

City Council Budget Adoption Meeting Transcript – 08/11/2021 (and continuing on 08/12/2021)

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 8/11/2021 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 8/11/2021

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

Please note that the following transcript is for reference purposes and does not constitute the official record of actions taken during the meeting. For the official record of actions of the meeting, please refer to the Approved Minutes.

[Pt. 1 - August 11, 2021 portion of meeting]

[10:09:26 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: On the dais, and we have five shown. And I see your block, Ann, but I don't see you. Are you with us? >> Kitchen: Yes, I'm here. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, good. And then Alison I think is yet to join us. But that does give us a quorum, so I'm going to go ahead and get started and call to order today the special called meeting on Wednesday, August 11th, 2021. This is to handle budget items. We also have an agenda with a hotel item. We also have today, not part of this meeting, but we have Mueller and Austin housing finance corporation, and then a series of budget-related items.

[10:10:28 AM]

We're going to begin today with the speakers. I'm going to -- these are speakers speaking on everything we have today. We're calling all speakers to speak. I'm going to give the people who are here in person the first opportunity to speak so that they don't have to stay here if they don't want to, since it's in person. Then we'll go to the folks on the telephone. And at the end of the telephone, I will come back and ask if anybody showed up that did not have the opportunity to speak at the beginning. After we have all the speakers, it's the general intent to go into executive session to discuss the hotel matter and to discuss the ballot language. Hopefully we can come out of executive session and then take action, if any, on those items

[10:11:30 AM]

and that will leave us, then, the budget items to deal with, generally following the process we have on the message board. But we'll begin with the staff and it appears that depending on the choices we make, there may be sufficient funds to be able to give to taxpayers even more relief than the manager had proposed, and still hit the priorities that had been indicated by council. But we'll see if it actually plays out that way. So, without objection, then, I would have the clerk, then, if it's okay, I have a list of the in-person speakers and I would begin by calling them. Okay. Are we all set?

[10:12:32 AM]

These include speakers being called on all items we have today, including items 1-5, budget fees and classification ordinances, item 6 to ratify the increase in the tax rate, item 11 and 12, the items for adoption of the budget and housing finance corporation, and the Mueller local government corporation. I think we have to call those meetings. We'll give people an opportunity to speak at that point as well. >> Mayor, I have a quick question on process. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Pool: Can you tell us how many speakers we have and how much time each person will have, recognizing that it's possible that different categories have different amounts of time? >> Mayor Adler: We announced all speakers would have one minutes. We had 110 or something like that sign up to speak, 24 in person. >> Pool: Thanks so much. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to call speakers. Let's begin with those that are

[10:13:32 AM]

in person who are here. I'll call your name and then why don't you come on down. Is Robert here? You have one minute. >> I'm here to speak on item 13. And I'm asking Paige Ellis to vote against the purchase for multiple purposes. One, it's in a high-residential area. Two, it's in a high-traffic area area. It infringes upon the businesses that surround the candlewood suites. And the idea or notion to turn it into a shelter for women seemed a little misguided. The shelter will be out in the open in public and do nothing for the security of the ladies

[10:14:32 AM]

or the families that will be using this shelter in the future. That's all I have to say. >> Mayor Adler: Kerry Roberts? Corby is on deck. >> Good morning, mayor and council, I'm Kerry Roberts, executive director of the greater Austin crown commission and a resident of district 8. We appreciate the public support for the city manager's proposal to fund two police cadet classes, but even with two full classes, we know the department will still have a net loss at the current attrition rate. So the budget rider to authorize a

third modified class signals the city's intent to aggressively train and recruit officers. But as councilmember Kelly and many of you know, it also presents some challenges because

[10:15:33 AM]

three public safety departments are using a facility that was built more than a decade ago and designed for an expansion that hasn't happened. So we have to find a way to improve retention, lower attrition, and scale the training. And we know that that takes time and money. No one could have foreseen the events of the last two years, notably the public health crisis, but some of the issues we struggle with are the consequences of policy decisions. And there was nothing anyone could do -- [buzzer sounding] >> About a pandemic, but the police staffing crisis was self-inflicted. With rising crime and slow response times, I believe all of us would support the hard choices you must make to keep our city safe. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Good morning, mayor and council, I'm corby, a resident of district 10 and the president of the greater Austin crown commission. Public safety is the most

[10:16:33 AM]

critical responsibility of city government. City manager cronk's proposed budget includes funding from two police cadet classes. The only way to lower crime and reduce response times is to keep recruiting and training new officers. Councilmember Kelly's budget rider authorizing a third modified cadet class is also very important. We have to do more to catch up. Reports from the 144th class have been encouraging. Improvements will continue to be made. I met many in the current class and was very impressed. Austin has a high recruiting standard. That's good, but also a challenge. We want applicants to know we are moving to a community that supports its police force. We must continue cadet classes to address the staffing crisis and implement police reform. [Buzzer sounding] >> And find ways to improve -- approving this budget is a vote for public safety. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[10:17:37 AM]

Is Susan here? You'll be on deck. Go ahead, sir. >> Good morning, mayor and council, I'm Cole, a resident of district 9 and a policy analyst for the greater Austin crime commission. The Austin police department faces a staffing crisis and the two cadet classes in the proposed budget are a significant step in addressing this crisis. As our community plans for police staffing in the future, these discussions should be informed by a data-driven model and not outdated metrics. Researchers from Texas state university and university of new Haven are developing machine learning models that combine calls for service data with survey research about community values and expectations. This will determine the optimal response time and the number of officers it will take to achieve goals. Researchers should have early

data that will be available to the public. This tool will help the city make informed decisions about how many officers we need to

[10:18:38 AM]

keep our community safe for years to come. We hope it will ground future budget conversations about police staffing in empirical data. Thank you. [Buzzer sounding] >> Mayor Adler: Is Mike shade here? You'll be on deck after this speaker is over. Go ahead. >> Good morning. I want to talk about the police budget. I want to tell you, as an accountant, don't make this a budget issue. Look at the services, crime, the number of police officers we have to make this community safe. When I look at this page in your budget, the personnel summary, between the 2018 budget and this year, four years back, every single department has an increase in staff except for the police. The police go down 6% and non-sworn 7%. When you look at the budget, the actual budget, you now have

[10:19:40 AM]

transfers out being 20% of the police budget. You need to please look at that. I am asking don't play a game with the state. Don't play a game. Look at officer response time, safety. This is what people want. They do not feel safe in Austin, Texas, anymore. If I can help any of you with that, I would be happy to do that. Thank you. [Buzzer sounding] >> Mayor Adler: Is pepper Medina here? Sir, why don't you come on down. Is pepper here? Is Amy here? No? Is Caroline here? No? What about Matthew cord? What about bill Spelman?

[10:20:43 AM]

You'll be on deck. Go ahead, sir. >> Good morning, mayor and council. My name is Mike, I'm a 45 year resident of district 6 asking you to vote against agenda item 13. I'm a resident of Anderson hill for 45 years and live directly behind the candlewood hotel. The reasons for asking the councilmembers to vote against are there is no public bus. There is no local grocery. And there is no physical and mental health facilities in the immediate area. And along with other members -- neighbors, pardon me -- we have experienced drug items in the fence behind the suites. Concerns are unwanted interactions with children at the schools and the neighboring

[10:21:43 AM]

playgrounds. We support the community first approach to solve this type of issue. [Buzzer sounding] >> Please vote against item 13. Thank you very much. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. As Mr. Spelman comes down, is Lydia woodruff here? What about Bianca? You'll be on deck. Mr. Spelman, welcome back to the halls of government here in the city of Austin. You've been missed. >> It is good to be back, mayor. I'm scheduled to speak on item 10. Is that in order right now? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> To keep it to one minute, it has been sold that Austin, Texas, has a homicide problem that is absolutely true. It has been sold this homicide problem is because we don't have enough officers. That is the furthest thing from the truth. The issue is not that we don't have enough officers. It is that homicide rates have increased between 30 and 35% in cities all over the united

[10:22:44 AM]

States. If you look at cities with small, medium, or a large number of officers per thousand, Austin is in the middle group. It turns out the small, medium and large cities around the country increased by about the same amount, between 30-35% all over the country. If you look at Texas you find the big cities in Texas increased by 30-35%. The rest of Texas increased by 38%. That includes small towns, rural Texas. We had a huge increase in homicide rates that transcended Austin's borders. If we increase the number of police officers, this will divert attention from what we need to do to get the homicide rate down. It will be putting more of our attention -- [buzzer sounding] >> Diverting our attention to more of the same. We know from experience that more of the same gets us more of the same. If we want to reduce the homicide rate we need to understand it. That means we need to know where it came from and what we ought to do to do something about it. [Bell ringing]

[10:23:44 AM]

>> I've extended my time. >> Mayor Adler: In terms of -- >> Mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. >> Mayor. >> Mayor Adler: In terms of absolute numbers -- I see you, Ann. I'll call on you in a second. In terms of absolute numbers, how is the crime, homicides, in Austin compared to other cities? >> We are one of the safest cities in the United States, as we have been for as long as I can remember. 80% of cities in the united States have a homicide rate higher than ours. That's after the large increase of 2020 and the first few months of 2021. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Sure. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, I just wanted to thank Mr. Spelman. I really appreciate the expertise you bring to this subject. And I would just ask if you haven't already, if you would email us and send us the information that you just shared with us. It's very helpful. >> Councilmember, I have a three-minute presentation on powerpoint which I will happily

[10:24:45 AM]

send to all of you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: Councilmember, thank you for coming down. So, this is the item for us to either adopt this ordinance or to not adopt it. >> Correct. >> Casar: What's your position on that? >> I would vote decidedly no on item 9, the one to adopt the suggested ballot proposition. You have no choice except to vote yes on item 10. It has to go before the voters. It's been signed by enough people. But I would urge you to tell the voters to vote against this. It's a bad idea. It's diverting attention from what we need to be spending our time on, which is identifying what kind of a homicide problem we have and what very specific responses the Austin police department and the entire community need to make in order to solve that homicide problem. >> Casar: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Thanks, mayor. Thanks, councilmember. Nice to see you back.

[10:25:46 AM]

>> It's good to see you, too, councilmember. >> Tovo: I had a couple questions for you. We're all very concerned about the rising homicide rate. You were wrapping up with some comments about what might be some good avenues to investigate for prevention of homicide. So if you could give us a couple minutes or follow up. >> I have actually written it down and I will send it to you, but here's the short version. If there is a specific reason for the homicide rate going up -- and there is -- then we can identify what the reason is and work our way backwards to the precursors and do something about it. Let me give you three examples. If it turns out a large number of homicides are due to people getting drunk in bars and getting in fights outside and shooting each others, which is true for a lot of places and maybe us, maybe not. If it's due to fighting in and around bars, there's stuff we can do about that. Calgary, Alberta, new south Wales, a bunch of Australian places have identified this as being a huge problem.

[10:26:46 AM]

In Australia they know what to do about it. It mostly involves working with bar owners to change rules to threaten them with having their licenses pulled if they continue to give drinks to people who are already inebriated and aggressive. Working with bars is a way of dealing with fights in and around bars. If you've got a domestic violence problem, there are a bunch of cities -- the Duluth model is famous, high point North Carolina is the most effective case -- of working with social service agencies, other city agencies with family directly, with churches to try and prevent domestic homicides, identify that a homicide is impending or the violence is ratcheting up and we can intervene. In high point, North Carolina, take took a problem which produced 17 domestic homicides in 5 years, implemented a program involving churches and

[10:27:48 AM]

families and social service agencies and reduced it to 1 homicide over the next five years. You can't do much better than that. If the problem turns out to be chronic offenders, Austin's operation cease fire gives us a good model to work with as far as that is concerned. They told all of the people who thought they were responsible for the increase in violence in Austin, we know who you are and we have a bunch of handles on you we're not using just because. But we can tow your car. If it's improperly parked, we have probation and parole restrictions. But pulling all the levers to get you to change your behavior, we can get you to change your behavior. It worked. By identifying in advance who the chronic offenders were and telling them what they were about to do, doing it in a measured way, they were able to reduce violence among those chronic offenders and citywide by 68%.

[10:28:49 AM]

So if we have a chronic offenders problem, we can go the Boston Ruth. If we have a fighting inside bars, we can go in a new south Wales route. There's solutions that have been adopted by police departments all over the country, all over the english-speaking world that address very specific problems. We don't know what specific problems we have to deal with yet. That's what we ought to be spending our time on. None of these solutions focus on patrol or response time. That's not a bad thing. It's good to have more patrols and faster response times. But that's not the core of any of these solutions. There's no reason for believing that just having more patrols or more fast response to the myriad calls we have is going to have any effect on homicides. >> Tovo: I really appreciate those three examples. Those are great ones for our office of violence prevention in coordination with other other city departments, include amend, APD,

[10:29:51 AM]

to take a look at. >> Mayor Adler: Thanks for coming back. This is the area that you work in at at the university of Texas. >> It is, although I retired in may. >> Mayor Adler: Congratulations for that. >> Congratulations to the university of Texas, too. [Laughing] >> My students will not have to put up with my calculus class anymore. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. >> I believe there are other questions. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter. >> I was going to first of all congratulate councilmember Spelman on his experiment and I hope that you will be engaged with us -- his retirement -- as we try to address the problems you've identified today in your retirement. I did want to just add, to follow on to councilmember tovo's comments about the office of violence prevention, as I understand it the studies we have under way right now are precisely to identify the very specific causes of the violence,

[10:30:52 AM]

particularly the gun violence. But the violence in general in our city. This work does not have to only be done by the police department as well. I wanted to underscore that and look forward to working and learning with you on these issues. Thank you. >> Councilmember, the experience of cities around the country shows you're absolutely right. The best work is done when the police department works closely with other city agencies, other local and state government agencies, occasionally even with the federal agencies. And particularly with the business sector, with the nonprofit sector, with churches. Everybody needs to get involved. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Thank you, councilmember alter and tovo and others. That was going to be my next question. Are we working on the analysis. It sounds to me, councilmember alter, that that analysis is under way. I would like to understand better -- not right this minute -- but I would like to understand better the scope of that analysis.

