fire risk areas? Do you know how much of our city that constitutes? It's enormous. And I want to read you something. According to AFD, Austin's historical wildfire and road start occurrences suggest that wildfires most often begin from roadsides and neighborhoods and move into the wild lands.

[11:31:49 AM]

Therefore wild lands are just as threatened by neighborhoods as neighborhoods are threatened by wild lands. So I just really want to point out -- I struggle with any expansion on ordinances. And that's a big one for me. Given my husband is a firefighter, I hear a lot about the job and the fires that they fight are people that have another mental illness, OCD, hoarding tendencies, hoarder houses catch fire a lot and they are big fires with a lot of kindling inside of them. And these are people who risk their neighbors' property as well, but we're not addressing that. So I keep finding myself -- I know that there are people in the room who think that that the intention is to pit us against one another, but you couldn't possibly know how much heartburn it gets me to see a group of human beings clash like this. It's so disappointing. My kids have decided that

[11:32:50 AM]

they're obsessed with this process and they're watching us and I'm so embarrassed and I'm so sad that this is how they get to see us behave because it's not the example that I would like to set. I want us to be able to disagree with one another and recognize one another's positions include where we're coming from. The lady who talked about her spinal illness. I'm so sorry, I know chronic illness well and it stings and I identify with you. The people who are talking about proximity to schools, I have children too. I understand your concerns and I don't think that they're illegitimate. I identify with you. The gentleman whose daughter goes to the university of Texas. My daughter rides those same buses and guess harassed by people housed or not also. I identify with you. I think more often than not our concerns are very similar and there really is no need for us to clash in order to have the conversation. I respect 100%, both my way of my family members who are pd, my family members who are pd, I respect and appreciate more than I could

[11:33:51 AM]

ever channel our public safety professionals so much. And I appreciate that what we're working on here mathematics R. Makes their job a little more difficult than it otherwise would be. And I really want us to get to a place where their job isn't so difficult, but I also need for the community at large to understand that we're not enemies. Council and our police department, council and our ems, council and fd, we work in conjunction with one another all the, even though we don't necessarily agree how to get to the solution. So I think at the highest level I just want to acknowledge that everybody's concern is legitimate. Everybody's -- I personally as a former boxer, I generally never feel unsafe, but that's my personal experience with feeling very able and capable for vocking for myself physically. That's not everybody's experience. So I understand that feeling unsafe can cause some anxiety. And I don't discount the

[11:34:52 AM]

relevance of your feelings. I just want to make certain that as we go through all of these things that we're acknowledging -- like I want -- here's a little exercise I would like to encourage everybody to do. I would like for you to go through this and see how we would consider how to approach it if the person is housed or not housed. Because housed people have a lot of problems with addiction issues, too. But they get to do it behind closed doors and not be under our scrutiny and judgment. So if we're really concerned about drug addiction, we need to be addressing drug addiction for housed and not housed people. So the more that I hear us expressing our concerns, I just want to make western we're taking the same level of consideration about the actual issue, and not delineating between housed people and not housed people. So in so many of these instances here I just can't see how it's not us specifically isolating and targeting not housed people. And it doesn't feel right. So to ask where I am on all these things, as much as I'd like to be able to answer, I

[11:35:53 AM]

just -- I'm still at the -- at its rudimentary level, uncomfortable with us being able to cast so much judgment and offer so much in the way of rigid prescriptions for how people live. I realize we need rules, I realize we need public order. I realize that people's safety is an issue that we need to be concerned about and addressed, especially as a municipal body whose job it is so get cussed out and yelled at and called nasty name, harassed, have people come to your house. I realize we signed up for this job and I realize that our job is to help to create rules that govern our municipality, but I think at the end of the day there has to be some compassion and humanity and respect and dignity for all human beings. And I really just don't feel like we're able to apply those principles, tenets to some of what it is we're considering. So I'm generally just struggling so hard that I would be inclined to just

[11:36:55 AM]

abstain. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: And I agree with you, Natasha. I've had people come to my house and harass me. I just had two days ago a group of anarchists come to my house with a bull horn filtering through my house, you know, harassing my wife, scaring my little dog. I grew up in the hardest, more crime infested neighborhood in Austin as a child. So I knew how to handle those kind. They don't scare me anymore: I'm not afraid. I never have been. When I see a homeless person doing something wrong I shout and scream at them because I know that that's not right and I'll call 911 and I'm not afraid to press charges. I could have pressed charges against those young folks that came to my house and tried to intimidate me on my

[11:37:57 AM]

vote. All I'm trying to do is try to keep affordable housing and we need to work with developers because we don't -- we're not in the business to build housing. And when we're trying to build more density and people keep fighting us and stopping us and now we have these young people competing for our houses in east Austin because they rent these three-bedroom houses for six hundred dollars apiece, they can afford that, or \$800, we're displacing families. And that's what we're doing. And I've worked with the homeless issues for over 30 years in Austin and we're still discussing the same thing over and over and over again. I'm not an expert. I do get frustrated with homeless when they -- when someone is coming down there cursing. I say one down here in the corner, he was swinging like

[11:38:57 AM]

he was throwing punches at people as they walked by. He didn't hit anyone, but he was threatening. He was scaring people because he said, ah -- I won't repeat what he said. But I know the poor guy has some kind of mental illness problem and we need to address that. And we're not going to be providing density and housing for people. The people that are coming in are going to be competing against the homeless people and affordable housing and they will pay more for it. So we need to step up. I don't feel comfortable with none of this here. I think that we hire a person, a professional person, that's going to come on board here in the next two weeks, and I want to give them a chance to -- her a chance to work with our police officers so they can get the resolutions done

[11:39:58 AM]

professionally by professional people and come by and make us that presentation on how we should address this issue. And so I'm not going to be voting for any of these and I'm just going to wait until the - - and hope that we give the new homelessness officer a chance to come up with suggestions and work with the community and the police. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. Like my colleagues I've been listening to the community over the past couple of months. And what I've heard is my constituents want us to demonstrate that we have a clear plan to help those experiencing homelessness so no one needs to camp. So that no one needs to sit around on the sidewalk because they don't have another place to be. They want us to use data, they want us to learn from other cities. They want us to rely on the

[11:40:58 AM]

experts and they want us to tailor solutions to the different situations that the people that who are homeless are experiencing. I'm looking for a way forward that gets us to that plan that, recognizes its humanity of our neighbors, whether they're homeless or housed, and doesn't criminalize being homeless, recognizes that we value public health and safety and provides APD with the clarity that it

needs. I appreciate the work of my colleagues. I know that many of you have been front and center in very different conversation that you have worked tirelessly over the last few weeks to try to get us to that point. But I'm going to have to say that I'm really uncomfortable with this process. I'm not sure we found a path that is responsive, but not reactive. We really need to focus in

[11:42:00 AM]

on the problem and I'm just not sure that the sum total of what's before us is going to get us there in any form. In an effort to comply with the exercise that you laid out, mayor, I will add a few things here. I believe that we need to provide more emergency shelter quickly and I'm interested in exploring whether health south is an appropriate place. We are paying for that building as it is. It is internal. Everything we've heard is don't set up tents, don't set up temporary structures. I don't want it to last at health south, but I need to know that that is an option. We need a strategy for the encampments. How do we move people to better situations. With respect to the ordinance we need clarity to APD and I'm not sure some of the variations and nuances get there. So I will say that I don't want camping on sidewalks at

[11:43:01 AM]

all. If we need to we could say no camping on on sidewalks from seven A.M. To 11:00 P.M. And then people have a place to be overnight. I understand the challenge with the high fire risk areas, but folks who are camping are very much at risk if there's a wildfire they don't have many of the safeguards of the folks who are housed near there. I understand the I impetus for the signage, but I don't want to live in a city where there is no camping or no lying signs. What kind of message does that send to our community? We just need to find a way forward that has a plan. We need to have data. This is a manageable problem. It isn't all on the city to figure out, but we need to find a way forward. And I really do -- I have

[11:44:03 AM]

tried to in good faith 19 this process and where we're going. But I'm really uncomfortable where we are at this point this morning. >> Mayor Adler: Further discussion on the dais? Anybody else? No? Councilmember Casar? Far. >> Casar: If there's no one new, I would want to try to see if there is some consensus on a starting point and in the end if there's not, there just isn't. I expect expected that we might actually move through the six of these, but I know we're short on time. >> Pool: Mayor, I did have some things to say. I thought you were going to speak and I was waiting for mayor pro tem Garza to speak because it looks like she was ready. >> Mayor Adler: I'm going to recognize people who raise their hand. Do you want to speak? >> Pool: Sure. Well, I don't much like how we've gone about this issue either. I think we loosened ordinances without preparing

[11:45:03 AM]

the systems and the services for the obvious consequences. Everyone in this community, everyone must feel safe and be safe. That is everybody on all sides of this issue, but the folks that my staff has worked very closely with, Emily Gare Rick in particular, Emily Mitchell, Chris Harris, thank you for the input you've given to my office. Thank you to the residents and the neighbors particularly in south Austin, but also in my district who have raised their voices and sent us pictures and said this is -- this is not our community. These are not the values of our community. Help us solve this. So everybody, everybody in this community must feel and be safe. And frankly, the job of a municipality is to provide a safe and healthy community for everybody.

[11:46:10 AM]

So I am a process and a procedure and a protocol person that I think if we have good processes we can get to good outcomes. Being clear and deliberate and intentional and compassionate in our language, how we treat people, how we treat issues. So as a person who puts a lot of faith in process and procedure, I will answer the six questions that the mayor has tasked us to answer despite the fact that I don't much like how we've gone about this issue. So safety for everyone, everyone, and ensuring a healthy community both built and natural, both the environment and the structures has to be our

[11:47:10 AM]

guiding principle. On number one, how to treat areas along creeks and banks, I think that should be the in and along the creeks and the banks, theory pairian edges of our creeks are fragile. We have to find ways to protect them. It is not safe for people to camp on them. It's also an expense there an environmental perspective. And our watershed protection staff tell us about that almost everyday. Number two, how to treat areas of high fire risk. It isn't safe to camp where there's a high fire risk. So we should not have any camping in areas where there are high fire risks and we need to double down on that, including making sure that people are not lighting fires in other parts of the city, including under overpasses where they're not permitted now. There's been a lot of

[11:48:17 AM]

conversation already on this issue that we didn't roll back other issues and other laws and other status. And one of them is lighting fires under overpasses. So to finish on the high fire risk, it's unsafe and if

you're camping in a high fire risk area in a wooded area, you are at risk and we wouldn't even know you were there if there was a fire. On number three, how to treat sidewalks and streets, the common practice for municipalities from the git-go has been to ensure safe, unobstructed passage on sidewalks and the city has spent a lot of money moving light poles, for example, to clear passageways because we care about safe passage for people who are not as ambulatory as I am. So it doesn't make sense to allow people to sleep on those sidewalks, and anyway, we can't guarantee their safety on those sidewalks.

[11:49:18 AM]

Three to four feet isn't sufficient, even if it is clear, for somebody mentioned, for example, two people in wheelchairs passing each other. So it's not safe. And the primary goal of a city is to ensure the health and safety of all of its residents, housed or not housed. Where to put up signage. I agree I don't want to live in a community where we have a lot of signs saying you can't camp here. So I'm not really sure at this point how we make that happen, how we manage that. It also would be more furniture in a sidewalk. And we're needing to clear those sidewalks for safe passage. So I don't quite know how to go about that one. And also I think somebody said that we should let the city manager decide where the signs are and what areas

[11:50:19 AM]

are unsafe so that we put up those signs, but we still haven't given any clarity on what the criteria would be. How to implement category three is number six and I would just say we have to have a clear action plan on the implementation. If we're going to do this we have to have timelines, we have to hew to them, we have to be willing and nimble in our implementations. I'd also like to say that I like the suggestion from chief gay to give officers the option to refer individuals to resources rather than calling for backup to do this. It makes a lot of sense for resource reasons as far as the officer is concerned. It's quicker, more efficient and more effective. And so I don't know that we -- I don't know why we're not doing that. So I think we should remove the impediment to allow the officers to do that and make sure that we have clear

[11:51:22 AM]

lines of communication so that the proper resources are chosen and aid is given to the individual who needs it. Previous because that's what we're trying to do. I also support the downtown Austin community court report as well. I appreciate the solid and stolid efforts that our community court have been doing for many years in our community to help connect people who are in crisis. Or who are just be rest to find the resources that they need in order to get better or to move forward themselves. So tip of my hat to dac. I think one of the unsung folks in this whole conversation. We talk a lot about our first

responders. We focus on police. Of course, fire and ems are also out on the streets helping and our community court is helping people get connected to resources and

[11:52:23 AM]

we need to reinvigorate and recommit ourselves to supporting that work as well. And I'll also note that very few of the folks who actually maybe get citations in the past actually went through that and had that citation stay on a record because they work really hard both to direct people elsewhere so they don't actually get any criminal citation and they work at expunging records. Anyway, they do good work. So I support the work that the dac is doing as well as the recommendations they gave to us on a number of occasions over the summer. I think we had it three iterations of a memo with it information and services that are provided approximate. Assistant city manager air ran know I guess this is under your area. And it is three memos that our dac folks sent to us?

[11:53:25 AM]

Or maybe more. >> It may be -- there certainly have been a number of memos and information that the community court has responsibly and in-depth trying to provide information that's responsive to council questions. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Garza: I wasn't going to say anything, but let the discussion start. But hearing people's comments and it sounds like -- I can count five because not having been able to talk to each other and know exactly where everybody was on this until now hearing everybody, I can now count to five, including myself, that is uncomfortable with the process, uncomfortable with the options before us, does not believe any of the options really address in a practical or real sense the concerns. I'm just not sure -- this is the day we're going to decide what happens right

[11:54:28 AM]

now. I agree with councilmember harper-madison, much of what she said. Everything people have said up here I identify with, I see, I feel your concern and your frustration with the process, but I don't feel we're responding in a way that really gets to any of it. And I know so many times we are in a position to have to make a compromise position and many times we don't make everybody happy. Both sides are mad at us because we have to come to this compromise, but this has been such a contentious issue and hard issue emotionally in a variety of ways that I just can't see us coming to -- any of us walking out today feeling good in a tiny way of what change could -- may have occurred. So I feel like we need to -- I know this is not going to make many happy, but we made

[11:55:30 AM]

an incredibly difficult decision. For anyone to think we did this and doesn't understand where you were coming from, that we don't care, it's hard to believe that people think that you choose to sit in the seat and not care. And not understand. And not understand the toughness and the challenges that you will face and the choices that you have to make and how it affects people. And so I feel like -- I don't feel like today is the day to make this decision. I think there's a lot of hard work, a lot of hard conversations that need to continue to happen. It has been incredibly tough for everybody, but unfortunately that toughness has kind of become a -- has been normalized maybe unfortunately. But I think that's where we grow is in these tough discussions and so ecosystem

[11:56:31 AM]

in a place where I feel -- so I'm in a place where I feel like we need to continue having these discussions, working on the -- and I'm not saying that this wasn't meant, but the very first draft of this happened the day we finished our budget. I mean, many of us felt like we were -- it was like I know we go from one difficult discussion to the next and that's what we do, and I'm not saying that was intentional by anybody, but I'm just speaking of the reality of how we got to where we are today. And it doesn't feel right to just do something to say, well, we did this, well, we created a plan. So I guess I would suggest and plead with the community to understand, we understand this is difficult and challenging and we want to get to a good place, but to keep having these difficult discussions because it's not -- I've been in

[11:57:32 AM]

Austin -- I was an Austin firefighter from 2001 to 2007, all in south Austin. These are not new. Those camps on 360 I've been going to since 2003. The issues, accidents along Ben white and south first, I've been seeing fatalities there since 2004 and up until I was no longer a firefighter in 2007. So I just don't feel comfortable making a decision today and I think I can count to at least five that -- >> Kitchen: Mayor, could I speak? >> Mayor Adler: I want to concur, I think, mayor pro tem, with what you're saying? Saying, because I don't think we're ready to do this yet. I do hear the desire in the community for us to act and to have a plan and to be able to move forward. I hear universal desire for us to be able to give our law department whatever certainty they need on the

[11:58:33 AM]

ordinances so that they can act. I hear repeated calls for an encampment strategy or for whatever strategy or multiple strategies are necessary. So I think I concur with you. I don't think we're going to get

there today. I also question whether or not we're going to be able to get there through icss, subquorums of council working together. I think in June when we got together we had tasked the manager's office with coming up with a plan for us using the new officer, but the manager is in a position to be able to speak to multiple council offices and I think that there's a real sense of urgency on this issue. I think the council has indicated a desire to put resources against it, but I'm not convinced as we leave here if we're not

[11:59:33 AM]

going to decide today that we think in terms of ics. But as we sit this is the highest priority for our community on lots of levels and I think that this is the kind of time when the city manager needs to step forward and say these are the issues in our community and give us a proposal on a way forward similar to the way the manager steps forward and presents us with a budget. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I would just say that I understand what everyone has said and I agree with the need to take more time, but here's something else that I think we need to do right now before we do anything like that. We've only talked about one piece of this puzzle. I really think that we need to take a few minutes or more than a few minutes and talk about the resolution. As I've said since the beginning, the encampment strategy, the encampment response strategy is a

[12:00:35 PM]

critical piece. I know that we're all frustrated so I say this not to anybody on the dais. I say this to the folks in my community in south Austin. We have been working together for years to try to do something about the area under Ben white. And while I appreciate taking more time and I think that's important, that does not mean to me to ask our city manager to come back with a plan. We're done with plans. We need to take action. And I think that what we've proposed with the encampment strategy, which identifies the area around the arch and the area under Ben white as an area we need to take immediate, and I do mean immediate action on, I don't think we need to ask anybody whether those are the areas that we have difficulties in. I don't think we need to ask anybody whether or not we should be working to connect people living in those areas to housing.

[12:01:36 PM]

And I would like to have the opportunity today right now to talk about that encampment strategy response and to ask our experts who have -- we have worked with to bring that forward, to come up and talk with us about it. I agree with what everyone has said that we really need to take the time to think through all the changes that we want to make and I'm okay with that, but I'm not okay with continuing to not really grapple with what we need to be doing particularly in the areas around the arch

and south Austin. So I would really ask my colleagues if we could take some time -- we don't have to take a lot of time, but I would like to ask and hear from our social service folks who helped us, councilmember tovo, write the encampment response strategy, and just have them come up and talk to us about that. And then we can move on if we need to. But I don't want to just talk about the ordinance and then say we can't deal with it today.