[10:31:52 AM]

And I would like to ask the staff that's working on those analysis to please consult with councilmember Spelman as they proceed with that analysis. We can have a conversation at a later time about that. But I really appreciate the fact that you've provided greatly to councilmember alter on the office of gun violence, and I appreciate that. So I want to make sure that I understand the scope of what's being pursued, because I'm hearing councilmember Spelman, really appreciate his advice, and want to be sure that we follow it and engage him in conversations about it. >> I'm happy to work with anybody who's willing and interested in working on this. I've been doing this for 40 years and would love to keep doing it. >> Mayor Adler: Anyone else? Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Well, I didn't want to pass up this opportunity to say hello to an old friend. >> Hi, Leslie. >> Pool: And how great it is

[10:32:53 AM]

to see you in chambers, councilmember Spelman. And also I think you were my adviser at the lbj school many years ago. It's good to see you. I have appreciated your good counsel on law enforcement and police matters in the past. It has been always insightful, not only while I've been on the dais, but before I was on the dais. So, thanks very much and I look forward to continuing the conversation with you going forward. Thanks for being here today. Good to see you. >> Thank you, councilmember. I hope my advice was good. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: So, also on this item that you're testifying on, there's multiple provisions. One is two officers per thousand. Another is 35% uncommitted time, sometimes known as community engagement time. While the press has oftentimes covered this at two officers per thousand, our city department, the police department, the budget office have said it's likely closer to 2.1 if not 2.35

[10:33:55 AM]

given that that 35% uncommitted time might be more. Could you talk us through your sense of whether or not it might be more than two per thousand given the 35%? >> First, the proposed law asks the police chief, whoever that is at the time, to identify what they mean by community engagement time. That's a very flexible term. It's not a term of art with a fixed meaning. The police chief has a lot of freedom to identify what is in and out of that box. If they are restrictive in their meaning, if community engagement time is something fairly narrow, that means we might need a lot of police officers to be able to do that community engagement time. More important it seems to me, that 35% is not going to be on top of our continuing to do exactly what we've always been doing, the way we've always been doing it. If you have more officers on the street, we know from Parkinson's

[10:34:56 AM]

law, work expands. If you're rushing from call to call already you have a little bit more flexibility to do less rushing and spend more time on the calls you're taking now. That's going to reduce the capacity for community engagement time in an unpredictable way. It might be beyond 2.2 or 2.3. It might be 3 or even more officers per thousand before we can actually get that magical 35% number. The bigger issue, it seems to me, we don't really know and it's difficult for us to predict how many officers we're going to need to hit that 35%. I think the bigger issue is what do we mean by community engagement. If we are just grinning, waving and going to meetings, showing the flag, that's one thing. That's what a lot of people think they mean, and what a lot of community policing means in practice. What it ought to mean is engaging the community with a specific purpose. It could be talking to bar owners if we have a bar problem. It could be talking to churches and social service agencies if

[10:35:57 AM]

we have a domestic violence problem and so on. And the more practical purpose we can put into that community engagement time the more effective it's going to be. Again, I'm concerned that this proposition is diverting attention from the practical purpose and the practical community engagement with purpose, and diverting it towards just more mass, more of the same. We continue doing what we're doing. Sooner or later we'll have enough officers to reduce our homicide problem. That's just not true. >> Casar: Thank you for that. We'll talk later about a 2.35, our calculation is that could be \$120 million a year, which would be quite a bit. And just as a point of information, as we close out here, we do have amendments to increase the budget for our family violence shelter, one of the things you brought up, to increase the gun violence intervention programs that we've discussed here, and other work here in the budget. Thanks again for your advice. >> You do. I fully support your proposal to

[10:36:59 AM]

add two academy classes over the next year. We do need the officers back. We should not be held to a standard of 2.0 going forward forever. We do need more officers. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

Colleagues, any other questions? Councilmember, thank you. >> Thank you very much, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is Lydia woodruff here? Come on down. .While you're coming down, is Bianca Ramirez here? >> I'm the one that's speaking, Bianca. >> Is Lydia woodruff here? No. And just before you speak, Ms. Ramirez, is ruepal here? You'll be up next. >> Bianca, item 13, I live next to candlewood with my boys. I grew up below poverty line and

[10:38:00 AM]

sacrifice so they may experience better. You may change the environment for many striving to do the same. You blindsided us by failing to notify us about the purchase. You obscurely removed all terminology from this item. Safe, stop abuse for everyone, urged council not to buy it. It is in Williamson county and doesn't afford the same protections as Travis. You claim to be against building up the middle class, yet city places these housing units in the same places with dense minority populations who are struggling. Why are you willing to create an environment that makes it difficult for future generations to navigate or maintain a livelihood? The norms we create in our communities will be the primary trajectory or children will follow. Why haven't you walked the neighborhoods to meet people impacted by this, but you attend soccer games without masks, or masking up to meet with others? We have value even if we are being disregarded or treated as though we don't. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[10:39:01 AM]

Come on down. Is preta here? >> No, she's not. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is Marshall here? >> Good morning, mayor and councilmembers. My name is rupa and I represent stop candlewood group. I'm opposed to agenda item number 13. Even if the notion of a battered women's shelter seems like a good idea, this does not meet the standards. Safe Austin recommended against it. It is far away from social services. The process is broken. There has been no transparency, which is difficult with real estate transactions, we understand. But consider the public nature of this property after so much controversy. It should be easy to communicate with us. By now, with no worries about leaking sensitive or protected information, communication is broken at Austin city hall. No one has reached out to us nor

[10:40:03 AM]

to any of the neighbors, business owners, and Williamson county. It was wrong for Austin eight months ago and it's still wrong today. Regardless of whatever coat of paint you try to slap on it. Thank you very

much. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Come on up. While you're coming up, is Carly here? You'll be on deck. Go ahead. >> Hello, I'm Marsha Watson, district 6, wilco, we the people. And I'm here to speak on behalf of agenda 13, opposed, of the candlewood hotel. So, first this was going to be a shelter for covid homeless -- covid homeless. Then a shelter for the homeless. And now a shelter for women. If you watched our heard our county judge yesterday in Williamson county court, he and willco, we the people and many others are aware that this

[10:41:04 AM]

direction is a bait and switch, mayor Adler. He spoke to you directly. Please watch that yesterday. Our county is fully prepared to file a lawsuit against the city of Austin if this goes forward. As discussed in times in the past 7-8 months, purchasing this hotel for \$9.5 million and spending another couple million dollars renovating it -- [buzzer sounding] >> Will not meet the needs of these people. This is not about the homeless. Stop wasting our time. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Connolly, while you're coming down, is Bob here? You'll be up next. Mr. Connolly. >> Good morning, mayor, councilmembers. My name is Mr. Connolly, I live in district 9, I'm the organizing director for the Austin justice coalition. This morning I believe you

[10:42:04 AM]

received a letter from a jc and planning our communities in strong support of moving forward with item 13, which is the acquisition of the site currently known as candlewood suites. We support this for a number of reasons. I don't have much time. But the kind of opposition that we are seeing to this is not unlike the opposition we have to any fair housing issue in the city, or anywhere in America. It's also an opposition that we see to the application of of the Americans with disabilities act. We know that 69% of Austin's homeless population has a disability and 40% is black. It's hard to separate this issue from a fair housing issue. There's no reason why some districts in the city should have shelter and housing space for the homeless while other districts can throw a fit and turn it down. That's not how we should be move should move forward. You can take leadership. [Buzzer sounding]

[10:43:05 AM]

>> Leadership applies when you're faced with tough choices. And it's more than just making decisions of political convenience. Thank you for your time. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mr. Barnes is coming down. Is sandy here? You'll be up next. Mr. Barnes. >> Good morning. My name is Bob Barnes, president of bank Austin. I'm here to speak on behalf of a family and their concerns about the pending purchase of the candlewood suites hotel. The family owns the two adjacent hotels, the Hampton inn and the

Homewood suites. The family banks with ibc. And ibc is a lender on the tootles. Hotels. All three share a common entrance. The Hampton inn is adjacent to

[10:44:06 AM]

and approximately 20 feet from the candlewood suites. My real concern today is the current process. After months of discussion in the community about the purchase of candlewood suites, we are seeing another attempt by the city to purchase the hotel without any discussion or input concerning the newly proposal use. Agenda item 13 first appeared on council agenda Saturday and now four days later it is coming up for a vote on council. [Buzzer sounding] >> I would ask at a minimum for council to postpone any vote on this today and allow for additional community input. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is saje here? You'll be up next. Go ahead. >> Time? >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Hi. I had a speech ready for you referenced to agenda item 13 and my very strong opposition and reasons of this terrible idea, including the safety for domestic violence victims.

[10:45:08 AM]

I was surprised, we get another kick in the butt by city officials and interim chief to place homeless on my park and also Emma long is not a solution. How will they pay to get in and get there, by the way? With more of my and other taxpayers' money? It is appalling for you, mayor, who I strongly supported and believed in, when we talked at community first advantage, that you cared and meant it. Disrespect for Fuentes to support defunding officers. Safety first for all is not partisan. The wokism pandering and posturing you push is disgusting. [Buzzer sounding] >> Thank you, Mackenzie, for supporting us. Thank you, Mr. Cronk, for your support.

[10:46:08 AM]

Don't let them pass the hot potatoes to you, sir. Stand up for what is right for our citizens, for all of us, including those suffering in our streets. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Is pepper Medina here? Okay. Go ahead, sir. >> My name is Sanjay and I'm against item 13. My family owns and I manage the two hotels in district 6 that candlewood suites shares a driveway with. We have been opposed to this proposal due to lack of notice, lack of community input, lack of answers to our questions, lack of services and public transportation in the area. The language is vague and broad. This seems like a bait and switch. We have been opposed to a

[10:47:09 AM]

homeless hotel for six months. It's sad to see a women's shelter become politicized. Safe prefers to work with Travis county. Williamson county does not afford the same protective services to undocumented immigrants that Travis county does. Thank you for your time. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Clerk, those were all the speakers that we had in person. We're going to now go to speakers that have called in. At the end of the speakers that have called in, we'll go back to the speakers that are in person. Did you want to come down and speak now? Had you signed up? [Off mic] >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to speak? Come on down and then we'll move to speakers on the phone. And I'm going to turn the chair over to the mayor pro tem. Mayor pro tem, do you want to take over? We have one more live speaker

[10:48:10 AM]

and then just let the clerk start calling the speakers on the phone and I'll come back here just as quickly as I can. Yes. >> Casar: Mayor, before you -- Ms. Mitchell is here. >> Mayor Adler: Two speakers, Kathy Mitchell, and the name of the other speaker? [Off mic] >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry? [Off mic] >> Mayor Adler: Okay. That will be good. There will be two speakers in here to speak and then the group. Mayor pro tem, I'm going to give you the chair. Go ahead. >> Hi. Kathy Mitchell, here on my own behalf. I have been participating actively in the academy review process. And I want to say that the process has proven to be both very fruitful, very difficult, because we have a lot to talk about, and we are nowhere near

[10:49:11 AM]

done. And I think that all of that kind of comes together to say that whatever happens after this class, I really hope that we carefully look at what we were able to accomplish during the 144th, that we continue to accomplish, and the most important thing to know about that is that we are not reviewing most of the curriculum. As you know, we started very late. We started right before this class began. [Buzzer sounding] [Laughing] >> Okay. So, any questions? >> Councilmember alter. Then councilmember kitchen. >> Alter: Ms. Mitchell, we have had an opportunity to talk a lot over the last couple days, but I'd like you to take a few minutes to continue what you wanted to say because I think it's important for my colleagues and the public to understand

[10:50:13 AM]

where we are at with the academy review. >> So, we have been able to review -- and I went back and counted all the items. We've reviewed six units. There have been many, many units that we have not reviewed because we are able to do an every two-week meeting. We talk about the unit for a couple of hours and then there's often but not always the ability to make a few of our changes and then a lot of

what we want to see happen is likely to be a longer conversation. So for example, we had a brief conversation about the U.S. Constitution unit. It was not on our review list, but we brought it up as necessary to understand the search and seizure unit, right. Like we need to understand what's being taught about the constitution to understand what's being taught about search and seizure.

[10:51:14 AM]

And so that raised some issues. But that unit had already been taught. And so, you know, this is just the practical reality of the process that we are in. I have been very clear, I hope with all of you and our whole group that we believe that this is a potentially good process, but it must continue, that we do see things that need to change in every unit that we reviewed. We have made recommendations even on the unit that is basically about how to use your comms equipment. So I say that to say that we really -- my group, the video review panel and the academy review panel wrote you all a letter this week that I hope that you've had a chance to look at. And it was basically to say that the process for evaluating in between these like 144 and 145 is something we hope you will really take seriously.

[10:52:15 AM]

And we don't want to just be a checkbox on a list, right. Like we've done that now. So, we're community folks. We're a little like, nervous. [Laughing] >> Harper-madison: I think councilmember kitchen was next. Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Okay, so you can hear me now? Okay. Thank you, Kathy Mitchell. I appreciate your participation through this process. We've been discussing this, as you know. And I am bringing -- with my colleagues, bringing forward budget direction that relates to completion of the curriculum review process before beginning the next class as well as coming back to the council for authorization before beginning the next class, and a number of

[10:53:15 AM]

aspects of that direction that relate back to the resolution that we passed previously. I want to thank you for your continued participation, Ms. Mitchell, and also for keeping us abreast of what you are experiencing and what you are recommending. I think it is a very important process that we need to get right and that we need to make certain that we fully complete as intended before we begin our next cadet class. >> Thank you so much. I really appreciate that. >> Kitchen: And thank you for working with us on the language of the direction. So, thank you. >> Harper-madison: Any other colleagues have any questions? >> I do, mayor pro tem. Thank you. >> Harper-madison: I'm sorry, I can't see you. I can't see the dais. Is that councilmember Kelly? >> Kelly: It is. Thank you. >> Harper-madison: Please proceed. >> Kelly: Thank you for coming today, Ms. Mitchell. I appreciate you being here to answer questions and I was just curious if my staff would be able to reach out to you to follow up on some of those

[10:54:17 AM]

items? >> I would love that. >> Kelly: That would be great. I want to reach out to the doctor to help sort out some of the things that have been brought to light and get the perspectives of the other committee members. >> Of course. >> Kelly: Thank you very much. >> Harper-madison: I think I see councilmember pool's handle. If you're on the dais, I can't see it, so you'll have to holler. >> Pool: I wanted to thank Ms. Mitchell. I didn't have a question for her. But I wanted to support the comments that councilmember Kelly just made. Let's make sure that we talk with Dr. Cringen to make sure we get good perspectives on what's going on. In the end we want to have the best curriculum that we possibly can. Thanks. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. Colleagues, any other questions? >> Casar: Mayor pro tem. >> Harper-madison: I'm sorry. >> Casar: Mayor pro tem.>> Harper-madison: Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: Ms. Mitchell, I saw that you testified on the budget as well on item 10, the ballot

[10:55:19 AM]

measure. Do you have comments on that, or are you deferring to others? >> Yes. So, I did sign up on item 10. I'm sorry. It's been a big week. Yes. I hope that you oppose item 10. This ballot initiative is one of those "Costs too much," that's kind of what you have to say about it. I think that it will be incredibly harmful for our work towards a comprehensive public safety system, the kinds of things that you heard from Dr. Spelman are the kinds of things that the community has been asking for, and are really what a lot of what you did last year was about -- adding mental health service providers, adding paramedics, adding to our public safety system, the range of services that are what people actually need and identifying

[10:56:20 AM]

the problems that underlie those 911 calls so that we can solve them. So, please do not move forward. I know you have to put it on the ballot, but I hope that you all are against it.>> Harper-madison: Councilmember Casar, were you done? >> Casar: That was all, mayor pro tem. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. If there are no other questions, colleagues, I would like to echo my colleagues' appreciation for all the members of the committee who have taken their time -- valuable time to contribute to this very important process. I'm heard some things that sound promising and some things that make me realize while we thought this was going to be a temporary process, I believe this kind of committee might be something that we need to have in perpetuity. And I just wonder, Ms. Mitchell, what your thoughts are on how long will the committee need to be in existence, or do you agree with the sentiment that we might

[10:57:21 AM]

just need to always have a committee reviewing our curriculum? >> We certainly, as a committee, have said that the process needs to continue until we have reviewed the curriculum. To the extent that a curriculum is a living and changing -- and should be a living and changing process by which we learn and improve what we are teaching, I absolutely think that we should have that conversation. I certainly couldn't speak for any of us as to, like, being permanently doing this. It is very time-consuming. >> Harper-madison: I appreciate that. That was not my implication. I'm going to defer to councilmember alter. The other question I had was you said we are not reviewing most of the curriculum, which gives me pause.