[12:02:37 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion? >> Alter: Mayor, I need to leave. I'm going to go ahead and leave if someone can just let me know. If we're going to vote then I would like to be here. If you want to continue the conversation -- I had a previous commitment when we scheduled this. I had two previous commitments. I was able to move one, but not the other. So I will be back at 2:00 if you need me. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Flannigan and then councilmember Casar. >> Flannigan: I think it's important to remember that this is not a problem that was just created and it is not a problem that's going to get solved from the dais. There are members of this council and some who aren't even on the council anymore who has been passing resolutions related to homelessness for years. For decades. Did not solve it. We finally get to the place in June where we say -- not

[12:03:37 PM]

even June. Prior to June we told the manager go out and find an expert. Go out and find an expert who has solved this problem, who has addressed it, who has a track record who can get it done. And not only did we do that, we took it so seriously that we had to go two rounds of recruitment to find the right person. And a week and a half into her job we're going to dictate to her how to do it? I cannot abide by that. As the mayor pro tem just said, we just passed the budget. We put historic investments in -- during the budget we debated about whether or not to be prescriptive to the homeless strategy officer. We should not be doing this right now. We need to provide clarity to the ordinances. We need to define that better since the police department has asked us to define it better. But to run out right now and to pass a resolution again

[12:04:38 PM]

when that has been the repeated mistake of some members of this council for a very long time I don't think is the right move today. >> Kitchen: Mr. Flannigan -- >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: I really appreciate folks saying that we need time and I'm good with that time. There was some level of relief that I felt hearing' that people wanted some time. I felt relief hearing that folks wanted time. I've been working really, really hard to try to provide people the clarity that I feel that the dais and community members have been asking for. If that clarity to the ordinance could be provided by the

manager, administratively, or if we need to pass something to provide clarity, I'm fine with that. There's been, and it's no secret, four of us trying to work this out have come from many of the same values, but sometimes different perspectives on these different issues, which has taken a lot of work and I appreciate that. And part of what I have

[12:05:39 PM]

tried to hand out here is something that does not -- because I've heard people have concerns with we treading what we did in June. That does not expand when we did in June, merely clarifies it. If that's what people are looking for, I believe that is what I handed out here. If people aren't ready to move forward on that Teed, that's totally fine. If people want to refine that for another point, that's fine. Or if people would prefer that the manager does the clarification, that is fine. There have just been a lot of early mornings and really late nights trying to do the clarityork that it was my sense that people wanted to see. So what you have here does not expand anything. It just codifies and tries to clarify what happened in June and then designates a small area around shelters, which is my sense of what I thought people wanted in June. But if we want people to take this up in another council meeting arrest do that work, that is fine with

[12:06:40 PM]

me. I'll ask you to look at this because what I did hear many people say, do you know what? I'm comfortable with where we are and we don't need to move forward today. I also heard folks saying I'm comfortable with where we are as long as we are just providing clarity. So I just want to get a sense, if I move it -- if I moved this today the way that it is, that says let's have an encampment response strategy and let's clarify what we did in June, whether there is majority support for that, and I'm comfortable moving forward that way also totally comfortable if people want some time or want to see if the manager can just administratively provide the clarity. Since we didn't get those specifics administratively for the manager, we just got a memo saying, yeah, we think clearance, we think four to five feet and I wrote down four just because I was trying -- I was trying to do some of that work so that we could provide some clarity and just move on from this. So if people want to just do the clarity we can vote this out today.

[12:07:40 PM]

If people want to do the clarity by ifc in a few weeks, here it is. With going expansion of June, save identifying small areas around shelter. But if not, that is -- I was just trying to help. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you. As one of the people who has been kind of working around the clock to try to get these documents ready, on the one hand I would like to have some closure here

today at least temporarily, but I understand the request for more time and certainly I think we would benefit from it. I just want to step back and say, you know, I think part of how we got here is that when we passed the June resolution that everybody on this council supported we asked the manager to come back with recommendations. As I mentioned earlier, he identified categories of areas we'd look to. But the need to provide what those specifics would be were up to us. So I think we all think that

[12:08:41 PM]

our alternatives are providing that level of clarity. So I would say, if we're going to have the discussion, we're going to have the discussion and it's going to be a long one from the different alternatives or a longish one about the different alternatives because we all see ourselves as providing a response to those general categories that the manager identified. I would say if we don't have this conversation today, I would ask that we not ask the manager to come back with a plan. I think we have to have those conversations together in a work session format talking through those issues. And I don't want to respond to the comment, to the assertion that we've sponsored resolution after resolution after resolution and that has been the problem we've had. Councilmember, public, everyone, I don't mean to make it targeted, let me name some of the resolutions. As we talk about some of the strides that our city has taken, they have come from resolutions. That is our job. We're policymakers. Pay for access, create it through a resolution.

[12:09:41 PM]

The density density bonus. It allowed us to change the services, not just housing, came from a resolution. The arch redesign a resolution. The development fees for community first in their last phase a resolution. The women and children's shelter, this is the one that we own that was supported the expansion was supported and opened about a year ago out on Tannehill, that came from a resolution. The money, the million and a half dollars that are allowing the Salvation Army to get a little closer to their operation and maintenance gap and also providing resources downtown, that came from a resolution. We actually achieve a lot. Those are just a couple of resolutions I could think of that I've sponsored. My colleagues have done so as well, sponsored important resolutions. This is the work of the council. So we've asked our manager to come back with recommendations. We asked our manager to bring forward recommendations from different departments. The downtown Austin community court brought forward some. It's time to send those forward. Helps out another resolution that we have initiated to create housing.

[12:10:43 PM]

So I think it's time to have that conversation about how we move forward asking the manager to come back with a plan. I think it's not appropriate at this point. We've asked for that. We've gotten the information and now we need to direct the action. So I concur with councilmember kitchen, I would request that we go through, we don't need to make a decision today or even next week. But I think out of respect for the work that the manager has done and his staff have done in providing us with options and the community members who have been part of work groups offering suggestions by the encampment strong strategy and others, I think we owe it to them to the ideas in the resolution because it's time to take action. Let me name a couple of others. The downtown toilets, the fountains, all those came from resolution. The work of this role is policy action. And we rely on expertise and sometimes that's individual community members who come and offer us suggestions

[12:11:44 PM]

like Steve O who was here earlier. Sometimes it's the -- those in our non-profit communities. Sometimes it's a combination of those like our social security service providers and our downtown Austin alliance who came forward and said we should listen to the national coalition for ending homelessness and redesign the services that are at the arch. That's how we do our work. And I would like to talk through the ideas of the resolution and again, either today or in the future, but I don't want to do it individually with the manager in the office. I think time to direct some action. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem. I'll speak to it after if I get a second, but I want to move councilmember Casar's clarity option. >> Kitchen: I don't have the -- which document are you talking about? I don't think I have that document. >> Garza: I believe it's Casar's alternative. >> Tovo: After agreeing we would bring forward a

[12:12:45 PM]

resolution with all the alternativings and talk -- >> Mayor Adler: There's a motion and a second. Discussion? >> Garza: What's made me more uncomfortable is now a characterization that if we -- if we pass nothing today it means we're not taking action. It has been said a couple of times we need to take action today, but it's also been said that we've been passing resolutions that have been taking action. We have been taking action. This idea that we haven't been doing anything unless we do something today is not true. It is not true. 2015, this is an incredibly hard discussion. This is an issue that -- it has fallen on local governments to fix everything because our state won't help us, our federal government won't help us. And now it's on us to fix it

[12:13:45 PM]

and we think that a decision today is going to be the one that fixes it all? I mean, I have too disagree. I respect the work that has gone into toyed. I respect -- everybody wants to walk out of here. All of our

spouses and children are going to ask us what happened. We've been talking about this. We've been having these difficult discussions with our family, with our constituents, and I just don't think we'll get to a solution today that you can't camp here and can't camp here and you look at people here and we fixed it. That's not where we will be no matter what passes today. So while I think we should continue the conversation, it's been hard, but necessary. If getting us -- if passing the motion I just made gets us six and we can continue this hard work, I think

[12:14:48 PM]

that's the place that I can feel comfortable with right now. >> Kitchen: Mayor, can I speak? >> Tovo: I need to clarify. I was certainly not urging action today on the ordinance. >> Mayor Adler: A second doesn't automatically get a chance to speak first. Councilmember harper-madison, did you raise your hand? >> Harper-madison: I did. I was just going to respond to my colleagues and say respectfully I don't see the of peace of talking through it -- efficacy of talking through it today if there's so much to be done yet. I can appreciate the comment about us needing to talk through it together. I think that's part of the problem is us having, you know, to adhere to the rules that I think a lot of the public doesn't realize we get siloed off from each other and whoa don't know where everyone is on the thing and we don't get the opportunity to discuss it because of open meetings act rules. So I think the opportunity for us to talk through it together is important. I do however want to

[12:15:51 PM]

recognize that -- I forget your name, I'm sorry. She's not here anymore, but the lady who mentioned earlier that she took off work yesterday and she took off work today. She said she's an hourly employee and took off work to come out here and have this conversation. That's a big deal to a lot of folks, right? So I want to recognize that y'all coming up here and spending your time up here, when we sort of talk on and on and on, especially when we know that nothing's going to happen as a result of it, I don't see it as being respectful of your time and I want to be respectful of your time and I don't want you to find yourselves in a place where you're sofa tying R. Teeinged and so sick of hearing us talk that you're resentful of us and not willing to work with us. We do do need to work together. I've heard multiple people say things over the last couple of weeks that made me say dang. I'm coming from a person who grew up in -- like councilmember Renteria, and are in areas where crime and drug and sex work, I saw it all. So as a kid this was my -- I

[12:16:56 PM]

was homeless. It not shocking to my, not jarring. I don't have the same advice real reaction that a lot of folks do, but it doesn't make it so your experience is irrelevant. So I want to make sure that we're

acknowledging their time and not have them be so fatigued with us not getting to the point where councilmember kitchen pointed it out. Acknowledged councilmember tovo pointed it out. We need to act, but we need to act in a way that's productive and thoughtful and to where we're not doing this again. We don't have to get you taking off of work to come back here and get us to deliberate again. I would like for there to be some process that we leave here with the understanding of how it will work moving forward. I think we owe it to them and the folks watching to give them a really clear timeline. Like Dobbs said yesterday you have to hold your elected officials accountable and you have to tell us what your experiences are so we're considerate about what you're going through. So I think they should have a point of accountability to