[10:58:21 AM]

You said six units, you've only reviewed six units. Six units out of how many? >> I haven't counted, but -- >> Harper-madison: Okay, I'll find it. >> But there have been seven completed weeks. I think we are in eight weeks. We reviewed one unit that was a week long. And all the others of the six, the other five were either full -- one day, or shorter. So that's sort of a way to measure it without -- because there's a lot of units. There's many short ones and some longer ones. But we have not reviewed most of the time, the material being seen by students during the time they have been there. We've probably we viewed two weeks out of seven or maybe 2 1/2 weeks out of 7. >> Harper-madison: That's helpful for perspective. Thank you very much. Councilmember alter? >> Alter: Thank you. I want to flag that when we

[10:59:22 AM]

have the conversations about budget riders related to the academy, and I'm a co-sponsor on councilmember kitchen's, I think we do need some conversation among the dais to surface some things. I have spent a couple of hours the last few days speaking with chief Chacon and Dr. Cringen, and I have expressed concerns that we can't do this point in time but I think we need to be very transparent about what our intentions and goals are as a council with how we proceed with the cadet classes and the officers that we need. But I think we need to be very transparent and very clear about the goal posts now. So I just want to flag that we will need to have some conversation not because I'm necessarily taking issue with budget riders, but I think we do need to have that conversation.

[11:00:24 AM]

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate that. Ms. Mitchell, we appreciate your time and coming down to city hall. >> Thank you so much. >> Harper-madison: I heard there was another in-person speaker, but I didn't hear the name. Can someone help me with that? >> My name is Amy Chrisman. >> Harper-madison: You're on deck. >> I'm here to speak against item 9 and I also adamantly agree with Kathie Mitchell. I was active in the quote, unquote defunding the police and I wanted to point out that there are we are deliberate, intentional tactics in getting those signatures for that petition. I am embarrassed to admit I was coming out of the library with my young daughter, a gentleman asked me if I'm interested in talking about deescalation of police and also mental health. I did not have my glasses, I signed the petition, didn't see anything that said save

[11:01:25 AM]

Austin now, banner or on their vest, but I signed it. I then sent them an email and a letter saying pleads, I completely disagree with all these points adamantly. Take my name off that petition. So I'm here to -- [buzzer]. >> Casar: Mayor pro tem? >> Harper-madison: I'm sorry, if there's a buzzer going off I can't hear it. My apologies. If that's time, thank you for your contribution. Councilmember Casar, did you have a question. >> Casar: Yes, I wanted to hear from the speaker what happened next and to tell a bit more of your story for us, please. >> [Inaudible]. >> Your question was what to do next? >> Casar: What happened next? >> I haven't had a response, but I didn't fill out an affidavit in a timely manner. I have heard from other

[11:02:26 AM]

people who experienced such as I and these petitions, these tactics are deceptive and should be considered bogus in my opinion. I'm not saying -- there's a lot to be said about that and I wish I could -- I don't know what can be done, but I hope that something will be done, but the awareness that the letter that I received from save Austin now, the rhetoric was atrocious. All the points on there I am opposed to. And I can go into reasons and rationales of why I am opposed to all their points, but I don't know what will happen now, but I do see that there is a power play for money. And it's ugly and it's not with the mindset of what is safe for the public. It's a power dynamic that is really -- I don't know what will happen. I really don't. But I hope that -- I would talk to them, the organizers

[11:03:28 AM]

of that, and say how much did you hire this person to represent you, misrepresent you, talk in such terms that is completely not on that petition and to then -- I would have that conversation. So I don't know what would happen, but I do see that there's a lot of fear-driven rhetoric that is completely not factual and it's also divisive and directed towards mayor Adler and of course you. And it's really

saddening. It's frustrating. >> Casar: Thank you, ma'am. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. Councilmember Ellis, did I see your hand? >> Ellis: Thank you, mayor pro tem. I did want to make sure she had a moment to fib her statement -- finish her statement, but I'm also curious, did you email them and ask them that you wanted your signature removed? I wanted to make sure I understood that part. >> Yes, I did. And I know I need to fill out an affidavit in a timely manner, all that.

[11:04:30 AM]

And it's bureaucratic and I will do whatever it takes to take my name off because I'm embarrassed that I was duped by this. >> Ellis: I completely understand. It's not your fault if you understood something to be different than what it was. You know, it is important for folks signing petitions to read them, but that's not your fault. I'm curious to see if you have that email and can forward it to me. >> Sure. >> Ellis: I do understand that once the petitions are submitted there's no way to remove them, but that is concerning to hear and I'm very sorry that that happened to you. >> You're absolutely right. I ought to have read it. I didn't have any glasses I was going by auditory cues. I heard deescalation. I felt sideswiped or hood winged by it all. >> Ellis: I'm sorry that happened to you. Thank you for your comments today. >> You're welcome. >> Harper-madison: Thank you very much for coming down. Clerk, I believe that was our last in-person speaker

[11:05:30 AM]

and we can move to folks on the phone. >> Thank you, mayor pro tem. We did have two requests for a Spanish interpretation. The callers are not on the line so we will wait a few minutes and then release the interpreter. The first speaker is Ty hovanky. >> Is it possible to provide that message in Spanish so that they can call in if they're watching? >> Harper-madison: I'm sorry, councilmember alter, I don't understand your question. >> Alter: If they only speak Spanish they won't understand they can call in now to get the interpreter, so someone who is better at Spanish than I am, if they could just provide that information. >> Sure. The interpreter is on the line if she can make that comment, that would be

[11:06:34 AM]

great. Jacklyn? >> Harper-madison: I don't know that Jacklyn knows what we're asking -- >> Can you hear me? >> Yes, go ahead, Jacklyn. Can you please inform the viewers that if they registered to speak requesting a Spanish interpreter to please call in within the next few minutes. Thank you. >> Thank you. [Speaking Spanish]. >> Thank you, Jacklyn. The first speaker is Ty hovanky. >> Hi. Can you hear me? >> Yes, please proceed. >> This is Ty hovanky in district 5. I'm calling in opposition to

[11:07:38 AM]

item 10. And basically I urge the council to take a more comprehensive approach to like public safety where we're investing more in community support initiatives such as the ones presented by ccu or Austin coalition. Yeah, the proposed measures in prop 10 are physically irresponsible. Fiscally irresponsible. For facilities, mental health care, parks etcetera. And then it leads to more tax increases, having more -- places a societal mandate that doesn't address the root conditions that eventually lead to crime. So desperation begets crime. So the more services we have, the more we can theoretically hit the root causes of these issues rather than slapping on a

[11:08:39 AM]

band-aid and thinking that having more patrol officers or having more fast response times will do the trick. [Buzzer]. Ultimately not the thing that solves the real issues. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> I was also mistakenly duped into signing the petition as well. I was presented with kind of misleading language of -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Thank you. >> Harper-madison: Speaker, I believe your time has expired, but let me check before -- clerk, before we let that speaker go, let me make certain that none of my colleagues have questions for that speaker. Colleagues, are there any questions? Okay. Thank you, speaker for your time. Clerk, we can proceed. >> Amanda wheeler. >> Hi, my name is Amanda wheeler and I'm speaking in opposition of agenda item number 13 for the purchase of candlewood off of pecan park boulevard. Not only has this not been properly communicated with the local community,

[11:09:40 AM]

businesses and homeowners alike, it is still an unfit location for those in need of social services and walking distance resources. On top of that, location does not comply with basic economic violence building requirements. So I'll conclude with this question, from this purchase who is ultimately benefiting? Thank you. >> Michelle meija. >> Hello. I'm here. >> Please proceed. >> I'm sorry. My name is Michelle and I'm the early childhood organizer with go Austin, vamos Austin. And I am here urging you to elevate the conversation of early childhood. Let's elevate the teachers, the center directors, the

[11:10:41 AM]

home-based childcare providers, the nannies, the families, the children. Children are our future and they cannot be on our back. In a city that deems family friendly we can do way better. I urge you all to be creative and rethink childcare how many can we rethink alternatives to make this work for all children

and their families? How can we help change the high turnover narrative that is fueled by burnout and low wages. Are there alternatives that our city can build together with the community that the city itself can fund. I appreciate there was a true effort on behalf of council members and engaging in the early childhood conversations this time around. I can assure you that this is only the beginning because we need to do so much more for this critical infrastructure piece that is foundational to a working and thriving city. [Buzzer]. Tur children deserve it and so do those who care for them day in and day out. Thank you.

[11:11:41 AM]

>> Monica Guzman. >> Good morning. I'm Monica Guzman, policy director for gave, go Austin, vamos Austin. We ask for community health, equity and stability. My renewing and increasing Austin public health funding, title I aid schools, the city must ensure to take care of those who care for others. Follow the need of the task force recommendations regarding neighborhood centers and reinvestment regarding [indiscernible] And response teams. Prioritize the anti-placement funds to ensure residents aren't displaced due to the development of affordable housing in the surrounding community. Housing repairs and property tax relief. Invest 400,000 in the equitable regional food system to develop a plan for concrete structures and racially equitable outcomes. Invest in the parks and recreation department to ensure support for the efforts to compensate community leaders for their

[11:12:41 AM]

efforts in pard's planning efforts. [Rapid speech]. [Buzzer]. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Rachel Shannon. >> Hi. Good morning. My name is Rachel Shannon. I've owned my home in district 1 for 20 years. I'm gravely concerned about the way our city is going. We haven't seen the reimagining of the public safety task force has proposed in detail. Adding \$10 million to the police budget over what hb1900 requires is working in an ineffective direction.

[11:13:43 AM]

And I understand and I appreciate that people are concerned about the present and future of Austin, however, ignoring the comprehensive information we have about how to build a successful future together is not the answer. The public safety we need is beyond policing. Scaling back police training does not have to equal loss of public safety or adding new police officers without accountability to quell fears rather than address the roots in reality of public safety. [Buzzer]. I know we heard from the [indiscernible] Panel and the academy review panel as well as the misframing and misperception -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. Scott Carson. >> Hi. My name is Scott Carson. I am a long time resident of district 6 in Austin. I live directly in

[11:14:43 AM]

between -- right on pecan park in between the candlewood suites hotel and the homeless encampment down off of 183 and lakeway parkway. I am adamantly opposed to your section 13 that you're voting on today. Do not do this. Listen to what your organizations are telling you, that this is not a great location. It does not have amenities. You would have to almost be an idiot to have people tell you it is not the right location from your organizations and the funding and still proceed with it. I want to thank councilmember kitchen for coming out and viewing the hotel and identifying that it is not what she was sold on. I want to thank councilmember Kelly for being an advocate for the community, the business owners and the homeowners here in the area. In the last two weeks alone I've had my truck broken into twice from homeless people in the area. This is not going -- [buzzer]. It's slapping a label on something trying to squeeze it through and turn it into

[11:15:44 AM]

something else. I'm adamantly opposed. Listen to your community. >> Speaker, your time has expired. Shelly egger. >> In July 2020 I co-authored the Austin gun violence report identifying white supremacy as the primary root cause of our gun violence epidemic. We warned council that the city was going to reach a breaking point. As the pandemic, police violence and political fear-mongering feud the risk factors for violence. We have seen that play out across the country over the past year. Today those same issues are pushing us backward toward a crisis of constitutionality and of conscience. The need has never been greater for anti-racist policies based on the best available evidence and the lived experiences of Austin's most vulnerable residents. The proposed ordinance could not be further off base. Save Austin now's website claims that the two to 1,000 ratio is, quote, a

[11:16:45 AM]

nationally recognized safe city standard as defined by the U.S. Justice department, end quote. The justice department had no such standard. Further, in 2004 the international association of chief of police said such ratios are completely inappropriate for staffing decisions. [Buzzer]. Flooding our streets with armed officers -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Terry Alpert. >> Hi. My name is Terry and I am against item 13. The city of Austin is still playing games with candlewood. The latest plan by the mayor and three council members is to expand candlewood's cases to use economic violence, housing or shelter or social services. Moreover the council has broadened the language to point that facility could be used for virtually anything.

[11:17:46 AM]

Not only is this not safe for neighbors, but it sets a terrible precedent for the city to purchase whatever they want for whatever purpose without engaging impacted neighbors and businesses or even notifying them. The city time and again lists how important community input is, but never implements it. I am equally skeptical about expanding the language to include any shelter, housing or social service. This speaks to the city not having a defined vision for how to proceed. The city should have learned from prop B how important community input is. I urge the council members to oppose the purchase, and if you must purchase, use the facility for a narrow, well documented purpose that is in line with the neighborhood and their expectations and includes community input. Thank you. >> Mayor and council, the next speakers will show a video, so it's mondo flores and Chrissy o'brien.

[11:19:12 AM]

[Music]. >> Hi, there. I'm a city of Austin silver parks ground crew leader. >> My name is [indiscernible] And I work for Austin public health. >> My name is Norris Easton, I'm an electrician supervisor with Austin energy. >> My name is Lauren and I'm a 911 call taker at Austin communications. >> My name is Ana and I'm an emergency plant officer with Austin public health. >> My name is [indiscernible], I work for public works in the street and bridge division. >> I've worked at the city of Austin for seven years, six as a temporary employee. While I'm finally eligible for full-time benefits and an annual pay increasement. >> I found out my employees and myself how critical an essential role we play in the city during the coronavirus pandemic, the winter storms and the summer storms that went through. We realize no matter what was going on in our homes and personal lives that we still had a duty to safely

[11:20:15 AM]

provide energy to our customers. >> We answer the calls for our citizens and we make sure that they get the help they need. We protect our citizens and our officers. In February with the snowstorm we took 8600 calls in one day. >> Me and my co-on workers, we have worked through the pandemic and also the snow and ice storm. During that time we risked a lot. We risked our families, rerisked our health. >> It's been working seven days a week since the beginning of the year to make sure that the vaccines are made available to the community and my colleagues and I both, many city departments, community partners, all coming out to really ensure that we're providing as accessible of a service as possible. And I can proudly say that due to all of those efforts we vaccinated as a city over 300,000 people in the community. >> So we need to really show love, we need to show respect and we need to make sure that people can get

[11:21:15 AM]

through this. For all of our city employees. >> We're asking you, council -- [buzzer]. For a meaningful pay raise as we deserve it. >> City council, please help us get a significant, meaningful pay raise. >> We're asking city council for a meaningful pay increase. Thank you, afsome strong. >> Next speaker is Robert foster. >> Hello, I'm Robert foster, district 9 resident. I'm here to urge you to either vote against 10 or at least show some amount of punishment for their tactics that they use. I received an extremely misleading letter saying that I should sign their new petition because I signed their original petition. I did not sign that original petition. I don't know how that is like legal, but I think we

[11:22:15 AM]

need to do something to ensure that antics like this does not continue because it's just putting the physical health of our city and also the political health in jeopardy. Thank you so much. >> Natasha Benton. >> Hi. My name is Natasha Benton. I live in district 7. Leslie pool is my council person. Austin needs a comprehensive approach for public safety. I'm against article 10. This measure prioritizes police and guarantees that lawn only be able to fund the police department. We need to reimagine public safety and have public safety roles that heal and support our communities. New laws are needed for police reform. This will do the opposite by adding hundreds of new police officers with no accountability. It is fiscalry irresponsible. If passed this would lead to budget cuts and elimination of city facilities like

[11:23:17 AM]

parks, libraries, mental health care and more. This would also lead to significant tax increases for hundreds, thousands of working austinites. We need to hire all kinds of different types of staff from park rangers to ems and fire personnel. And if this measure passes this means cuts to those departments. Thank you. [Buzzer]. >> Elizabeth roan. >> Hello. I live in district 5. I'll give some general comments today. First regarding the budget, I want you to please stand by your support to reimagine public safety beyond policing. I remember moving roles out of the police is the right thing to do and we need to find other ways to handle such matters. I appreciate all the attention you're putting into the cadet training and just want to keep your mentality moving in that direction away from policing. And the Austin police need

[11:24:19 AM]

more accountability rather than more money. Secondly regarding homeless and hotels, I appreciate all your efforts to utilize the spaces for shelter and housing. I know that everywhere you try to do that you

face opposition from people living nearby. I live in district 5 and I'm hoping to find ways to get neighbors involved in trying to welcome new housing and more density so we can house all our neighbors. Lastly regarding save Austin now's initiative to have items 9 and 10 on your agenda -- [buzzer]. Thank you so much. >> Kitchen: Mayor pro tem? This is councilmember kitchen. I didn't catch the woman's name speaking from d5. I think I recognize her. >> I'm certain that the clerk can repeat -- >> Can you repeat her name. >> Elizabeth ream.

[11:25:20 AM]

>> Kitchen: Thank you. >> >> Kitchen: Smith. >> My name is Richard Smith. My wife Kathleen and I have served the homeless for a number of years. I oppose the purchase of candlewood suites in February. I appear today to state my objection to the complete lack of transparency in the item 13 resolution before you. My concern is about the conditions under which our homeless neighbors will live at candlewood. Will residents of candlewood be permitted to rent out their rooms for prostitution or engage in other illegal activities such as the sale of drugs? Will police officers be allowed to walk the halls and enforce the law to protect the residents of candlewood? The resolution states the purported cost of purchasing candlewood, but does not state the ongoing cost of maintaining candlewood or the cost incurred by impending litigation. The citizens of Austin

[11:26:20 AM]

realize the reduce of it being a domestic violence shelter. Where is the transparency? The citizens of Austin deserve better. Thank you. [Buzzer]. >> Tovo: Mayor, may I ask the city manager a question? City manager, I'm not sure if that was just a rhetorical question or a real one, but can you just assure the public that like any other city facility the city would not tolerate illegal activity taking place if the city were to purchase this facility? >> Cronk: I can absolutely get that confirmation, thank you. >> Brandon gannecot. >> Hello. My name is Brandon and I'm from district 7. I'm calling today in strong opposition to item 10. This ordinance would lock the Austin budget into increasing APD's funding year over year, depriving vital responses and first responders of that needed funding, forcing us to hire more and more police officers will not make us safer, it will simply

[11:27:21 AM]

increase the number of people in power to enact violence without accountability on our streets. Ems, firefighters, homelessness solutions, health care, all these things make Austin a better place to live and are far more deserving of our tax dollars. This expensive and feeling space proposal is the opposite of what we need. Please instead focus on solving the problems that we face. Thank you. >> Baldave chadre. >> I am against the agenda item number 13. I own two hotels that share a driveway with the

candlewood, which the city is considering to purchase. Homeless housing and now for women's shelter or any other shelter.

[11:28:22 AM]

We already struggle with the public safety challenges, the homeless [indiscernible] Needles, violent episodes and worse. Our area has no access to health and sorry services. There is no hospital, there is a single bus line half a mile away. It is hard to imagine the homeless staying at the candlewood will get the treatment they need. [Buzzer]. This also applies to domestic violence or -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. Jennifer Lyon. >> Hi. My name is Jennifer Lyon. I'm a resident of district

[11:29:24 AM]

9. Recently I was asked to sign a petition I was told to fund police accountability. I was happy to sign the petition and to have the opportunity to model activism and reinforce the importance of police accountability to my children who were there with me. Unfortunately I did not read what I was signing and never would have had I known what it was, which ended up being another teachable moment. I was embarrassed and angry to find I had been purposely misled by the canvasser to sign the save Austin now petition by using language they knew would intentionally deceive me. I am here to give my opposition to the save Austin now petition. I support comprehensive police reform in Austin. I want Austin to instead invest in ems, fire personnel and gun violence prevention programs as well as mental health response teams. Thank you so much for your team today.

[11:30:28 AM]

>> Stephanie Hoffman. >> Hello. You can hear me, correct? >> Yes, please proceed. >> Great. My name is Stephanie Hoffman. I am in draft 3. I've been here for -- I am in district 3. I've been here for about 15 years. [Indiscernible] At any of the other council meetings that I have been a part of here. I just want to say that I would really like council to stand by your votes last year and reimagining public safety. This is extremely important. Austin needs a privilege approach to public safety. This measure lists one kind of public safety worker over all others and guarantees that Austin will only be able to fund the police department. I am in agreement and appreciate listening and you all [indiscernible] Earlier.

[11:31:29 AM]

And on the cadet curriculum, thank you, council members for asking questions burned that. This is very, very important. The time is now to stand for the community. It's right now. [Buzzer]. This will do the opposite by going with 10, this will do the opposite by adding hundreds of new police officers with no accountability. >> Speaker, your time has expired. Marie chadre. >> Hello, my name is Marie, owner of Hampton and Homewood adjacent to candlewood. I am strongly against item 13. The city says this is the reason to want to purchase. First, you should never reveal address and location. Second, Austin never informed us or wilco and

[11:32:29 AM]

candlewood shares our driveway. And while is Cynthia long's letter now not attached. In 2019 the councilmember kitchen said that the city will not buy hotels in residential neighborhoods. Why is the city not keeping their words. Who is protecting our jobs, homes and livelihood? Austin, you're making a very hasty not thought out decision. It's in Williamson county and pushing services on to them. Autopsy needs a large homeless community from community first. Mayor Adler, you even called Allen graham a saint. Build our own successful homeless community. Do not buy candlewood. We will fight this to the end. >> Mayor Adler: Please stay on the phone for a second. >> Kelly: Thank you, mayor and thank you for calling in. It was brought to my attention that the letter from commissioner long had not been posted as backup to the agenda but I had that corrected within the last couple of minutes so it is now available for all of council and the mayor to review.

[11:33:29 AM]

It should be online shortly. Thank you. >> Tovo: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: And I didn't realize it wasn't in the backup, but I know we received it last night from one of the city staff. I received it from one of commissioner long's staff members, I assume, but we also received it from the agenda office as well. >> Council members, we just received the updated memo at 11:29 so we are posting that updated memo. It takes a few minutes. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Next speaker. >> Sola Luna. Sola Luna, please unmute. Emily sawyer.

[11:34:39 AM]

>> Hello. My name is Emily sawyer. I live in district 4. Save Austin now's ballot measure is not needed and will not make us safer. I live here, work here, pay taxes on a mortgage. I'm a runner and allow my kids to ride their bikes. I feel safe. I understand that murders have risen and every murder is a tragedy. And I also know that Austin's murder rate is the envy of every other Texas city of our size and recent increases in some crimes are part of a national trend. I do not believe that changes in rates for particular crimes up or down or related to decisions about the Austin police department. I do believe that save

Austin now and the police union are trying to make us all afraid and for that they should be ashamed. I imagine my day. If this measure were to pass and all we will ever be able to fund again is the police department and I see police checking out my kids' books at the library. And a police officer standing next to the swimming pool with a gun and a life vest. I see police officers

[11:35:39 AM]

everywhere. Instead of making me feel more safe, it will make me feel less free. [Buzzer]. >> Stephanie Goodman. >> Hi, my name is Stephanie Goodman, district 6, and I'm against the purchase of candlewood item 13. This draft language says this is to be used for domestic or other shelter or related services. This allows you to turn it into anything you want. First a shelter, then psh and then a economic violence shelter. You've changed the name three times and faced opposition because you lost. No one trusts you in the community. You still won't even engage the community. We know safe Austin told you it doesn't meet the needs and recommended a different hotel. We saw the letter, but you won't share that with the public. Why not. Commissioner long also wrote to you in June about candlewood about the lack of food, services. Less than a thousand feet

[11:36:41 AM]

from schools, 30 feet from minority owned women businesses. It violates the zoning restrictions and ordinances that sets a precedence for us, but convenient for you. That letter was up on Sunday, but not now, why? Organizations are telling you the same thing. [Rapid speech]. [Buzzer]. Please do not do this. >> Cangarrett. >> I live in district 4 and I urge you on support item 13, the purchase of candlewood suites. Housing instability, health care, it can be a public cost savings of more than \$10,000 used per person per year. Housing essentially all things. Homelessness is the result of many factors like when we're living in the worst housing crisis and wages are not enough to support rent and other basic needs. Public policy decisions that

[11:37:42 AM]

create inequitable decisions and attitude about who deserves support and where those people should live. Homelessness is a stoppable problem but it does take resources and political will. Candlewoodsweets is a two-year-old program and it will have programs for its residents. We have the council bill do what's right and what needed for our fellow humans. Our neighbors. Council has made great strides in housing people living in encampments through programs such as the heal initiative and such initiatives will not be possible if we cannot create permanent supportive housing and dignified shelter opportunities in all parts of town. [Indiscernible]. [Buzzer]. >> Speaker, your time has expired. E Scott Cobb.

[11:38:42 AM]

>> Hello, my name is Scott Cobb. I work as a lifeguard at Barton springs. I have been continuously on payroll for more than five years as a temporary employee. I'm very thankful that an amendment has been offered to for person employees. I would like to make sure that every temporary employee getting a stipend gets the same amount and not whether on the status of regular employees or temporary employees. I have a couple of questions and I would like to ask clarified what the date in the amendment mean. Must the temporary employee have been hired by April one or hired at any time since April 1. The city would not have been able to reopen as many pools and not have been able to open another day at Barton springs. Lifeguards have also worked on [indiscernible] In stages four and five as we're in now. Also some way should be found to provide stipends

[11:39:43 AM]

for temporary employees who will go back to school in the next couple of weeks. [Buzzer]. Many temporary employees -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Alexander Ramirez. Alexander, please unmute. Anthony Murray. >> Yes. My name is Anthony Murray, resident of drub. I called in today hopefully to explain to city of Austin that save Austin now's deceptive approach in trying to protect our community. The idea that adding two

[11:40:43 AM]

foot soldiers for the force for every thousand citizens will make us safer is wrong. The evidence is glaringly obvious that cops do not prevent crime. That is health care, food security and health and shelter. We need to stand up to the bullying and redirect funding to first responders that deserve our appreciation and taxpayer money. Ems, fire, park rangers, city and social workers that the things I addressed earlier. Please stand with your fellow citizens and vote against increasing their budget and main power. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Clerk, before you call the next speaker, colleagues, it's been suggested that when we're done with speakers we have staff just lay out really quickly their five pages I think on the budget just so that we lay that out. [Buzzer]. And we give council an opportunity to ask quick technical questions of our staff. That might be necessary for people to be able to fine tune their proposals over

[11:41:43 AM]

lunch. No discussions of merits, no need to lay anything out, just we'll have staff here for a second in case people with really quick questions and then we'll break. The intent is again to do executive session on the hotel and on other items that are said with respect to that ballot language and come out and resolve those issues if people want to resolve them out here and then continue on with the budget. So manager, if that works, if manager can be available for that quick rapid fire questions. Clerk, let's go back to the speakers. About 30 left. >> Luis malfaro. >> Good morning. This is Luis malfaro, associate executive director of Austin voices for education and youth and a resident of district 1. I'm speaking this morning in support of councilmember tovo's budget amendment to support community schools coordinators.

[11:42:43 AM]

As you know, Austin voices has been working with our social workers and family resource staff to support families virtually and through food distribution, events through the winter storm and pandemic. We've been organized to be resilient because we've built community-wide systems that are connecting parents, families and schools to serve as providersment we're now in the midst of a summer health campaign focused on getting kids ready to go back to school and covid clinics. Austin voices is requesting your support for councilmember tovo's budget amendment to fund community schools coordinators that we will field in four targeted parts of the city to link community partners, school campuses, parents and grassroots organizations together with our family resource centers. [Buzzer]. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Thank you.

[11:43:46 AM]

>> Frances Acuna. >> Can you hear me? >> Yes, please proceed. >> Yes. My name is Frances Acuna, I'm a long time resident from dove springs. And a climate resilience community lead organizer for gave, go Austin, vamos Austin. I have sent you a spreadsheet where I put together the many recommendations that residents have expressed about flooding [indiscernible]. Some of that information I took from other cities and other states from what they are doing for flood mitigation. I have seen resiliency in residents everyday and in everyday arrive. Residents are learning about flood insurance, they're learning about how to build an emergency kit. They're learning about how to respond to a disaster. I have listened to their concerns, their fears and we

[11:44:47 AM]

have worked hard to prepare for a disaster. I urge you as a resident as organizer that you allocate funding for long-term -- locker room term infrastructure fixes, green infrastructure and communication that -- [buzzer]. You must have funding for standing ordinance for -- have such as case managers -- >>

Speaker, your time has expired. >> Ileana Rubin. >> Ileana Ruben. >> Yes, hi. My name is ileanna Rubin.