[12:17:57 PM]

hold us to. Let's work through the weekend, all next week. I don't know what it looks like, but let's give them something to take away if it's not going to be some solutions today, it's going to be a timeline that they can expect for us to adhere to. And then I would like to say and this is not me disrespecting anybody's commentary, but I love my city. So when people talk trash about action I feel a way. So I would like to recognize that for the people who live in Cesar Juarez, nobody here thinks your city is trash. For the people who rich in Detroit, from people, from L, from San Francisco, from Portland, places that have issues that are similar to ours, we want to make sure that y'all don't think that we are inherently calling your city trash because we're not. And that's about all I would like to say. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: So the reason I seconded this, I know there's a baseline document

[12:18:57 PM]

with allover alternatives. This is the vision with version with my alternatives in it. This has been a version that I've had essentially the outlines of posted since Tuesday, the summary of posted Wednesday. So it's been out there for awhile. It provides the clarifications. If there isn't a majority to move forward on it, that's okay. Of course, I know that some of my colleagues may have amendments in wildfire areas or on other things. If we're just able to advance the ball that's good. It's okay. Because we are short on time, I just wanted -- I appreciate folks just checking in to see whether the alternatives that were supported by a variety of the advocates that have worked on this for so long just clarify what we did in June to see if that has support. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. There's a motion and second on the floor. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I want to clarify, maybe I wasn't clear. I said I thought we were going to vote today, but I

[12:19:57 PM]

was very comfortable waiting, especially given the fact that multiple people have talked about the need. I think we have to discuss this all in context. So I'm supportive of the approach of -- as I said, I would like to talk through the resolution. If there's not a capacity to do that today, my interest would be that we do what you suggested, councilmember, and try to come up with a timeline for how to do it together rather than asking the manager to take these disparate ideas and courtroom back to us with a solution. I think we need to have that conversation with one another. And so -- again, I don't know if -- I don't know, mayor pro tem, if you were hearing me saying that we needed to take action today. I was saying I don't want the manager to go off with these ideas because I do -- we need not a planning process that reports back to us, I think we need to direct some action. But it doesn't need to be today. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I would agree that I don't think we should -- I think if beer

[12:20:58 PM]

not ready to vote today on these alternatives, then I think it's appropriate to set forward a process. As councilmember harper-madison and others have suggested, it's very soon, but set forward a process to go through these. Councilmember Casar, I really appreciate your efforts to put this forward, but I just want to emphasize that what you've put forward are the alternatives that you have put forward and I appreciate that but, for example, you deleted the area around the south Austin housing center. That is a critical component of this. And for us to say that we're not ready to go through and work on the alternatives and then put out one that just has one side of the alternatives I don't think gets us there. I think what I heard was that people wanted more time to think about alternatives, which I think makes sense. But I don't think we should -- if people need

[12:21:58 PM]

more time to think about the leashes then I don't think we should rush to adopt one side of the alternatives, particularly when it doesn't address an area that's critical to south Austin. And then the last thing I would say is just this, again, I would really like to talk through the resolution, that's an important component of that we're talking about. And mayor, can we please talk through the resolution? >> Mayor Adler: We can certainly -- I'm not going to be the one that sends us away. My sense is that -- people could correct me. I would be fine voting for clarity because I came in -- because I think it provides clarity. But if we don't do that today I think it is important that we set a work session, that we actually set a calendar and pick a date and we could work immediately to get that day where we put a day to this issue and talk through the issues.

[12:22:58 PM]

Maybe with the documents out there's a way to frame that conversation. But I do think that it is imperative that we act and that we move forward. And manager, I think you should take an active role in that conversation. But if we don't decide something today, we'll get that set. R. For a work session for us to be able to do that. There's a motion and a second on the dais in front of us to approve the deal. Further conversation? Pio. >> Kitchen: Mayor, councilmember alter is not here. We told her we weren't going to vote when she left. >> We didn't say that. >> Mayor Adler: Pio. >> Renteria: I can live with this resolution here. I think it could add a little bit more to it. But including that we do-- when we look at this resolution, we assign this

[12:23:59 PM]

resolution to our housing strategy officer that's coming, homeless strategy officer. And make it flexible enough for her to make changes on these resolutions and let her make a recommendation in 60 days to us. And I'll be happy to support that. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Ellis. >> Ellis: I just want to reiterate my concern with feeling rushed to go through these. I'm really impressed by the homeless strategy officer's background. I think she's got a great amount of expertise in this and I'm really hesitant to try to keep moving forward even though I want to change things too, I want to make sure we're changing the right things. So that we're not coming back again and again and having our police officers have to learn a second, third, possibly fourth set of rules. It's just going to create chaos. And I want to make sure that we are going things that are

[12:24:59 PM]

going to work citywide, that are easy to understand, whether you're experiencing homelessness and you need to find a place of refuge or whether we haven't talked about school Zones. I want to make sure that we're all very clear about what's going to work in our community and I really want to allow our new homeless strategy officer to work with our staff and guide us through this process because -- I'm not saying any other councilmembers do this, but if I were to do this I would feel a bit rushed. That creating a resolution and assuming everything is going to work difficult for me to comprehend. I like information, I like metrics and I'm just really concerned with approving things today and crossing our fingers. I hope that doesn't come across to anyone -- I know the people that have been working on this care about homelessness issues. They are fierce community advocates. Everyone is approaching this from a really good place, but I'm personally

[12:26:00 PM]

uncomfortable archbishop can with putting all my eggs in this basket and praying that it works. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I would respectfully request that whatever starting point we

use for the discussion whenever we get to it is the one that has the various alternatives in it because that would be the more comprehensive and inclusive document that includes and highlights where we have in fact alternatives in front of us. So while I appreciate the extra work, everybody who has been writing on these, has been up really late and working over time in short periods of time, but for us to move forward in a balanced and equitable fashion I believe that we need to work from the document that was compiled that has the alternatives,

[12:27:01 PM]

all of them included. So we all feel like we are operating from an equal place at the starting point. Mayor, if that makes sense to you, please. >> Mayor Adler: I understand you're arguing no, which is certainly acceptable. Mayor pro tem. >> Garza: Mayor, I can withdraw my motion, and I understand why folks are uncomfortable with that, because it goes back to I guess what I was originally saying is even if we took the time to go through any of these ordinances, we have all read them. And even going through them is not going to change my mind that I'm not you know comfortable with them. So with that being said I can withdraw my motion with the understanding, I think people have expressed, some type of work session with our new strategy officer to not dictate to her -- not start with a document.

[12:28:01 PM]

Maybe allow her the opportunity, some time, to assess the situation and provide us with some feedback. Maybe even on the ordinances or just some ideas. So that's what I'll say. If it's possible -- I don't know if you can do that. I forget the parliamentary rules. >> Mayor Adler: You can't do it by yourselves, but you can do it if there's no objection. Is there an objection to withdraw the motion. Mr. Flannigan objects to it. It's still on the table. Further discussion or debate on it. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I'd like to make a motion to postpone the idea. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a second to post pen the item? Councilmember Renteria he seconds the motion. Discussion on the item to postpone? Councilmember, you made the motion, you get to address it first if you want to. >> Kitchen: Most of what I'm hearing from folks is both a desire to take action, but a desire to

[12:29:01 PM]

really think through what we're doing. And I respect that. I also respect what people are saying with regard to the homeless strategy officer and the resolution. We haven't had a chance to talk through it, and because of the way we have to do things with quorums, I certainly understand that people haven't been able to see that what's in the resolution is a product of our conversations with the homeless strategy officer as well as our social service agencies, but given how fast we've had to move and because of difficulties in sharing information, I certainly understand that people have no way of knowing that,

nor have you had a chance to have your own conversations with the homeless strategy officer. So at this point I think it just makes sense to postpone, but what I would suggest is what councilmember tovo had suggested, and that is to owe is to have a tight time frame on that. And a mechanism so that we all no he when we're going to discuss it again. I would suggest that would have to be around October

[12:30:04 PM]

October 17th when councilmember harper-madison is back. And I'd suggest that we probably need a work session prior to the session on actually voting. There's numerous ways to do that and we need to address both the kinds of things we've talked about in the ordinance as well as the kinds of things we've talked about in the resolution. So that's a long way of saying that's why I suggest that we just go ahead and postpone today. >> Mayor Adler: Further discussion of the motion to postpone. Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: Mayor, I get the feeling that folks want more time on this and that's a good thing. I saw councilmember Flannigan object to the postponement so I was interested in his perspective if he's willing to offer it because I want to take that into consideration before I vote. No pressure, though. Just checking. >> Flannigan: I still feel like we can provide direction at least in small ways and define some of the

[12:31:04 PM]

areas where we're hearing directly from our officers that they need some more definition. I think at the very least we can do that today. And I'm fine starting with this alternative. There are things in it that I would like amendments to, but that is just how I feel about it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on the motion to postpone? Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Maybe with that exception, I haven't heard anybody on this dais urging that we move forward today. And so I would suggest that we not and that we use -- and also I believe we represented -- I believe, this is my opinion, that we represented to our colleague when we scheduled this meeting and even in our conversation today that we weren't going to take a vote in her absence. >> Mayor Adler: To be clear we would not take a vote on the issue while she's gone. >> Tovo: Okay. In any case, I think we would be better off postponing action today. Again, I would like to stay here and at least walk through the different elements of the resolution because I think it -- I think it would be useful. I think then we could mull

[12:32:04 PM]

over those ideas in advance of our work session and I think -- I think there's a lot less prescriptivity in it than others. And I would love the opportunity to explain why. >> Mayor Adler: We're on a motion to postpone. Any further discussion? Those in favor of postponing this motion please raise your hand? Those opposed? Mr. Flannigan voting no, the others voting aye. Councilmember alter off the dais. We're

going to postpone what is in essence the ordinance element, which is items 1 and 3. Councilmember tovo and kitchen would like folks to stay to discuss the resolution. People willing to stay? >> Harper-madison: I think I already -- it is absolutely no disrespect whatsoever. My motivation is out of respect for the people.