[11:45:47 AM]

I am a resident of district 9. I'm asking the council member adjust budget for community needs. The amount for community initiatives is not enough. Police do not prevent crime, they sometimes respond to it. What prevents crime is adequate housing, food and health needs met, accessible health services, basic income and community care. This is what the reimagine public safety task force committed to and police were never designed to protect bipoc communities. Please reallocate the budget for more to the task force recommendations that actually falls to the health and safety of our community. Thank you so much. >> Maddie Riley. >> Hi, my name is Maddie Riley and I'm a resident of district 6. I'm here to voice my opinion

[11:46:49 AM]

that budget should be amended to focus on community solutions for the sources of crime instead of asking our police to be the band-aid on failed policies in Austin. We're seeing a direct correlation between the rise of income in equality and the rise of violent crime. In district 6 homeowners being priced out are price poor from house prices that rose 52% in a single year. It is essential that rewrite in flexibility in the police budget to create solutions. Rather than spending our money on overplacing we need to have solutions that we need for policing, work with our department to provide direct aid programs, housing programs, access to childcare and food programs and other things that reduce the stress of poverty and are shown to lead to the higher rates of violent crime. Throwing more money at a single solution by increasing the floor of the police budget will not slow what we know are community-wide intrinsic problems. [Buzzer]. Let's stick to what we know

[11:47:51 AM]

and own up to our promises from last year. Thank you. >> Lisa Hudman. >> Yes, can you hear me? >> Yes, please proceed. >> I'm Lisa Hudman and I live in district 8. I'm against item 13 and urge the council to oppose the purchase of candlewood on pecan park boulevard. I have experience with the homeless and working in women's shelter. The hotel is not a suitable facility for a women's shelter. It does not follow the non-profit guidelines that it needs for addiction and treatment facilities, bus stops and grocery stores. The hotel campus has vulnerabilities and doesn't provide suitable protection that women need in a sheltered environment. Shelters are often targeted by the bullies that these women have escaped from. Also there are residents and businesses on the other side of the fence from candlewood and it's within a two mile

[11:48:53 AM]

radius of five schools with the Westwood high playing and practicing fields only yards away. Let's keep this neighborhood safe and come up with a better solution for our women needing shelter. I'm completely opposed to this purchase, but have a question about the price tag. Williamson county records show the hotel appraised value at 2.5 million, but the city is offering 9.5 million. [Buzzer]. Why would the city offer triple evaluation. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Carol Guthrie. >> Hi. I'm speaking on the budget item and item 10. You saw the video -- anyway, Carol Guthrie, business manager for afscme local 1624. We're asking that you support the employees in

[11:49:53 AM]

getting this additional small compensation. It will help them. They have worked tirelessly to -- they have worked tirelessly to serve the community pre-vaccine, post vaccine, prestorm, post storm. They have been there every single day and they need your help. I appreciate the pay raise that is actually in the base budget and I mention that because my concern on item 10 is that there will be massive layoffs. Item 10, the save Austin now ballot measure is fiscally irresponsible and I hope that you will stand opposed to it. This will bankrupt our city and we will have massive layoffs. [Buzzer]. You will have to choose which public safety you want. Do you want fire? They're going to have layoffs. Ems will have layoffs. >> Speaker, your time has

[11:50:55 AM]

expired. >> All right. Thank you and good luck. >> Manuela Cisneros. >> Good morning, city council, members. My name is Manuela Cisneros, a parent of a child in aid and grandchildren who attend aid schools: I'm here to speak in support of councilmember tovo's budget amendment to fund community school coordinators with a partnership with the Austin voices for education and youth. I'm a single parent who has been unfortunate enough to have my children attend schools that are community schools. And a community -- community schools I have a chance to be on the pta board, [indiscernible] Board and included in the planning and decision making that happens around my children's school.

[11:51:56 AM]

When the school district closed the schools a few years ago, parents like me who didn't want to lose our schools got together to keep it open. We made our school better by building stronger relationships

between parents, teachers and community partners. When covid hit the schools in our city -- [buzzer]. Speaker, your time has expired. Bethany Carson. >> Good morning, my name is Bethany Carson speaking on item 1 of grassroots leadership. When we have a five-year deficit it is irresponsible to fund \$10 million of anything that cannot be decreased, such as the police budget. Three years from now you could be in a place where

[11:52:57 AM]

you cannot raise revenue and funding has run out for initiatives you would have today. The governor has set a trap with hb1900 to deprive cities of the resources for growing cities to be affordable growing places for anyone but the wealthy. All our safety suffers if we cannot fund community needs. No amount of policing can compensate for creating a fundamentally unliveable city that forces increasing numbers of cities to survive. We're already seeing this reality and you must act now to reverse it. There are \$60 million of APD divisions that the reimagine public safety task force identified as harmful that could be cut and reallocated today. Thank you. >> Hi, my name is Taylor fox. I'm a resident and homeowner

[11:53:58 AM]

in district 2 and I'm calling in about the items number nine and 10, the save Austin now ballot measures. You've heard from other people that this measure would severely cut city services and I agree that that would probably happen. Every year for the next five years and maybe longer, the city will have to decide how deep those cuts should be. I guarantee it will never be enough to meet demands for more and more police money so the city will have to also decide how much to raise taxes. Just being realistic here. Every year city council will create more cuts and say no to critical departments like EMS and every year the city will have to decrease taxes far more than we've seen before. If you have to wring another \$100 million a year out of taxpayers to fund hundreds more police while deserving some semblance of an EMS and fire system, that just sounds like a recipe for real tax increases that will never end.

[11:54:59 AM]

[Buzzer]. I'm also concerned that the ballot proposition language that -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Gabriel Alvarez. >> Hi, I'm a resident of district 7 here in solidarity with Austin safer when. I voted for councilmember pool and I'm confident that she and other council members will vote no on this inflammatory irresponsible and ineffective measure. I'm strongly in favor of defunding and abolishing the police. Public safety is incredibly important to me but I know that police do not prevent harm from occurring and absolutely do not keep us safe. Deep roots with slavery and anti-blackism is not

a solution. The essential challenge of providing for the safety and well-being of our diverse communities. We need as many speakers to set a comprehensive approach

[11:55:59 AM]

to public safety which centers not the naive approach of criminalizing poverty, but rather the much more strategic effective and just approach of changing the conditions that enable harm to occur. But I urge you to oppose this dangerous measure which leveraged people's worst fears against them and continue your work with other departments to keep us safe by protily meeting your needs like housing, medical care, food access and mental health care. [Buzzer]. >> Hi, can you hear me? >> Yes, please proceed. >> Okay. >> Thank you. My name is Katherine Wright Meyer. I live in district 6 near the candlewood hotel. And I'm opposed to the purchase of the candlewood hotel by the city of Austin to use as a housing site because though it's called a shelter for domestic violence right now, this could be and probably would be switched out in the future. Candlewood backs up to a

[11:57:00 AM]

stable neighborhood in Williamson county, not Travis county. There are five schools near candlewood and long and circuitous and hazardous both by [inaudible]. >> Alicia samoud. >> Thank you. I am in district 6 and against item 13. Mr. Mayor and council, please understand this. There should be no kind of shelter whatsoever in a hotel named candlewood. This hotel is way too close in proximity to residents, small businesses, schools and children. We will then be faced with the same issues such as public safety, threat, drugs and crime. It is not a proper location

[11:58:00 AM]

in this district according to this city's guidelines and it is unjust for these hard working middle class residents who spent most of their lives working hard to build their community to keep their family safe. If we're honest with ourselves, most of us would not like this happening to our family and community. You can do better find a more appropriate location in district 6 to support these individuals. Come out and take a look at the hotel, would you? Williamson county hears us and will fight and vote against item 13 and we ask that you do the same. Thank you, councilmember Kelly -- [buzzer]. For those who oppose this item -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Please visit us and hear us first before you express an opinion. Thank you. >> Kelly: Mayor, could I request that we call back the previous caller Mrs. Wright Meyer because I believe she was cut off or

[11:59:01 AM]

the call dropped. >> We do call every speaker that gets disconnected but a lot of them when we do reach them, they disconnect. So we're reaching out to her. Zona Gillreath. >> Hi. As a proud resident of district 1 I would like to speak against the proposed increase of APD levels. We haven't addressed the need for deescalation and we haven't uprooted the history of abuse in the academy. When we can never reduce the police budget when it proves to be the mistake that it is and in a moment where petulant children facing discipline for the first time, officers are sworn to and manipulating Austinites to call them for help and told nothing can be done because APD don't have the staff and our prosecutors won't enforce the law.

[12:00:01 PM]

The Austin community deserves better. We have better ways to spend this money, better ways to solve this problem. Thank you. >> Katherine Wright Meyer. >> Yes, I think I was cut off. A I'm not sure. I don't know if I was heard before or not. My name is Katherine Wright Meyer, I'll start over. I live in district 6 near candle wood. I'm opposed to the purchase of the annual wood hotel by the city of Austin to use as a housing site because though it's called a shelter for domestic violence right now it probably would be switched out to something else. Candlewood backs up to a stable neighborhood in Williamson county and there are five schools near candle wood. The walk to children who might be in the hotel would be long and hazardous and circuitous and it would pose a problem for both moms and children walking down the

[12:01:02 PM]

paths and sidewalks. The location is bad for adults because shopping for adults is one to two miles away. They would have to walk along sh45-620 and that is hazardous by all the traffic and having to walk through or by extended homeless encampments to Walmart and walking the alternate route is kind of remote in a way and help would be hard to find walking along that -- [buzzer]. For the neighbors it's a bad situation because -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Thank you very much. Before you call the next speaker, colleagues, there's probably about 20 speakers left. I'm going to amend my recommendation to you. I think -- I'm going to need to step off. So I would suggest that we hear the speakers. There are two speakers that are going to speak both in housing finance corporation

[12:02:02 PM]

of the council so you will do that convening again. And then take a break for lunch. We'll come back in an hour, we'll let staff lay out the budget to ask technical questions that you need to fine tune your

proposals. We're not going to discuss the budget or the merits or any of that kind of stuff. And then we'll recess to go into executive session. And to the mayor pro tem I'll hand the chair back to you. Thank you. >> Myuta raja. >> I am a resident of district 10. I'm also one of the tri chairs of the climate quality chair commission on sustainability. I'm here to oppose item 10. The petition to put this on the ballot was a tactic. Adding police budget won't decrease crime and these

[12:03:02 PM]

items will not follow anything that the public safety task force carried out. I suggest that this money goes towards those solutions instead. Finally, police have been proven over and over to be a threat to people of color, especially black folks. Every time I see news of police shootings, I'm reminded that Austin is not safe for people like me. Our overinvestment in policing clearly signaled that we do not value our citizens of color. Thank you. >> Chivas Watson. >> One second. All right, don't start my time yet. Okay. I'm chivas Watson, community

[12:04:05 PM]

health worker and community advocate throughout the area. Safety in Austin is not measured by more police patrols or oversight, but as the gentleman said earlier and as Malcolm X said, by appealing to the root of conditions are not the issue. When the laborious efforts such as acquiring candlewood suites receives such disdain from neighbors we see what the root issue is. And the root being found with directly impacted people like myself and communities of colors continue to be neglected. The people who have brought real solutions to this dais. This entire budget is against the people's needs and wants who are simply surviving after the covid, [indiscernible] And delta pandemics. I asked last year for \$500,000 of reentry services to be provided but this year will go to someone who didn't have a service for me when I was a felon returning from prison last year. I once again ask you --

[12:05:05 PM]

[buzzer]. [Rapid speech]. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Mikala staunch. >> Good morning, council members. My name is may ka la and I am -- mikala and I am a resident of draft 3. I am Latino and I live less than a block from district 5. When I drive in my neighborhood I am anxious and scared. I worry about whether or not I or one of my neighbors being in the wrong place, wrong time, are next to be at the mercy of an officer who has not been [indiscernible] Or mental health training. Item 10 would increase APD's budget without meaningful commitments to training such as these that have been proven to actually help the community. Instead, item 10 proposes that 35% of an officer's time is dedicated to undefined community engagement.

[12:06:05 PM]

As a Riverside resident I promise you that my neighborhood does not need engagement from APD but resources like mental health, housing and ems. Item 10 is fiscally irresponsible and can lead to budget cuts and community resources. I am safer when community resources are adequately funded. [Buzzer]. I ask that the council listen to the recommendation from the Austin -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. Raul Alvarez. >> >> Good morning, mayor, mayor, city councilmembers, city manager. Thank you for this opportunity. I'm Raul Alvarez with C.A.N., the east Austin conservancy and I'm a district 3 resident and I'm here to ask for your focus

[12:07:05 PM]

on efforts to address displacement. I submitted background documents so please look to those details. First I'll share in the last two years that east Austin conservancy has had commitments of over a million dollars from contributions from the development community and we ask for your help to build on that success. I'll focus the rest of my time on what's marked as recommendation four of the document I shared and resource centers and hubs designed to bring utility for residents and neighborhoods who are in most need of assistance in times of crisis. These are also the communities most vulnerable to displacement. We need to be on the ground in an ongoing basis in these neighborhoods not just in terms of disaster emergency because the needs in these areas don't go away. [Buzzer], when the disaster emergency passes. For more information on the proposal, I refer to the anti-displacement action coalitions proposal on community resources --

[12:08:08 PM]

>> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Thank you for your time and I stand prepared to help in any way I can. Thanks. >> Kelly: Mayor pro tem? I think you're on mute. I wanted to say thank you to council member Alvarez for coming and speaking with us. It's really great to have your input. This year and within the community. I didn't want you to drop off the line without saying thank you for your service. >> Absolutely. Like I said, we're here to help in any way we can these are difficult issues and C.A.N., the conservancy and I myself will do whatever is needed to help. >> Harper-Madison: Councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: Yes, Raul. Contact our office. I know that Stephanie has been working with you on that issue and please continue reaching out. We really need to address that issue because we are with your help and your non-profit, we'll be able to save a lot of these seniors

[12:09:09 PM]

that are living on a shoestring budget and barely surviving and be able to stay in their homes. And with your help you have accomplished that and I hope you can make it better and improve it even better with our help. So thank you. >> Yeah. I see great potential. So again happy to help. You know you will hear more from me. >> Harper-madison: If we can go to the next speaker. >> Jennifer Mcphail. >> Hi. This is Jennifer Mcphail. I'm with adapt of Texas. I'm a community organizer with them and I wanted to speak with you today. In particular about the parks and rec department budget. A few years back we completed a parks master

[12:10:09 PM]

plan and it was recommended in the master plan that \$27 million gets spent on Ada improvements for a three-year period to make parks accessible and the programs that they implement throughout the city accessible to people with disabilities as well. And we're way behind schedule. The city was required to be fully accessible in every aspect of community life. And by 1995. So we're very, very far behind schedule. And we just wanted to get on record to let you know that we want to do more with you to ensure that people with disabilities have access throughout the community. [Buzzer]. But if you don't dedicate the right amount of funding then all the good intentions in the world don't matter. >> Speaker, your time has expired.