[12:33:05 PM]

And observation of the proceedings right now. I don't see it being productive. And I also want to echo what councilmember Ellis and mayor pro tem Garza have said about us needing to have the person with whom we've entrusted, you know, our desire to really thoughtfully address this situation be a part of the conversation as we're doing it. I personally don't see the benefit of the deliberation over the elements of the -- included in these 97 pieces of paper that we all have in front of us today. I really, really would encourage us to -- you know, Mr. Mayor, what we could do -- I don't mean if this is appropriate because of how -- I don't know if this is proposed of how we would have to be considerate and equitable. Can we ask them if they see it beneficial for us to do it today? If that's the case, I'm happy to do it. My hesitation is I don't see how it's beneficial to people who are observing the

[12:34:06 PM]

proceedings? >> Mayor Adler: You're talking about the law enforcement officers here? >> Harper-madison: Everybody here. Everybody who has taken the time to be here today. I don't personally see how it's beneficial. And if we can't ask them whether or not it's beneficial to them, then I would rather we not do that today. >> Mayor Adler: I think you could ask law enforcement if they would want us to take action today on the clarifying issues. But I don't think that it would be appropriate to ask just kind of the general public to weigh in. >> Harper-madison: I think what he's saying is the action of deliberating what's before us today, not an action. >> Mayor Adler: I think we'll make that decision. >> Harper-madison: Deliberation, consideration, discussion. Excuse me, it's -- I'm saying us going through this and talking through the items, I don't see the benefit of doing so today, especially when our opinions are so varied right now. I don't see the benefit. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I for one would be willing to stay to discuss the resolution, even if some of our colleagues need to leave the dais, especially if we weren't taking any action, in case it was helpful to have a public airing of

[12:35:06 PM]

those issues. So I would stay with the group. Councilmember Ellis and then councilmember kitchen. >> Ellis: I might have one recommendation. Is that chief Newsome in the back? Could you provide us -- you know, if we're going to be meeting on the 17th about this to discuss it further, could you lay out for us with your department what exactly the difficult parts are to enforce and from a ground level someone

who has their eyes and ears on it, to kind of help us figure out where there could be some confusion or we're not sure what council wants us to do here so we're erring on the side of caution S that something that you and your colleagues could help us kind of work through? >> We could absolutely provide that in advance in enough time for you to consider it on your meeting on the 17th. >> Ellis: That would be helpful for me especially to know where the sticking points are and where we can help clarify. >> Mayor Adler: It looks like the best time to set a work session is going to be the week of the 10th. Maybe we could do it early that week. Check people's calendars.

[12:36:08 PM]

That would get us 10 days before the 17th. So we'll check with offices on that schedule. Councilmember Kitchen. >> Kitchen: I understand and I hear the concern about not taking more time to deliberate or discuss. I would just simply like to ask someone to come up and discuss the encampment strategy. I think we can do it in five or 10 minutes. I would like to ask Darline to come up -- I would ask our homeless strategy officer to come up too, but I don't think he was some able to be here. This is something we had some discussions with -- you can introduce yourself, with -- anyway -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Tovo. >> Tovo: In consideration of what councilmember Harper-Madison has said, I want to assure the public that these are -- it sounds as if we're not taking action today so there won't be a vote.

[12:37:09 PM]

And the conversation that we're about to have is televised and so if you want or need to get back to work or other life goes on, you can always tune in and hear that conversation. And so if that helps, I would just offer that. And I appreciate the opportunity to talk through some of these things. As councilmember Kitchen mentioned earlier, we did share the resolution with our homeless strategy officer, with members of the community, with professionals, including Integral Care and Darlene. And I think it would be variable to have on one while some of those people are in the room to have some ever that conversation here. I see Mr. Valdez from the downtown Austin community court here, if he's able maybe he could describe what that alternative of providing outreach. And then we can use this time today while we're all gathered and we do have some of those individuals in the room to help set up our conversations, our work session conversations around the concepts and the resolution.

[12:38:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: So I think it's fair to say we're not going to take votes on anything from here on out. So we're going to now speak to the dais or pull people up to the podium. I'd just say that in terms of colleagues and their schedules. So you want to talk to us about encampment strategies? >> Garza:

Mayor, I'm sorry. I moved a lot of stuff today and because we're not taking action, I have to go and try to go do some things. But we will watch the video of the information. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Understand and that's why I wanted to make clear it to anybody we wouldn't be making any votes now. Go ahead. >> Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity. My name is Darilyn Biler. I understand why it's difficult to pronounce it. I'm the director for Integral Care and also the chair of the downtown Austin community court boards and commissions. Really appreciate the opportunity I had written a statement, I will read it

[12:39:11 PM]

and I'm open to answering any questions that you pavement. As the local [indiscernible] Authority, Integral Care exists to create a community where individuals living with mental illness, substance use disorders and intellectual disabilities have an opportunity to thrive and reach their full potential. We understand that that is very difficult to accomplish while individuals live on the streets. I'm -- we are here to support the resolution to develop an encampment response strategy to address the needs of individuals living around the arch and around Ben Ben White Boulevard. We appreciate Council's commitment to address encampments not through criminalization, but by connecting individuals experiencing homelessness with services and housing while partnering with health care providers like us at Integral Care, another key homeless service providers to address the conditions on the streets. We believe that to effectively and

[12:40:12 PM]

compassionately address encampments, an organized encampment response system is essential. A key to the success of this process is to collaborate closely with our law enforcement partners, encampment residents, neighbors, property owners and other city departments to ensure individuals are connected to treatment, basic needs and alternative places to go, including housing. We recognize that these encampments pose a health and safety threat to those who stay there and an environment where people can't fully address their health care needs. For too long people have been presented a false choice that we can either prioritize safety or help with compassion. We believe that this strategy can do both so long as we listen to our neighborhood residents and very important, including those neighbors experiencing

[12:41:13 PM]

homelessness. Hear the concerns of advocates and work together as one community. I understand that this is a very difficult issue and the resolution you have in front of you is pretty open with the intent that the new appointed homeless strategy officer will convene a group of stakeholders including Integral Care

at the local mental health provider. To bring the essential elements and how that will be moving forward. We support the efforts as we are facing a public health crisis and doing nothing at this point really should not be an option for us. I recognize that today is not the day, however we encourage all of you to please consider addressing the encampments in an organized way with a strategy that is moving us

[12:42:15 PM]

forward. It is really difficult for us as providers and for us as a local mental health authority to continue to address the needs of individuals experiencing homelessness if we don't have a systemic way to move the needle in our community. Thank you. I'm open to answer any questions you may have. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions. Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Thank you so much for being here and for all the work that you do each and everyday. I wondered if you could describe the kind of work that happened outside the arch during the pilot project and the way in which that was kind of a mini encampment response strategy and just lay out what the process was in that setting. I think you captured that that the description in the resolution is intended to voice support for that strategy and the process without being prescriptive about how it would be implemented and who would implement it. If you could describe the pilot in terms of the by name list and how that operated.

[12:43:15 PM]

>> So this would be the second time for us to come up with a system, with a strategy to address this need. Approximately two years ago we came together as a community to develop a pilot to address the encampment around the arch and it brought many of us together including law enforcement who was an essential component to this pilot. The pilot had some success, however, the pilot did not eliminate or decrease by much the number of saids camping around the arch because we did not have additional resources set aside to address that initiative. The pilot pretty much move existing resources to provide collaboration with limited resources. And western able to assist many and we created a by name list and we met on a weekly basis and actually, councilmember tovo, used to

[12:44:17 PM]

join us every week to have the discussion and create alternatives. However it was really difficult for the community to fully address the issue around the arch because we didn't have additional resources assigned and we did not have additional resources allocated to assist individuals with housing placement. >> Tovo: Thanks very much. Would you explain what a by name list is? I'm not sure if everyone knows what that is. >> The by name list is a process by which a engagement staff will engage individuals outside and get to know them. All about getting to know individuals, who they are, where

they come from and identify their level of need. And based on that by name list the team would gather together and review the cases and develop individual service plans for each person. And this is a strategy that has been used across the country and has been tried with great success when the

[12:45:19 PM]

resources necessary are attached at the end of that by name list. >> Tovo: Thank you. And by resources I think you're saying you need number one shelter and then the kind of case management that helps that individual get into permanent housing and some of the support and housing assistance that would make that housing possible. Are those the resources that you would identify as necessary in this situation? >> Yes. We have an ability to assist individuals move into housing if we have the resources dedicated. And we need case management, we need additional mental health supports, substance use is a major issue for this community. And if we're looking at individuals around the arch, approximately 75% of those individuals are struggling with substance use condition. So it is extremely important for to us ensure that they have access as they choose and are ready to engage in treatment. And of course, the housing

[12:46:20 PM]

at the end. That is the solution. >> Mayor Adler: I have a couple of questions. And thank you so much for the work that you do and it's critical in our community now and I'm excited that more now than ever before we haven't community focused on doing what we need to do in order to be able to end homelessness in our city. And now basically you and your organizations play a really critical role. The by name list, do I understand that correctly, that's where you actually -- you look at that community of people and you recognize that each one of them may need a slightly different housing strategy, but you work with each person, you bring in the housing resources, the service support, and you actually go through the list virtually like one at a time on a weekly basis until you've been able to place everybody in a better, safer place. That's what the by name list is, is that right?

[12:47:20 PM]

Roughly. >> Correct, yes. We have seen systems like this work really well when we create a strategy. We created a by name list to-- and veteran homelessness. We have a by name list. >> Mayor Adler: That was my point. In this city we've already done that. >> Yes, we have. >> Mayor Adler: We did that. That's what we did with the veterans. We identified who they were, we put their names on a list, os met weekly to locate them. We would say at the end of the week, okay, we have four more people that are ready for our apartment. Let's go find an apartment for these four people. We brought in the apartment association and the real estate council. We worked through that list and we did it successfully here in this town. Is that correct? >> Yes, we have. And we're moving through the same process with lifeworks

who is bringing us together as a community to -- to address youth homelessness. >> Mayor Adler: And that's working successfully. It's gotten half of the

[12:48:21 PM]

children experiencing homelessness off our streets last year alone and that effort continues. I want you to know that I support what you said about doing that in the area around the arch. Because I think that's important for us to do. I also support it on the camp underneath the overpass at manchaca. Because I think in part it's important for us to be able to demonstrate to the community at large, the city at large, that we have strategies and approaches that work so that we can actually bring some hopelessness -- some hopefulness into this situation. So I think it's really important, and I'm not sure that there are going to be more visible places to do that than around the arch and at the manchaca overpass. So I support those. Here's my question. Beyond that we have encampments all over the

[12:49:24 PM]

city. Should we be focusing just on encampments. Should we be adopting an encampment strategy where our focus on the city now is just going to be -- let's deal with encampment after encampment after encampment. Is that a recommended best practice? >> We need to make sure we develop a short-term strategy as we continue to expand our resources to meet our long-term strategy. And that's creating deeply affordable housing. It would be very important for us and I know that all of us providers really want to have stayed at the table with Lori, the new strategy officer to ensure that we develop the short-term strategies and the long-term strategies. The short-term strategies should be assessed and evaluated to ensure that those are working before we move forward with expanding

[12:50:26 PM]

this type of strategy. An example of that, if I may may, we have seen similar strategies work in our cities. Philadelphia had an encampment strategy that started with two camps and then from there they moved to four camps. And they continued to develop systems to address encampments after that. And of course, we would need to develop something that works for us in our community that is Austin. It's not like we're implementing something from someone else. But it needs to be assessed. The system has to be assessed and reviewed and evaluated before we move into another encampment. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. And in fact, Philadelphia had that really good example. Orlando also had a successful encampment strategy that our new homeless strategy officer was involved in. And I understand and learned this weekend that Minneapolis executed a successful encampment strategy run by our brand

[12:51:28 PM]

new department city manager who hasn't started work yet, but I think starts work on November first. So I'm really excited about us initially being able to have those proof of concept issues doing what we already know works in this city because we've done that in essence with our own quasi encampment that the community of veterans and a quasi encampment of the community of children and youth but learning more from Philadelphia and Minneapolis and everywhere. But I join with my colleagues in saying it's something that we need to implement and fund and resource, you know, the initiation of that, at least in the arch and perhaps another place. As we discussed in order to be able to show the

[12:52:31 PM]

community in a very visible way that these kinds of things work. Thank you for everything that you do. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, thank you, and I appreciate the questions that mayor and councilmember tovo asked. So I understand the two recommendations are the arch area and the area under Ben white. The area at the manchaca intersection is an important area, but it's not the only part of that area and in my understanding from our discussions earlier this recommendation is that whole area, the Ben white bridge. I know we've talked about that. I know we just wanted to clarify that so the folks -- the folks that are here from south Austin and can understand that that's the whole area that we've talked about being a priority. >> Sure. I think to put it into condition text, integral care last year served 4,000 individuals experiencing homelessness. Of those we were able to

[12:53:31 PM]

move about 560 individuals into housing. We have teams that are out in the community and providing a encampment services, case management, mental health and substance use treatment. We have been providing services around the arch, in the arch and the Ben white area for quite some time. The reason that we suggested and recommended those areas to be the priority areas is because we defer the areas where we are seeing the largest encampments and the areas where we could have more effective impact. Once those camps are addressed we will have then the opportunity to move to area areas of the industry as part of the strategy. But to your point those are the areas that we're seeing the largest concentration of

[12:54:32 PM]

individuals experiencing homelessness and also complex chronic health conditions where we are having to respond to. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: So that I understand, there's -- it may be that it's the pathology of what it is that you're doing dealing with out on the ground. The area area at manchaca and it seems to me that there are people camping on unsafe situations, on islands and medians, the cars going by on the Texas u-turn are very close to them, other traffic going past them. I'm concerned about their safety, I'm concerned about the things they have being that close to traffic that's moving at a pretty rapid speed. So to my untrained, unprofessional eye, which is why I don't want to make any of these decisions, that just looks unsafe to me.

[12:55:32 PM]

And then there's the transit area that has the bus stop area. And then there's another area that's past that that goes out to Lamar. And it's relatively flat and it's covered. I was throughout a week ago and I probably saw about 10 people throughout in that area. And it looked to be relatively safe. I mean, it was flat, it was covered, it was sheltered. Is that the area that you would be prioritizing? >> So I think it's important for us to -- before we determine the areas to be prioritized to come together with providers to determine what are the areas that make more sense. There are approximately 100 individuals around the Ben white area. And we have about 100, 150 around the arch. So that would be close to 250, and it depends on the

[12:56:38 PM]

fluctuation and it depends on what is decided through the ordinance where the movement is going to take place. But the Ben white area I would say we have about 100 individuals. And if you're asking in terms of our support, we will continue to support that entire region because we know that that is where we can surge and provide services of highest impact. It would be hard to only move and say okay, only this section abuse people will move. If they know that we are providing services only to one small section, that small section will get really crowded really fast. So we want to -- we are proposing to tackle the entire area around the Ben white and the perimeter of the arch. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Further discussion?

[12:57:40 PM]

Thank you. >> Thank you so much for the opportunity. And thank you for all the work you're all doing. I know this is a very difficult conversation. And your commitment to addressing and end homelessness. I appreciate it. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Were there other people you wanted to bring up too? >> Tovo: [Inaudible]. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Ellis? >> Ellis: No, I think that was really helpful so I appreciate kind of opening that dialogue and being able to hear from her. That was helpful. >> Mayor

Adler: Could I have -- would you come down, chief? I know you've been asked to come back with stuff too, but just so that -- just a couple of things I wanted to talk to you about so that I -- so that I can think about these things over the coming weeks. I really appreciate councilmember Ellis asking for everything we can do to

[12:58:43 PM]

define things in specific objective ways. I mean, I recognize the reality of the situation. It's a tool we took away from police officers is the ability to be able to take an enforcement action for someone that you had not seen create a public safety risk or a public health hazard. When you see those things you can still take action. What we took away was the ability to be able to enforce again against someone when you did not see that. >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: And my sense is that the community or at least a strong majority of the dais believes that's the right policy. That we shouldn't be enforcing against somebody for a different crime by creating a crime that we can enforce in order to get a crime that we couldn't enforce. We want to try to create that universe of crimes we can enforce because we want to enforce those crimes.

[12:59:43 PM]

So I know that we have a lot of people that come up to say there are crimes that you can't enforce because you are not there when they occur. And that's because of a state law, not a city law. Is that correct? >> [No microphone on] For a misdemeanor charge, not involving family violence, we have to observe it in order to arrest for it. Felonies, breaches of the peace, we can take action immediately. You know, if somebody said you say you are robbed and we show up and that's the person that did it, that was a felony offense, we're able to make an arrest at that time. But things like urinating and defecating and littering, if we don't see that happen, then we cannot take enforcement action against it. >> Mayor Adler: But that didn't change. >> The state law has always been that. >> Mayor Adler: One of the questions we had is you used to be able to -- you could still take an enforcement

[1:00:44 PM]

action because they were sitting there or lying. You can take even enforcement action. >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: So you don't need that tool anymore. I know that there was some question about whether if someone videotaped something in today's technology world, whether that's something that maybe the policy of the department have or could change. >> So just recently we're in the process actually of looking, city legal has provided a list of case law that has come about in recent times. The rule that I talked about was written in the '60s, I believe. Rules have changed and court cases have come along recently where video could act in the place of officers' presence in certain situations. That's something

we're still freshing out. We haven't finalized our review of that, but that is something that's possible and on the horizon. >> Mayor Adler: That would be good, and if there's anything we can do from a city ordinance standpoint to

[1:01:46 PM]

clear that or make that something that you can use as a tool, you know, let us know so that it's something that can be considered on this dais. >> Okay. >> Mayor Adler: In the conversation that you had earlier, you talked about the enforcement component of the ordinance that was discussed. And the ordinance was written in a way that said, first you have the right to enforce our ordinances, which means if someone is breaking the law, if they are urinating, defecating, masturbating, whatever it is, it was against the law create a public -- whatever it is, you have the right to act. It went further to say that if it was reasonable for you to bring in someone else that could intervene in a noncriminal way, then you should do that. I think all the language said if it was reasonable, you can do that. If it's not reasonable, then it wasn't a requirement for

[1:02:47 PM]

you to do. >> Sure. >> Mayor Adler: You had said that if you couldn't get the voluntary compliance, if you brought in a host team and an officer arrived, why would that officer be able to get compliance where you couldn't. And it may be that the host team is the wrong went it to bring in. I know that -- wrong entity. I know Miami and other cities have created other teams. We have community paramedics who are not officers. So it's possible for a city to create, you know, a literal -- hundreds of resource folks that could be navigators or interveners that wouldn't necessarily be one of the two police officers on a host team. But that's not on you, that's on us. I mean to the degree that you as an officer -- I don't mean you, but our force, as