[12:11:11 PM]

>> Something as simple as bath rooms get left out. So I'm going request of you that we meet with you and/or your staff to talk in more detail because -- >> >> Harper-madison: Is that caller still on the line? >> Yes. >> Harper-madison: If we could allow her to finish her statement, please. Yes, we can. If you wouldn't mind finishing your statement and then I have one question. >> Sure. I was just going to wrap up by saying that these are really important issues and the longer it takes us the more it's going to be difficult to catch up because the city doesn't stop growing just because we put things off. Ada compliance and improvements are just as important as anything else. And during the pandemic mental health has suffered for people with disabilities as well. Being isolated is very difficult on everyone,

[12:12:11 PM]

including us. >> Thank you. I appreciate you sharing that perspective with us. I would like for you to be able to elaborate with my colleagues and I. I wonder if you have the information you shared with us and maybe more that we should be informed about, that way it can help to inform our decisions moving forward. Do you have that compiled or is that something you could put together for us to review? >>

Yeah. We intended to have some written comments for you and I can try to track down copies of the most recent versions of the master plans. You have both a sidewalk master plan and a parks and recreation department master plan that serve as Ada transition plans. When the Americans with Disabilities Act passed in 1990, cities and other governmental entities were required to have what's called a transition plan. It's basically a battle plan to figure out when you are going to meet benchmarks. But you were required to have all those benchmarks

[12:13:13 PM]

met and the compliance achieved by 1995. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate you pointing that out. [Overlapping speakers]. >> Harper-madison: I believe councilmember Kitchen has a question for you as well. >> Kitchen: Yes, thank you, Ms. McPhail. So basically what you're saying is that we haven't allocated additional -- sufficient dollars to make progress on the Ada -- >> That's correct. >> That's correct? Okay. >> Yes, yeah. Six that would be part of the -- >> I'm sorry, go ahead. I was going to say part of the problem, especially for the parks and rec department is that it continues to acquire property and do good things, but it leaves the existing properties that have needed attention far

[12:14:14 PM]

behind. We keep acquiring new things without any real approach to the existing projects. >> Kitchen: Thank you for bringing that to our attention. >> Harper-madison: I agree. Thank you very much. Thank you, clerk, you can proceed. >> Calista Preston. >> Hello, my name is Calista Preston. I live in district 6. I am against item 13. The idea that the city could use the hotel for anything doesn't make sense to our community, whether quarantining people for covid, housing people with domestic or for chronically homeless are all complex challenges that have to be addressed thoughtfully and carefully, giving people the chance to decide how and when to use the hotel doesn't make sense. Will it spend millions to refurbish only to fail.

[12:15:14 PM]

The latest plan for a domestic shelter, then why does safe strongly against using the facility and why does the hotel have none of the security that a domestic violence shelter requires. This points to the city not having a plan and in the absence of a plan wanting as much flexibility as possible at the expense of the community's interest. We are hard working, tax paying citizens. >> [Buzzer]. >> Whitney loss. >> Hello, I've lived in Austin for 15 years and I'm a resident of district 3. Apart from the threat of covid I have felt safer in Austin over the last year than I ever have before because I thought we were finally on a path to reduce police spending. Last year we were promised a

[12:16:15 PM]

shift in the way that we approached public safety and yet here we are again fighting to ensure that funds for vital services aren't ripped away in favor of deeply unnecessary and ineffective law enforcement expansion. Please hear what the majority of austinites really want. Don't increase the police budget, don't put other vital budgets like EMS and at risk. Do what you promised a year ago and provide evidence based strategies for keeping us safe. Make sure we have services that keep families together that maintain beautiful spaces to actually build community in and that house our less fortunate neighbors. Use your power to help us move forward, not back. Thank you. >> Noel Davis? >> Hi, my name is Noel Davis. I live in district 2. And I'm council please not

[12:17:17 PM]

to direct more dollars than are needed to be in compliance with house bill 1900. If you do you will be moving in the opposite direction of what you wisely voted to be in stand for last year. And if you go forward with the overfunding for APD urine forcing investments in what has not been working for so many in our community Andrew Rivera is in fact actively harming many people. So you've received many reports on the specific problems within APD and now by overfunding APD you will be supporting the continuation of that harm. So instead please direct funding the extra \$10 million to the reimagining public safety task forces' innovative recommendations such as five new neighborhood hubs for addressing gaps in services, more funding for community health workers and funding for the equity office review and oversight process. [Buzzer]. Please fund these community safety initiatives and do not increase funding for police. Thank you.

[12:18:21 PM]

>> Laura Templeton. >> Good afternoon, mayor and council members. My name is Laura Templeton, I live in district 10, and I'm opposed to item 13. The purchase of candlewood suites hotel to shelter victims of domestic violence for the same reasons I was opposed to the purchase by the city to potentially house our homeless there six months ago. It is simply not a good fit. According to the study conducted by safe, it fails to meet building requirements. It states that they buy hotels in Travis county where they have built strong and trusting relationships with people in the criminal justice and [indiscernible] Order systems. They would not have these relationships with their counterparts. They also stress that Williamson county afford the same leniency to undocumented immigrants. All of you should have serious concerns about that. Please give up the flawed idea of buying candlewood and find better,

[12:19:21 PM]

long-lasting, viable solutions for our city's most disadvantaged citizens. Thank you. [Buzzer]. >> Ana Stewart. >> Hi, Ana Stewart, district 1. I want to speak against item 10 and ask that any money be diverted to reimagining public safety task force recommendations. I also want to echo that 10 is effectively bullying and puppet earring our city now with absolutely deceptive tactics. I want to ask that the city does something about that. I don't know what that is, but some extra scrutiny for those petitions in addition

[12:20:22 PM]

to whatever scrutiny is being done, verifying through one way or the other each of those signatures. So many people have been duped into voting for these policies. And also Austin as a white and resourced person it's absolutely ludicrous to me that Austin is not safe and needs more policing. And policing is not faced for the underresourced communities and people who are terrorized by police. [Buzzer]. Put the money back into communities through reimagine public safety task force recommendations -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Sean Taylor. >> Hello, my name is Sean Taylor and I've been a

[12:21:23 PM]

district 5 resident and homeowner since 2015. I'm speaking today against agenda item 10 and to ask you to amend the upcoming budget to fund community supporting solutions. Community resilience hubs, community health workers and an equity review office and the public defenders office would all be more effective than policing. I urge you to stand by your budget vote last year and commit to renorth austining public safety beyond policing this year too. For our underserved community members, they are being harmed as much or more now as they have testified repeatedly. You've heard the reimagining public safety task force's recommendations, but the proposed budget funds the police department 10-million-dollar than hb1900 requires. Those millions could instead support the task force's recommendations. Show us you were serious in your landmark budget last

[12:22:23 PM]

year. Please support those recommendations. Thank you. [Buzzer]. >> Chaz Moore. >> Hey, this is Chaz Moore, executive director of the Austin justice coalition. You know, I don't want to repeat what everyone else said. I really hope that there is some way to remove the extra 10 million that is on top of the refund of house bill 1900. And I really hope you listen to the slew of people that have come on and said they've been duped by the save Austin now petitioners to sign this thing. If there's a way to

postpone this and go back and verify signatures I think that would be a really great move. And I highly encourage you all to continue to make hard

[12:23:23 PM]

decisions that are not easy and that are not status quo as we continue to try to reimagine public safety. So as always, I'm here to support you all and available to anybody whenever if you all want to talk about what that looks like. Keep up the good work. >> Jen marguilis. >> Good afternoon. This is Jen marguilis from district 1. Time and again from last summer you heard council, for community members pleading with you to increase health and well-being and guest from policing that didn'tly harms black and brown austinites and people with mental illness among too many others. The budget before you fixes incremental steps towards the goals of reimagining public safety, but it leaves intact the overpolicing and so many other resources. This budget doesn't change things for the people who have been telling you they're the ones most

[12:24:24 PM]

impacted by overpolicing. By funding the police the city moves backward from the progress you committed to. There's still time for you to defund this. Don't budget for a third cadet class. Move the additional \$10.5 million in the police budget to reimagining public safety priorities. Looking forward, please make every effort to fight the ballot if you can. [Buzzer]. >> Frank neshner. >> Hi. My name is frank. I am a homeowner and resident of district 1 and a member of Austin dsa and I am calling dependence item 10, save Austin now has lied to too many people and I am neutral on item 1. However you should only fund APD at the minimum that is

[12:25:25 PM]

required by hb 1900 because those dollars are dollars that we will never get back. And as we've seen Austin pd cannot be trusted, do what they say they're going to do as we've seen with their enforcement as it stands. I'm also asking that you vote yes on item 13. We see what people are saying. Somehow domestic violence survivors are problems for them. However, people need housing everywhere and segregating housing is not going to solve anybody's problem. So I'm asking that you fund the services according to the reimagining public safety committee and you do the right thing as was requested by you last summer. Thank you. >> Sola Luna? >> Hi. This is sola from district 5. I'm executive coordinator for Austin justice coalition speaking against item 10.

[12:26:25 PM]

Save Austin now's ballot measure will prevent Austin from providing the services we actually want and need. The council did not have an extra three million to hire much needed park rangers. The animal shelter needs additional staff even just one or two could help. There are so many organizations that we aren't able to find the funds for just a handful of full-time employees. If we continue to fund APD, that's virtually going to be if there's no money for anything else. I have personal experience with APD when I was suffering from a mental health crisis and I can tell you the last thing we need when you're at your absolute worst is to be handcuffed and escorted in the back of a police car. I was not violent, there was no need for it. It was just procedure and not something they had to do. [Buzzer]. I'm asking that you consider funding more mental health

[12:27:26 PM]

services and housing and virtually every other thing instead of APD. >> Speaker, your time has expired. Kristin Durham. E hello. I'm a seven year resident of Austin living in district 4 and I also lived in Austin for four years in the late 1990s. Austin is by far the safest city I've ever lived in and I've lived in at least 10 major cities across the U.S. The people who aren't safe in Austin are unhoused neighbors and others living in eclectic communities. We don't need more police. We don't need to increase the police budget. We need more money and services who support people and communities in crises. We need more housing, parks, childcare, things that enhance communities and raise all of us up and make Austin a nice place to live for all of us.

[12:28:27 PM]

We can't just throw more police at our problems. It doesn't work. We have to actually help people. All people. Not just wealthy people and property owners. I also want to testify that I was lied to by save Austin now canvassers on two different occasions. Once at the Travis county tax office and once at the farmers market at Mueller. They said it was to increase training for Austin police -- [buzzer]. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Thank you. >> [Indiscernible] Azhar. >> I serve on the [indiscernible] Of planning in our communities. Thank you for giving me opportunity to speak here today. As was mentioned earlier, planning Austin communities and the Austin justice coalition sent a letter to

[12:29:28 PM]

all of council asking them to vote in favor of item 13. Nearly 40% of austinites faced with homelessness identify as black and nearly 70% are austinites with a disability. As a community it is integral that we provide equitable opportunities for the unhoused now our city. The Austin strategic housing blueprint

has goals for these opportunities. In order to support such community goals and to meet our commitments to affirmatively furthering fair housing we must have that creation of housing in district 6 and west Austin. On a personal note I want to say that I am a frequent patron of the businesses in this area. I often go to the Pakistani, independent I can't understand and I really enjoy the food. And I want to say that I will stop going there because I feel unsafe -- [buzzer]. If anything this will ensure -- >> Speaker, your time has

[12:30:29 PM]

expired. >> Carmen Ilanes-pulido. >> Good afternoon, city manager, mayor and council. I want to say thank you for your service today. This is one of the most critical moments that I don't envy you, but I appreciate your enduring presence to hear all of the citizens who are concerned and speak to you today. I live in district 9 but I'm here in support of multiple priorities. First and foremost the budget recommendations that had been submitted to you from the gave coalition and informed by residents all over the eastern crescent, especially in north and south Austin. Regarding a number of priority, but also specifically on the resilience hubs and these are very bear legal and in line with the recommendations you see around neighborhood centers in reimagining public safety's task force

[12:31:29 PM]

recommendations. So like many other speakers, I North Korea you to lean in wherever you can to align and find resources for those things. Finally, I just want to say -- [buzzer]. You will also see us emphasize the need to continue support via Austin public health for our parent support specialist. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Abigail Jonse. >> Hi, Abbey Jonse here, district 5, speaking against item 10. We want police reform, but Sam told people that item 10 would do that, but it won't. This measure adds 40 hours of training. A lot of misinformation has already been spread that this training is what the

[12:32:30 PM]

community has asked for, but it absolutely is not. One of the many misrepresentations to the petition signers is that officers will get deescalation training. Instead the measure directs training to, quote, equip the officers to handle evolving fluid, dangerous situations and enhance their own safety and that of the public. And they specifically include, quote, intermediate weapons proficiency, active shooter scenarios and hasty team reaction, end quote. In other words, more of the training that adds to fear in officers, but any person can be a dangerous shooter and the solution is more weapons training. [Buzzer]. >> Speaker, your time has expired.

[12:33:31 PM]

>> Zenobia Joseph. >> Ms. Joseph, please unmute. >> Yes. This is Zenobia Joseph. Thank you, council members. I just wanted to point out a technical issue first. The speaker registration actually showed the 11th and the 13th, but only permitted speakers to sign up for Mueller for the 13th of August. So if you could just be clear about when speakers can actually speak on the budget as opposed to posting extra dates if we can't speak, that would be helpful. As it relates specifically to my opposition as it relates to the budget, I just wanted to call to your attention my opposition to project connect funding of the full time equivalent. There are 18 positions, 2.4 million that is specified in the budget document, but there were 12

[12:34:34 PM]

ftes August 5th, 2021 and the mobility committee requested. Either way I want to give you two specific examples. Jackie Nirenberg's salary 20 from \$90,000 to \$250,000 as director of community engagement and involvement of Austin transit partnership. [Buzzer]. Yanez banks salary went up under Austin transit partnership -- >> Ms. Joseph, your time has expired, but if you will wait on the line we will transition over to the Austin housing finance committee corporation meeting. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, Janet. I appreciate that. At 12:35 we're going to adjourn the regular city council meeting and begin the Austin housing finance corporation corporation meeting. Ms. Joseph?

[12:35:35 PM]

>> Exhibit a, both of them actually don't show any investment in home ownership and so I just wanted to make the comment that I'm looking specifically at housing development assistance program where it's just a dash. If you look at ownership housing development assistance there's nine G.O. Bonds and if you look at the other, exhibit 8, you will see only about 25 people as it relates to home buyer assistance. And I just wanted to call that to your attention because as you are aware, when you approved the St. Johns 19 acres there was no home ownership included in that. So I just lastly will say that the same arguments that you keep hearing about the permanent supportive housing and candlewood applies to he is sparrow Rutland permanent supportive housing as well and I would ask you to take into consideration the memo that I sent to you guys for item 118 for councilmember tovo last week. It's still relevant today. And for the people who are

[12:36:36 PM]

listening, pandemicoversight.gov is where you can actually file a fraud waste or abuse complaint -- [buzzer]. And I just -- I believe it's important for you -- >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. And clerk, I'd like to clarify for the record, I said adjourn the council meeting at 12:35. We needed to Vess the council meeting at 12:35. My apologies for that. I believe we have an in-person speaker for the Austin housing finance corporation. >> Yes. Pepper Medina. And I don't believe she is present. >> Harper-madison: Okay. Give me a moment because I do believe -- so that's it. So with that, I am going to recess the Austin housing

[12:37:36 PM]

finance corporation meeting at 12:37 and go back to the Austin city council meeting. So at 12:37 we're going to resume the Austin city council meeting. And I believe we have some remaining in-person speakers if that last speaker is one of the speakers. In which case the next in-person speaker is Caroline Ryan. >> She is not present. >> Harper-madison: Okay. In which case our next in-person speaker is Matthew corn. You have to forgive me. It's difficult for me to see chambers. I can't see the podium at all. >> They are not present. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate you offering me that validation. Lydia woodriff. >> Not present. >> Harper-madison: And then lastly there's Frida

[12:38:37 PM]

Chang. >> Not present. >> Harper-madison: Okay. So it's my understanding that before the mayor left the dais that the last instruction we had was that we'd go ahead and recess for lunch. We didn't discuss how long we'd do so. It's going to be a long day for us. Colleagues, do you have an idea about how long you would like to get? 30 minutes, 45? >> I'd say at least 45. >> Harper-madison: I would say at least 45 also. Is anybody opposed to 45 or prefer an hour? >> 45 is good. >> Harper-madison: All right. In that case if there's no further questions, at 12:39 I'm going to recess the Austin city council meeting. We're going take a 45-minute lunch. See you guys back here.

[1:43:56 PM]

>> Harper-madison: Natasha harper-madison in chambers and virtual on August the 11th, 2021. We're going to resume the city council meeting at 1:43 with a staff budget presentation. And then after the protection we'll toss a few questions, but obviously being mindful of the time. >> Carey Lange, brief budget officer. I just ask that the presentation be put up. Next slide. So we'll start the staff presentation with the staff amendments for the proposed budget and the first amendment that we're going to discuss is the revenue based on property tax. As we mentioned in last

[1:44:57 PM]

week's work session, the property tax revenue budgeted has decreased 2.4 million. The staff recommendation -- the staff amendment -- the staff amendment represents this decrease with a new proposed property tax rate of 281.6 million. Likewise there is an increase in the property sales tax for our current year estimate. This increase is a 5.8-million-dollar increase for current year. And a projected 3.1-million-dollar increase for fiscal year '22 for sales tax revenue. Next slide. The next amendment that I'm going to discuss is the transfer from the hr department to the police department. In the proposed budget there was a transfer of two civilian positions to the hr department.

[1:45:57 PM]

Upon further review of the tasks of those two positions, both departments determined that the proper chain of command and the proper fit for those commissions was closer to the academy staff so those of organizational development training manager and the recruitment coordinator will actually remain in the and department. There's a net zero impact to the general fund for this amendment. And then next is the fiscal year '22 mayor and budget council carryover, the \$843,000 based on savings from this fiscal year. Next slide, please. And then the Austin police department actually received notice that they would receive a grant from the active victim grant and from that we moved several positions into the general fund with the thought that the grant would not be continued in fiscal year '22. With this innovation we are

[1:46:58 PM]

increasing the grant authorization for the voca grant and moving six victim services counselors into that grant fund. That does end up freeing up about \$519,000 in the general fund within victim services. And then project connect, based on the property tax changes, we are anticipating a small decrease in the property tax revenue for the project connect fund. And we are allocating \$152.8 million for expenditures, which are based on the agreement with capital metro and will go to the Austin transit partnership. Next slide, please. The Austin fire department is working with the development services department to continue their services with their expedited building plan unit and this is a position that both departments have

[1:48:02 PM]

requested. Development services will fund this position for this support and so there will be a net zero increase to the general fund to continue with the services to review architectural plans. And then there

are 11 positions that we are proposing for the housing and planning department. These are general fund positions that will be completely reimbursed by the Austin transit partnership grant with a zero impact to the general fund. The next three slides are just discussing the fee schedule changes. Watershed protection is adding language to their fee schedule to allow for some peoples in the watershed regional storm water management fees and this slide just details those changes that are going to be added. And the next slide, please. The Austin transportation department is increasing fees related to their valet

[1:49:02 PM]

service program within their parking management fund and this is based on a cost of service analysis that was completed in this fiscal year. Those changes just were not updated in the fee schedule prior to proposed so this is a correction of those needed increases. And then finally, development services department, they are deleting a couple of fees related to the residential plan review. And these fees are already included in the watershed protection department fee schedule so that's why those are being deleted. They're deleting some wording in their residential miscellaneous fees. And then they're adding a fee for the amount of 147 that was inadvertently misplaced once they did the renaming of the zone compliance letter. So this is a correction of that fee being left off inadvertently. Those are all the proposed changes from staff amendments, and I am happy

[1:50:02 PM]

to answer any questions. >> Harper-madison: Thank you for the presentation. We appreciate it. Councilmember kitchen. I can't see the dais and I really don't want to skip y'all. If you want to holler out if I miss you. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I understand right now we're just asking quick questions and if we have anything to discuss from a substance we'll do that later. >> Harper-madison: We said we'll do the quick questions, substance later and then technical questions later. >> Kitchen: My question is at some point I want to hear from budget staff on the impact on taxpayers of the various levels of tax -- of our tax rate that we may be consider. So I guess that's contemplated for later. >> Harper-madison: I'll have interim director Lange confirm that would be one of the questions you would consider appropriate now or should we save that into until we get deep beer the content. >> I think we can have that

[1:51:04 PM]

content when we get deeper into the technical content. >> Harper-madison: Councilmember kitchen, did you have any other questions? >> Kitchen: No. >> Harper-madison: Okay. >> Alter: Mayor pro tem, I have a quick question. I wanted to clarify that you said the reversion of the positions between hr and and had a net zero impact on the general fund. Does it change the budget for and? >> Does it change

the budget for and? It does not change the budget for and. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Harper-madison: If there are no other questions? -- >> Tovo: Mayor pro tem? >> Harper-madison: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I have no questions on the presentation. I had requested from the mayor that we have that speed round of questions for staff that help us kind of prepare for the voting later. So I'm not sure if that was

[1:52:04 PM]

the technical questions that you referred to or what, but I have those questions Teed up whenever the appropriate time is. >> Mayor Adler: So yeah. I think the intent at this point now that we've had this preparation, to give council and frankly their staffs the ability to answer technical questions that people need to be working on while we're back in executive session dealing with some of those other things. So it's not the time to debate merits or anything like that, but if you have technical questions such that you and your staff -- >> Tovo: That would be great. I'll run through those and I'm happy to provide a written copy for staff who need it. Let me preface this by saying -- >> Harper-madison: Councilmember tovo, I hate to interrupt, but before the mayor came back I said we'd defer to the technical questions later. And I think theoretically councilmember kitchen had what would be considered a technical question. So if you wouldn't mind can we start with her since I

[1:53:05 PM]

skipped over her? Oh, the chair is back. Chair, that's a request that transpired while you were away. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem, I appreciate that, but I will recognize councilmember kitchen as you were going to do. >> Kitchen: Yeah. I think at this point I know that we'll have opportunities throughout the day. At this point I just wanted to make sure that we'd have an opportunity later to -- as we start to talk through our budget amendments and start to consider what level of tax rate each of us may be interested in, I would like to understand at that point the impact on the savings for our taxpayers. I'm okay bringing that up later. >> Council member, we can resend if need be. We sent out a document I believe on Monday evening with a list of every tax rate option up to the eight

[1:54:06 PM]

percent with the impact to the typical homeowner and the typical senior disabled homeowner. If that's the information you're looking for, at the -- there are some areas that we can highlight if there's something in particular that you want us to identify. >> I thought it would be important because we've had budget presentations in the past with a slide that showed taxpayer impact with the taxpayer given the fees and that sort of thing. I'm really looking for an update to that slide. >> We can get that update out to the council in the next few minutes. >> Kitchen: Yeah. I don't know what -- council obviously hasn't had the discussion yet or decided what rate we all want to land at. I just want to be sure as part

of that conversation we will know what the impact is of what our decision is. >> We'll get that worked on. >> Mayor Adler: If you can resend that email out. For some reason I missed that email.

[1:55:06 PM]

If you could send that again, I'd appreciate it. I'm sorry? >> Alter: It was Monday at 8:50 and they gave us a very exhaustive chart. >> Mayor Adler: Great. I'll find it. Okay. Thank you, councilmember kitchen. Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Thank you. Colleagues, to frame some of my comments, some of the questions relate to things that I need to know about before I vote on some of your amendment. Some are to identify some ongoing funds. If you look at 17 -- I'll just provide a one sentence framing for this. If you look at question 17 it outlines the positions that will be coming in in-house. We had a work group of this council and councilmember Casar and councilmember kitchen and I and councilmember Flannigan and I served on it a and we were going to phase in positions

[1:56:07 PM]

that are of consistent use here at the city of Austin, things like security guards and custodians who are filling a constant ongoing need, but we fill those through contract positions versus hiring them as city employees. And when we got to the bottom of it, it was a cost issue. And it was a priority of this council to make those positions permanent, city of Austin positions, recognizing that out of fairness and really efficiency from a taxpayer perspective, it makes pest sense for those positions that are fulfilling ongoing needs to be city of Austin employees. I had hoped we would be phasing more of those positions in during this budget and I would like to see us in the course of the next day or two to do an additional chunk of those, even if it's just those proposed for the city

[1:57:07 PM]

library, which is five security guards. And I had mentioned this in some of our earlier conversations and doing that is going to require some additional funding. Some of my questions that are 401(k) To follow are an attempt to see based on the really great budget questions we have asked what are the viable options. Now I'll just speed through them. In number 34 I had asked a question about nonmedical incentives which equates to about 2 hub thousand dollars. I have a list of what those are, but I'm asking the staff whether there are any they believe will not take place this year because of our ongoing pandemic or are there any that can be eliminated without causing lots of upset among the staff? In twin and 162 I have a variety of questions about our spending within the hotel occupancy tax and

[1:58:08 PM]

that's probably a little bit of a short back and forth with our staff. We are approving that budget and the estimated allocations. And among other things I want to understand the answer in 162 talks about an assumed acquisition of \$10 million and I want to know what happened to those funds that were not expended because I think they were set aside for one of the acquisitions that we have not been able to complete, but is a priority of our council and I want to make sure those are not being redistributed into other areas. Also I would like a better explanation in 21 of which of those positions currently exist and which ones would be new for the upcoming year because of our hotel occupancy taxes have dropped, I want to really make sure we're setting enough aside for those couple of acquisitions that we're still pursuing. In -- questions 96 and 64 deal with the development services and thanks to my colleagues who asked these service.

[1:59:08 PM]

It's not clear why the center for ace is not covering its cost through fees. These are both questions about the development services department which is now an enterprise fund and I think councilmember Kelly you had asked 90 about what and why funds are being transferred from the general fund into dsd if it's an enterprise fund. So one such transfer is ace, and I just asked my question about that. One such transfer is listed as urban forestry and the city arborrest and asking follow-up questions. It sounds like he is covered on fees and I'm not sure why urban forestry is not. And I would like to know whether dsd is able to maintain a fund balance, roll over funds from the previous year as our other enterprise funds can do. And if so how much is being rolled over. 123 also deals with fund commitments.

[2:00:09 PM]

\$300,000 in ongoing annual fund commitment to the long center improvements. I'd like to understand that was a commitment made in 2014. I would like to understand what the end time is and what the period of time of the contract is. And then if staff would clarify for us, same question, 123, the \$7.5 million in the economic incentive reserve fund, are these dollars all spoken for in terms of meeting -- of providing the incentive to the companies that have already met those metrics. Back when we first started under the 10-1 council there was a policy of -- financial policy of paying forward, like paying the incentive couple of years of chapter 380 payments and I want to make sure that 875 is just what we expect to pay out this year and not in future years. And if it is prepaying some of those, if you will, I would like to know how much

[2:01:10 PM]

that is because those would be ongoing funds we could tap. I'll leave it there for the moment. 152 there's no scope yet as I understand the teens the question 152 there's no scope yet for that position other than it will help expedite affordable housing developments, but I would like to understand whether that position will come online this year. And 149 and 189 both deal with the etod study and the northeast -- let me three for now because I may have sorted it out. I had some questions about whether that \$1.1 million for the etod study and the geographic program is being studied and if you're bringing that forward in the amendment. I think I understand that so I'll leave those questions for now and I have any remaining I'll ask another time we talk up your

[2:02:10 PM]

amendment. 24, I'll leave that for now unless I leave that money. Number 12 refers to the arpa allocation not including a position to be -- to assist with the case manager workforce development and it includes -- there's a line in the answer to 12 that talks about, well, the arpa allocation doesn't include a position and I'm not understanding that exactly because it was a pretty general allocation. I want to understand better if it cannot have a position for some reason. I'm not clear on. And that's it, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Before we go into executive session does anybody else have any other technical questions they want to answer? Yes, councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. We've already asked staff, but I'm just going to flag

[2:03:10 PM]

this because we'll probably have an amendment. In the capital rehabilitation fund there's some funding for the animal shelter that I think could be funded with KO's and I wanted to do that and debt finance that and move that money into pard's allocation of the rehabilitation fund so we would still satisfy our policy with respect to capital rehabilitation but we would be able to accomplish the needs of the animal shelter as well as provide additional assistance to pard in their very high maintenance backlog. So we're exploring what portion of that 400,000 will be used in KO's. An then I'm also -- this is more of a flag for my colleagues. The non-profit arts grant has gone through its process and they were able to -- they're going to be awarding 100 grants, but there were

[2:04:11 PM]

219 applicants. Those applications are already in and scored, so depending on if -- I would prefer it to stay low on the tax rate, but if we are going to go up, I will be suggesting that we provide additional funding into that grant fund so that we can provide an additional 50 or so organizations that are in need of funding right now with covid so that they can thrive as arts organizations into the future. But we're waiting on confirmation on some numbers. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Fuentes. >> Fuentes:

Thank you. And councilmember alter, I wanted to draw your attention to an amendment that I have provided and posted on the message board. It's a policy directive regarding cultural arts funding that would ask that we allocate more funding into the cultural arts program. It's a net revenue neutral policy directive and it's

[2:05:12 PM]

just asking that we get even more money out the door as quickly as possible. So I would draw your attention to that posting on the message board as well. >> Alter: Was that something you posted this morning? >> Fuentes: Yes. >> Alter: I didn't see it. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, anything else on a technical? There have been several budget amendments that council is bringing that I am really supportive of that identify a particular vendor to do a particular task. And I can't know and I don't know whether that's the best vendor to do that task. In most cases it seems to be right there because I know the vendors and I know they're doing phenomenal work. At the same time there are folks that are reaching out saying that before you actually award it to those vendors there might be some background that would be helpful on reporting issues if they've ever risen in the past on a future contract that enable us to be able to fix or raises equity issues

[2:06:13 PM]

in terms of maybe this is an opportunity to also build some additional cultural capacity into contracts. So I've asked my staff to pull together an overall rider that says that to a degree that any amendments have identified a particular vendor to do something that the council should see that as statement of intent and statement of endorsement of an organization that's doing really good work, but ultimately the staff has the discretion to make sure that the purpose of the amendment is being fulfilled in the fairest, justice, most efficient and best way. So we may need your help in figuring out how to actually word that overall rider. Anything else before we go back to executive session? >> Kitchen: Mayor, I have a question about what you just said. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. You haven't had a chance to

[2:07:13 PM]

talk yet so I'll talk to you and then go to councilmember alter. Go ahead. >> Kitchen: Thank you for clarifying the language that you're talking about bringing forward. As part of that I think it would be helpful just for clarity purposes to designate which amendments it applies to, just to avoid any confusion or lack of clarity for the staff on which ones it applies to. So when you put that together it would be helpful to understand which one it applies to. >> Mayor Adler: We'll take a look at it. They were the ones who identified a particular vendor to do such, a particular organization to do something. It could be that that is something that is the right body to do whatever it is. >> Kitchen: Sure. >> Mayor Adler: But I'll try

to catch them all. >> Kitchen: No, I don't have a problem with what you're saying. I just want -- I know that there are always possibilities for lack of clarity or confusion and I want to just help our staff understand what is meant by