[1:03:47 PM]

officers are out there and they see somebody and say this person is violating the law, I'm happy to have a nonjudicial intervention, you call a number and they are not home. They are not there. They are not -- it's not working hours, whatever that is, it becomes unanimal for you to wait, you do what you need to do or if it's an ex time donated scent circumstance and you can't even make the call. Because of the circumstances it wouldn't have been reasonable to make the call, you don't have to do that either. But then it becomes on us. If we're not supplying, funding and resourcing the increase of the downtown Austin ambassadors or whatever it is that is determined to be the right strategy going to the point that my colleagues have made, that's a resource question and that's on us. Somehow there's got to be a way to track the data, not in a check -- a check-off

[1:04:48 PM]

way so when we're compiling the data, no one has to go back and read all the reports so it can be just done electronically so that we make it as easy as we can, but some kind of feedback loop on the council that says we are underresourced ING this intervention that we want so people can look at us and say hey, it's not law enforcement part, they are happy to do that, ready to do that, even anxious to do that, but we haven't supplied the resources. So we have host teams then that need to be on 24/7 or that becomes on us. So we have to get that data to make sure. On the tape measure question, and you know I've had conversations with the chief about this too. >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: I know that if we set a distance of four feet or five feet she it's easier to say you can't

[1:05:49 PM]

be out on a street, and I understand that. But is it better for us to say there has to be four foot of clearance or five foot of clearance or whatever we say than it is the language we have right now that just says you can't even reasonably block or impede access? >> It's better than the language now. The most legally enforceable and defensible language is just sidewalks, that you can't be on sidewalks. You know, if you look at a person laying there, you could make a guess that it's less than four feet. My point earlier is can you stand up in court when that ticket goes to court and clarify and certificate and swear to the fact that the person was violating a law when you didn't measure it. And so if you don't measure it, it could lead to court challenges later. And then you don't know. You arrest a person for what you think is two feet of space and when you search

[1:06:49 PM]

them you find crack cocaine in their pockets. That case is going to be thrown out if you can't point out to the four feet. So it just creates -- >> Mayor Adler: How intrusive is it to ask the police officers to have a four-foot tape measure? >> We've never done it. You know, I don't know -- it's one more piece of gear. It's not something that's traditional that we would have and so it's kind of hard to say standing here if it's obtrusive or not. It's just not normal. >> Mayor Adler: And I understand that. And we would, if we did that, we would be setting something up that would be new, but it doesn't even have to be like a metal tape measure. You could just have a fewer-foot string that you could just see whether or not it was four feet. It would be a four-foot string from knot to knot and would be relatively easy, I would think. >> It just seems somewhat impractical when you have 1,000 officers at different times of day, some on bikes,

[1:07:50 PM]

horses, in cars, you know, unless we issue the exact same piece of equipment to every person, are they going to have it. Obviously we -- we can figure out anything that we're tasked with, but the best solution is just sidewalks, period. >> Pool: Mayor, can I just comment on that one specific piece that you are talking about on the four-foot measurement. >> Mayor Adler: Before I move to a different topic I'll come back so you can talk about the four-foot thing as well. And I understand that it's easy to say on a sidewalk anywhere, but that runs us into the same policy issues. If I could have a 20-foot sidewalk and somebody sitting on a 20-foot sidewalk, clearly not impeding everything, it begins to look more like the old law where I'm going after that person for sitting on a sidewalk on three feet of a 20-foot sidewalk. Not because that was really a problem, but because I'm concerned about something else.

[1:08:50 PM]

If I'm really concerned about access and impeding, then having some kind of standard that really relates to access or impeding might make sense. And so if you could also think about it, if we had a four-foot deal, I mean literally it could just be a spring that was put in somebody's pocket that they could test, I would like you to think about ways we could do that to minimize the disruption. I recognize that would be a new thing. >> Yes, sir. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I just wanted to say that I can imagine a situation where is officer seizes someone close to the curb and they are not four feet away from the street and they get the string or metal ruler out and start trying to measure it and that person moves. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Pool: And then you will have a fairly comical situation where the officer will be trying to measure four feet and the person who

[1:09:53 PM]

they are targeting or trying to measure keeps moving. It would become a game and people will game it. And so this is why having on the one hand some prescriptive solutions, it makes it so difficult and that is what government struggles with all the time. >> Sure, yes, ma'am. >> Pool: I would say if we do that, if we have a measurement and try to provide a ruler or some kind of tape measure that we are setting up a situation in our community where it will become a game, it will become comical and it will in fact not provide the level of public safety and assurances that I think we are actually trying to get to. So I would urge that we move off of that particular strategy and look for something that's a little bit more recognizing of what it is we're -- that we're working with people. >> Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: One of the other issues that you raised that was creating

[1:10:54 PM]

difficulties for officers were their belongings. I mean, what to do with belongings. Because right now you indicated there's insufficient equipment to be able to deal with belongings and doesn't sound like something that we have done a lot of. In the city. >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: There are other cities dealing with homelessness challenges that are well beyond our sophistication with respect to storage and the like. And again, I think that's one of the things that's on us. And I know that, you know, my colleagues and I on the council have discussed really needing to be able to deal with that. I mean, there are other cities that provide storage facilities for people that are experiencing homelessness. Provides a place for those things to go. It also sets up the system so that when you are ever in the position where you have moved somebody or you have

[1:11:54 PM]

for whatever reason taken possession of their things, there's a place to put it other than in the evidence room. >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: At the police department, which seems like a wholly insufficient and inappropriate thing to do. >> Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: But I think that's on us trying to come up with -- it's one of the things we mentioned in the resolution in June was asking for strategy for storage. Not only for what happened -- it's all the reasons you need storage. Somebody who is on our streets and never presenting any kind of challenge to anybody so he or she has a safe place to keep her things. But as well as in the situation where we established the protocols for what does it mean to move folks. It's real apparent from looking at other cities that quickly there are going to be organizations that will be challenging us as a city no matter how we treat possessions. So we want to make sure

[1:12:55 PM]

we're doing it in a way that honors all -- everybody's rights and privileges, but also our responsibilities in the city. We want to make sure that whatever we do we empower the force. It's -- it's just really important that everybody in our community never question the safety in our community or our ability to be able to enforce our laws or the -- or any of that stuff. And I want you to know that I want to do -- and I know my colleagues want to do everything we can. >> It's well known and we appreciate all the conversations about this whole process. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen, then councilmember tovo. >> Kitchen: Just a quick comment, not for now, but on the issue of the sidewalks, I think when we have later

[1:13:57 PM]

discussion, I think I'll want to ask our transportation department to speak to us when we have that conversation. For me there's two issues related to the sidewalk. One of them is the -- you know, how to measure enforcement that we've just been talking about, but the other issue just has to do with the

transportation safety standards that we have in place. That relate to how wide a sidewalk needs to be for a pedestrian use. And so I think our transportation folks can speak to that. >> Mayor Adler: That would be great. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I wanted to also just express my appreciation because I know you've been in the midst of so many of these conversation and so much of the productive action. I just wanted to also -- I'm not sure if Mr. Valdez is able to -- or if there are any more questions. >> Mayor Adler: No. Thank you very much. >> Tovo: I haven't had a chance to read through as thoroughly as I want to the memo that you supplied us with earlier this week, but

[1:14:57 PM]

I know that there is a substantial section about storage, but also about outreach and some of the brainstorming that you all have done and identification of alternatives that would -- that would respond to this question. I wondered if you could talk us through those two pieces. I also know and I think it's embedded within your memo that our public health department is working really closely with our providers to identify places for day services and some of those day services are going away at the arch, and it was my understanding they were pretty close to some solutions for individuals who needed some of those day services. So if that's something you have information about too. So I guess that's three components. One would be outreach and what you have been contemplating in terms of ways you could expand services so outreach teams are available a broader variety of time including 24-hour -- you know, more

[1:15:57 PM]

hours in addition to weekends. Secondly the storage piece, and third if you have an update on the day services, which is really public health, but I bet you are aware. >> Sure. Good afternoon, Peter Valdez, community court. Regarding the storage, I'll answer that one first. With the funding that was approved in the budget for social service contracts, we plan to issue a rfa asking for proposals for storage solutions. We see that as one of our priorities because we've been hearing so much about the need in the community. And also due to our involvement with the homelessness advisory committee, that is one of the things that we hear a lot from them as well is that need for storage. So we are hoping to get proposals for that, and we're planning to issue that request for applications in

[1:16:58 PM]

November or late October. Regarding the outreach, so we envision sort of an extension to what host does without the -- the ems component, but in conjunction and working with APD. So being a tool for APD 24 hours a day, seven days a week, where we would -- we would be the contacts for APD if they have somebody that was not willing to comply and needed motivation or a clinical approach to -- >>

Kitchen: Mayor, we can't quite hear with you all talking. >> Or required a clinical approach to motivation. So -- and we're not plan to go address crisis situations. This would be proactive engagement where these teams

[1:18:00 PM]

would frequent our jurisdiction and develop relationships with the individuals that are being seen in our jurisdiction. Again, being a tool for APD for individuals that aren't willing to comply where there is an issue with obstruction or camping. To that, once we did engage, then we would connect them to our in-house case managers who would work with them on -- to connect them to the continuum of services that we already have and ultimately connect them to housing. So that's our -- that's our plan for the outreach or our proposal, rather. >> Tovo: And that is -- thank you very much. I mean I think that is exactly the kind of strategy that's outlined in the various versions of the noncriminal enforcement. That outreach piece is the one that we really don't have enough of right now.

[1:19:01 PM]

And so as I understood what you were just describing, that would be more or less kind of like a host team, some teams that look like host team without the paramedic and without law enforcement. They would be the caseworkers. >> Right. It would be definitely the clinical portion of the host team, which integral care currently provides. But it would be where -- the teams would be out in the community full time and they would be working with the individuals whether or not APD was contacting them for assistance. But they would also be available to APD if somebody was not in a crisis and not posing a threat, but just could use some motivation to help them comply with the ordinance. >> Tovo: Would you need more financial resources to have -- to make that expansion and if so what? And as I understood your

[1:20:03 PM]

memo, though I was reading it quickly, that seemed to be the preferred option versus extending the hours of the dacc and some of the other options that were considered, that this seemed to be the alternative that was being recommended. >> I would say given council's desire to stay away from criminal remedies, I think that this would be the best noncriminal remedy and the best approach to helping individuals get connected to services as opposed to citing them or arresting them. >> Tovo: So from this council, you would need a commitment of additional resources, I assume. >> So we would -- yeah, to develop the team, yes, but keep in mind also that once they start referring people into our in-house case management, we would also need to expand that. Because even with the additional two

case managers that we're getting on October 1st, we still have a wait list of over 50 people. >> Tovo:
And I'm not sure

[1:21:03 PM]

that I saw estimates of costs in here, so I think in preparation for our work session about this issue, city manager, I would -- I think that it would be helpful to really look at some numbers, unless I've missed it in here. >> We didn't include any estimates. >> Tovo: I think it would be helpful to really have that information about how much those alternatives costs. I appreciate so much the memo and detailed responses regarding storage and so many of the issues that we asked in that earlier resolution to look at. I think this is very responsive and appreciate it. Thanks for the work you do, I know it's challenging. We often highlight the others in this equation and don't often recognize or as often as we need to recognize the work of the downtown Austin community court and everyone who works in there. So thank you for your part in working to end homelessness. >> Thank you as well. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: To expand your services, we're going to have to find you the

[1:22:04 PM]

space you need to do that, right? >> Well, again, since the outreach team would be operating in the community full time, not necessarily for the outreach team, but definitely if we need to do expand in-house, we would need more space, yes. >> Flannigan: I just want to note I have advocated for that consistently as well. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Are we ready to call it a morning? >> Kitchen: Yes. Could we just recap our next steps just so the public can understand. >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to address? >> Mayor, council, community members, one thing I heard from this robust conversation this morning was a need to ensure that we had a proper conversation about next steps that would incorporate the expertise of our new homeless strategy officer, and then conversations that she's

[1:23:05 PM]

been having as she gets her feet on the ground here. In the short term, having a work session, we'll get that scheduled as soon as we can. Likely in the next couple weeks. I think the mayor mentioned the week of October 10, but we'll see what works with folks' schedules. And then incorporating as a baseline for that discussion a lot of the topics that were talked about today. So the things that were included in these draft resolutions, but I also want to make sure that our homeless strategy officer can set the table of other things that we may not have been talking about, but are important for our path forward as we move forward as a community to look to address ending homelessness. I really think that is the immediate next step. I think there might be other things that come up in the coming weeks and I don't

want to prevent us from bringing those forward to council, so if there is a special called meeting that's needed or emergency funding that might be required, I hope that you'll give me the permission to

[1:24:05 PM]

schedule those, especially as we hear more from community members and hear more from our homeless strategy officer. So I think that you may hear even before that week of October 10, but at a minimum having to set the table for a robust work session on the week of October 10. >> Kitchen: Yes, I would like to add that -- I want to be clear that the work session is a prelude to another date that we're going to vote. So -- so I think that at the same time we set the work session, we need to set a date for when we plan to vote. And we can certainly have -- and we need to have discussions of the scope of that vote, but I think the subject matter of the ordinance needs to come back to us and the subject matters in the resolution need to come back to us at a minimum and certainly anything else that homeless strategy officer might want to suggest or you and the city manager might want to

[1:25:07 PM]

suggest in conjunction with the homeless strategy officer or anyone else on the team. But I want to stop with the work session. The work session needs to be a prelude to a session where we vote. It's just important for us to get that clarity on a very short time line. >> Understood. >> Renteria: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: And I also would like to have them come back and say -- and give us information on how we can address the overpass, underpass campsites. I'm afraid that -- I think we lost a couple people already this year crossing 35. And it's just very dangerous and especially those that are experiencing mental illness. I've seen them just walk right in the middle of traffic without even looking. And I'm very afraid that, you know, we're trying to reach vision zero and we need to really look at that. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Councilmember

[1:26:07 PM]

alter referred to it earlier and since we're starting to get a fair amount of [inaudible] About it, I just wanted to offer a little context for the health south inclusion within the resolution that we brought forward. We've talked a lot about the encampment outside the arch and the need to connect individuals immediately with shelter, with housing, with support. And so I would ask the manager to -- this isn't direction because obviously we're not providing direction or taking a vote, but the intent of the provision that talks about health south is to consider that among other options. You know, there are organizations in our community who have suggested perhaps a hotel-motel would be a good solution for immediate emergency shelter. People have suggested that we consider our recreation centers. Well,

we went down that path. I brought forward a resolution asking our manager to consider temporary -- temporary shelter in one of our city

[1:27:07 PM]

facilities and we got back the recommendations of rec centers and there was a high cost and displacement of programs and a lot of other reasons that make that not feasible. Or it would be feasible, very challenging. It would disrupt a lot of activities that are currently taking place at our recreation programs. So, you know, I appreciate and understand the concerns about using that particular facility. I am absolutely committed to seeing that site redevelop, I hope for the purposes that we discussed when we passed the two resolutions looking at creating housing on that tract, mixed income housing but with a high priority for affordable, attainable housing for people working in our service industry downtown including at the med school down the street. That is, in my opinion, a very -- a very unique opportunity that we have because we got that building for a good value and it's in a place where we are really going to need housing for the people working when that area who will not be able to

[1:28:08 PM]

otherwise afford housing in that area. So I'm committed to that. I would be happy to add language that if we considered that, we would move forward with the rfp. In the time frame we received a letter from our county judge asking us to pause on the rfp to consider other uses. It was signed by central health, by a representative of U.T., by others, suggesting we look at a variety of options from permanent supportive housing to a detoxification facility to some other purposes. We have not yet initiated that rfp. Again, I think that there may be an opportunity to have some of those, to have some multiple uses in that end product, but I hope we're going to continue to move forward with housing and child care and some of the resources we know individuals working in our downtown need and would have trouble accessing within the high prices of that. This was an attempt to look at using that facility for a

[1:29:10 PM]

very short-term. The commitment would be very temporary, no more than a year. It's very -- again, I'm gotten a lot of upset calls and emails about it, but I have to ask myself, you know, if we're asking our manager to go out and seek shelter opportunities, purchase a facility, lease a facility, I have to ask myself the hard question why we wouldn't consider, at least analyze the facility that we own that has I believe 40 individual rooms, bathrooms, common area, commercial kitchen that is sitting vacant for which we're spending, I believe, about \$800,000 to maintain. As a short-term solution, it could be ideal. And so, again, I don't think that that's the ultimate future use, but I think we should have a conversation

about it short term, very temporary use for this purpose, among the consideration of other options and the resolution I hope makes it clear that it

[1:30:10 PM]

was one option among many others. And if not, I am really eagerly soliciting your feedback about what kind of language would really make it clear that it is among other options and would be a very short-term use. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: So, you know, we didn't take action on any resolutions today and I don't want staff to lose that point. My expectation is that staff will bring back the options they they will work and with the related price tags to make them work. That's what this comes down to. My understanding is health south is not something you just open up. There's money to be expended to do that and we should always be comparing the things to the other things. And so, you know she that's why I don't support the resolution is I need staff to go out and do the work. >> Mayor Adler: So my observation would be -- you got to talk just before Kathy so now it's my turn. That I join and actually

[1:31:11 PM]

with both of my colleagues, the last two that spoke with respect to emergency shelters, I think that the message really to take away is the urgency of the moment. I think the community is expecting us to actually act. We didn't get there today, but we -- because we weren't ready. But we need to. So anything you can do to help facilitate us and the community to intervene in what's happening in our community for the benefit of everybody I think is going to be helpful, and looking at emergency situations I think is one thing you would need to look at and come back with whatever the appropriate recommendation is. And I support, you know, considering anything that you all think would be worthy of considering. With the understanding, and I concur with councilmember tovo that the ultimate goal of the health south property

[1:32:13 PM]

is -- certainly we want to take a look with respect to affordable housing. I think the resolution spoke to it either be on site or off site, and expect to get back both of those proposals at some point, but also concur that adding to that rfp, you know, consideration of other community benefits in addition to affordable housing as suggested to us by the county judge and some of the other players, I think we would also be real interesting to see what kind of concepts or ideas or thoughts were brought back to us. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Just quickly, I know we're wrapping up. Thank you, councilmember tovo and mayor. I also share the -- I share the sentiments councilmember tovo set forth

about health south. It's a building we're spending a significant amount of dollars on every year and it's vacant, so we really need to consider it for this immediate need.

[1:33:14 PM]

Time limited, et cetera, as councilmember tovo said. And councilmember Flannigan, I appreciate your comments and I do also want to hear from our homeless strategy officer. I also think it's appropriate for us to bring forward resolution items because we've been working on them for a long time and I appreciate the expertise of our homeless strategy officer, but I don't -- I think we need to have realistic expectations of her. She is new to this city, she needs time to understand the lay of the land and apply her expertise. So I want to hear anything she has to say in the short term, but I don't think that that -- I think we need to act. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else? Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Quickly, councilmember Flannigan, I appreciate and agree and I'm aware that that facility, health south, in addition to any others would require an investment and repairs. I think our staff, we have

[1:34:15 PM]

been obtaining information about that and I think if we're having a conversation at the work session, it would be helpful to have some of that information be folded in for that facility as well as hours. And I've had a few queries about that letter. The letter to which I referred was from judge Eckhardt back in July and it was signed by a variety of people and identified, as I mentioned a variety of uses from short housing, treatment for people about substance abuse disorders, a range of uses. That might be considered for that tract. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. With that said, it is 1:34 and this meeting is adjourned.