[2:08:14 PM]

that. That's all. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter? >> Alter: Thank you. I think we have two organizations in for financial money for victim services but those were written to be illustrative or what the program was not to sign which organization would be getting it, but I think it's written that way. And then I also wanted to just bring attention to my colleagues that we're not bringing an amendment to add funding for the minority ethnic chambers. We've been working with them on a great plan that I think is going to help us to better accomplish the goals that we have for those chambers and our city investments, but it is at this point budget neutral so we're not adding any additional funding in the budget. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I haven't had a chance to

[2:09:14 PM]

look at the chart that you sent out with property tax rates. Will that tell -- if I wanted to know what the rate should be to still deliver all of the property tax relief that the manager had proposed, is that point marked on that page? It is. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Do you remember what that rate was? Approximate. >> It's not marked or highlighted, but it's included in the report. \$9.03 per year. >> Mayor Adler: \$9.03 per year. There's a corresponding rate that drives that. >> 5.4. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. All right, councilmember tovo, did you have anything else? >> Tovo: Yes, mayor. I neglected to say that I'm going to be circulating if I haven't already an amendment related to code and some direction related to a

[2:10:16 PM]

variety of areas from resilience hubs to the downtown Austin court and some other areas. I would welcome and ask both the staff's help and you as my colleagues' help in seeing if we have identify some ongoing funding for those positions described in 17. Obviously not all of them, but again if we could making bit more progress to bringing in some of those jobs that would be helpful. >> Mayor Adler: All right. I think with that we're ready to go to executive session. So you want to pay attention. We're going to go into executive session. By the way, this will be entirely remote, so no one will be physically present in executive session. I think that was the way we saw that these meetings be handled best. We're now going to go into closed session to take up possibly four items. Item number 16, which was the employment duties evaluation of manager has been withdrawn for today. Pursuant to sections 551.071

[2:11:17 PM]

and 551.072 of the local government code we'll discuss legal issues and real estate matters related to item number 13, which is the hotels matter. Pursuant to 551.071 of the government code the city council will discuss legal issues related to item number 1, which is the adoption of the budget to discuss legal issues related to the funding of staff for the anti-displacement measure. Number 14, legal issues related to the potential November 2nd, 2021 election, basically ballot language, I think. Item number 15, legal issues related to the covid response. Without objection, we will all retire to our offices, I think, or where we are, and give us five minutes and then we'll all be in executive session together. The time is 2:11.

[4:55:33 PM]

(Executive session)

[5:06:18 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: The time is 5:05. We are out of closed session and in session. We discussed real estate and legal matters related to item 1, 13 -- actually we discussed real estate legal matters related to 13. We discussed legal issues related to items 1, 14 and 156789 and now we're back out. Colleagues, let's see if we can take care of the nonbudget stuff that we have. I think we can vote on 8. Consider 9 if we want to. 10. So we can talk pilot language in propositions a and B. We can also do item no. 13. Which would be the hotel issue. And it's 5:05. It could be that that takes us to our dinner break.

[5:07:18 PM]

The first thing we'll do is just let everybody go through and explain their amendments. If people want to and then I think probably we should have a conversation about where people think they might be with respect to tax rate. Because that might help us better understand kind of the parameters within which we need to fit. I think we need to take a dinner break around about 6. I think we should have those kinds of -- preliminary stuff done. Taking a break at 8 or 9 o'clock no later than that if we can and come back and recess the meeting and come back tomorrow and see if we're able to knock it out. Does that work? Council member kitchen. >> Kitchen: Just to be clear, so you're suggesting that we go to eight or nine o'clock tonight.

[5:08:18 PM]

And that we start the budget process just by explaining and that's as far as we get. Is that what you're thinking? >> Mayor Adler: Yeah, to the degree that people feel like they need to, we can also talk about where people's tolerance is maybe on the tax rate issue. I think that kind of tells us kind of the envelope within which we may be working. >> Kitchen: Well, I'll certainly do what others are interested in doing. I would prefer to not go late tonight. I think getting through the items we have to vote on to night will make significant progress and then I think we can take up the budget in the morning. So I would be happy to not come back after dinner, but of course we'll defer to what others think. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We have a long day tomorrow potentially and I think if we can kind of lay out a framework even if just for an hour or so, too, I think that might very well help us a lot tomorrow. I'm not

[5:09:18 PM]

real sure what to work on to night until we've had that preliminary stuff. So that would be my preference. But let's go ahead and -- you want to decide that now? Are people comfortable going to eight o'clock tonight? Paige? >> Yes, thank you, mayor. I would like to get as far as we can tonight. Just my two cent on how our process is going. And we have a lot to get through and I would feel comfortable if we went as far as we could and had less on our plate for tomorrow. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, council member cast car. >> Casar: I suggest if we keep our dinner break tight, while still acknowledging some people's need to feed their families and the like, if we did dinner from 6 to 6:45. Maybe we could get an hour and fifteen in before eight. >> Mayor Adler: Council member pool?

[5:10:19 PM]

>> Pool: That sounds good to me. I don't want to go much past eight and then we will reconvene tomorrow at ten. Is that right? That's the posting for tomorrow? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. All right, let's go ahead and proceed and see if we can make that work. Let's begin with item no. 8, which I think is now posted -- >> I think you meant to start with 9, prop a. >> Mayor Adler: We're starting with prop a. Let me see if I can find that. >> It's like the parkland is 8 and the -- 9 is the save Austin now petition.

[5:11:31 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have an extra hard copy? >> Actually it's 9 and 10. I guess 9 is the -- it says adopting the ordinance and 10 is setting the election. So 8 and 10 are the two election items of the.

And 9 is the adoption. >> Mayor Adler: The lines have been filled in on the ordinance for prop a -- I think the lines have been filled in on the ordinance for prop a and prop B. So I'm going to go to the computer screen in backup which I can take a look at but then I can't see anybody on the computer. >> Mayor, can you remind us all where the backup is on this? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, if you go to austintx.gov. Click on government. Go to city council, meeting information. On 8-11 there is the city

[5:12:36 PM]

council meeting agenda. >> Mayor, if it helps, I can e-mail these out. >> Mayor Adler: That would be great. >> I think we need to make sure the public knows where these documents are, too. >> They are posted on the council website as all other backup. But I can e-mail them out as well. >> Mayor Adler: That would be great. austintx.gov. That's one of the drop downs. Go to city council meeting information, when you go to council meeting information, the first thing that's listed there is the 8-11, the budget adoption reading of city council. There is an agenda button off to the right of that. Click on that, and that gets you to today's agenda. And I think the number for us to start with here is the

[5:13:39 PM]

proposition -- it will be proposition a, which are on our agenda items 9 and 10 I think. I think 9 is the resolution if we were going to adopt the citizen initiative. Does not appear to be the will of the council to do that. In lieu of doing that then we set it for an election. So if you click on item no. 10, that gets you to item no. 10 which is the work papers and the like. >> Actually, mayor, I would like to vote in support of adopting the petition as is. I just want that on record even though it's not the will of the council. >> Mayor Adler: I understand. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Mayor N that case, would council member Kelly make a motion? >> Mayor Adler: She

[5:14:39 PM]

certainly can. Does anybody want to make a motion to adopt item no. 9? >> Kelly: I'd like to make that motion. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to the motion? Okay, failing for want of a second. We'll move now to item no. 10. Item no. 10 is in front of us. It's version 2. That is in front of us. Hang on a second here.

[5:15:57 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Does this have the language for the proposition in it? >> Yes, the ordinance does. >> Mayor Adler: The ordinance. Okay, I see it now. I'm sorry. So we've been presented with an ordinance. This item here which is item no. 10, is there a motion to approve this item no. 10? Council member Kelly makes a motion. Is there a second? For this motion? >> I can do that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, council member pool. We'll let you second that. Colleagues, we've been presented with an initiated ordinance. Since we're not going to adopt it, we have to set this on the ballot. The initiated ordinance has a caption associated with that that was circulated with the petition.

[5:16:59 PM]

And some have argued that our city charter requires the council to use the caption in the circulated petition as the proposition that's placed on the ballot. For a for or against vote. The caption language in article V of our charter that these proponents point to has been there essentially in that identical form for nearly 70 years, since I think 1953. I'm not aware of a Austin city council ever adopting a petition's caption as the proposition language. Based on legal advice that this is what is required by the charter, I'm also not aware of any court having ruled that that's what a council has to do. Even if the charter might

[5:18:00 PM]

otherwise be interpreted to require such an approach, the council cannot take that step if the petition's caption is inconsistent with the requirements imposed upon us by state law. As to how a proposition has to be stated. And we know that it is the council's duty or collective duty under the Texas election code to adopt appropriate language for the proposition that puts an initiated measure in front of the voters for an up or down vote. This duty as articulated by the courts doesn't compel us to blindly adopt the captions language as the proposition. In fact, state law forbids the council from doing so if taking such steps would not present a fair picture of the initiated ordinance to the voters.

[5:19:00 PM]

And this makes sense because those circulating a petition can just add a caption that doesn't match what the initiative is asking the city to do or to change or to add. A remedy that would have us reject a petition that was signed by people who intended for that petition to be put on the ballot to reject it because a caption was insufficient to give a fair picture clearly would not be something that I think the public would accept nor would it I think fair, efficient proper running of government. So if the charter language is not the guide, then what are the rules we have to be guided by when we're picking language and we refer then to state law. And direction. The caption or proposition cannot contain an affirmative

[5:20:01 PM]

misrepresentation of the ordinance, and the proposition or caption cannot leave out key features of the initiated ordinance. This is state law. We are bound by it. We cannot and should not ignore it regardless of what our charter might be interpreted to say. So comparing the substance of the initiated ordinance with the caption that accompanied it when the petition was being circulated, based on the discussion that we've heard since the initiated petition was certified by the clerk, I find, and I think others of us on the dais have found some pretty significant problems associated with the omission of key features. The caption omits the following key features of the initiative, and the first one is cost. I think that in some respects that is the most

[5:21:01 PM]

salient key feature of this resolution. This resolution is in essence ordering a budget action. It's ordering a specific spend, and it is a huge spend. But yet the fact that the voters voting for this would be potentially incurring such a significant cost and liability is not mentioned at all in the petition caption. The petition caption does not reference the minimum police staffing levels that are described in part 2 of the initiated ordinance, which is probably the second most salient feature of this petition. Because it sets a very specific staffing level.

[5:22:01 PM]

The petition's caption does not reference minimum levels of community engagement required of the police force, which is a key feature that's found in part 2 of the initiated ordinance. There is no reference to training mandates found in the proposed ordinance at all. So based on these admissions, it's my view that the council would not be following the guidance and requirements of state law if we simply accepted the exact language of the petition's caption in choosing the language of the proposition that is to be on the ballot. Therefore, this motion containing the proposed language that actually provides a fair picture of

[5:23:02 PM]

the proposition and contains the key features would read: Shall an ordinance be approved that at an underestimated cost of \$271.5 million to 598.8 million over five years, requires the city to employ at least two police officers per 1,000 residents at all times, requires at least 35% of patrol officer time to be

uncommitted time, otherwise known as community engagement time, requires additional financial incentives for certain officers, requires specific kinds of training for officers and certain public officials and their staffs and requires there be at least three full-time cadet classes for the department until staffing levels reach such a specific level.

[5:24:03 PM]

Colleagues, that's what's before us right now. This resolution, this ordinance in front of us would identify this matter that would appear on the proposition on November 2nd as proposition a. Colleagues, further discussion on this item? Mayor pro tem. >> Harper-madison: Feel free to redirect if after we -- after we're done indicts cussing the item as the more appropriate time. We had multiple callers earlier who made reference to the item and had concerns and I just wanted to make certain that people didn't think that there was something that we as a body could do about their petition concerns. So do you suppose now or after we discuss this item is the time for us to see if staff can come up and talk to folks about what our options are there? >> Mayor Adler: We can

[5:25:04 PM]

certainly have staff come up if you wanted to have staff come up to speak to this now. >> Harper-madison: I think it will be brief, just a matter of the city council does Microsoft the power to -- does not have the power to do anything with this petition. I just want folks to know that we just can't do anything, and I think having the professional speak to it would be great. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, let's bring up our clerk. >> Mayor and council, I will try to address that question. Under state law once a petition has been certified, council has the option of either adopting it or ordering an election. As far as the questions regarding wanting to have their signatures removed from the petition, state law requires that an affidavit be filed with my office prior to the filing of the

[5:26:05 PM]

petition. Once the petition is filed, any affidavit that would get filed after that date would be invalid under' state law. For this petition, we did receive calls and e-mails regarding the process for having their names removed. Any of those that were received prior to the filing, we provided them with the affidavit form and instructions, but we did not receive any prior to the filing of the petition. If that answers your question. If not, please let me know. >> Harper-madison: Very much so. Thank you. The last thing I would say is if you could just confirm, so there is nothing we can do about the folks who want us -- it's done. What could be done is done. >> That is correct. Council has two options and law can correct me if I'm incorrect. Either to adopt or to place

[5:27:06 PM]

the measure on the ballot and then the voters -- >> Harper-madison: I'm sorry. I was referring to the petition specifically. Thank you. I think you answered the question. >> Yeah, the only options you would have would be to discuss putting forth charter amendments on the petition process for future petitions. >> Harper-madison: I think we'll definitely look into that. My staff and I have been talking about it briefly. >> I'm happy to talk to you about those. >> Harper-madison: I'd appreciate that very much. Thank you, Jeannette. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, further discussion on this item? Council member Casar? >> Casar: Mayor, because the ballot language includes the range of cost, I would like Mr. [Indiscernible] To just very briefly talk about his memo to us that resulted in the cost that is put on the ballot. So I know you have a longer -- I know as our

[5:28:06 PM]

chief financial officer you have a longer memo on the cost, but will you lay out for us, especially because it has sometimes been said two officers per thousand, but your memo lays out it could be more after a higher cost. If you could walk us through that, that wap great. >> Sure, the proposal does call for two officers per thousand employed, and so to have two officers per thousand employed at all times, we will essentially need to over hire because of the way our cadet classes run if we want to ensure that we're always two officers per thousand employed or hired, that necessitates us to over hire. Another parameter is the 35% uncommitted time, sometimes called community engagement time, proactive time. Achieving that target in conversations with our police research team, we believe that we would have to go beyond two officers per thousand employed in

[5:29:06 PM]

order to achieve a 35% uncommitted or community engagement time without having unacceptable impacts to our emergency response capabilities. That number comes out to more like 2.35 employed with the same caveat to get to 2.35 employed, we would need to over hire beyond that amount. >> Casar: Understood. And if we were at a population of a million, 2.35 comes out about 250 and which is roundly about 600 more officers than we have employed today more or less. >> More or less. And then we also looked at it over -- taking a look into the future, of course, based upon population growth. We will have to continue to add officers in order to maintain those ratios. And when you start talking about hundreds of officers, you run into the very real dynamic of where are they all going to be housed and so looking into substations and current facility capacity and where would we be able to house these additional officers.

[5:30:07 PM]

Of course there is vehicle cost and equipment cost that all have to go into that O C then at about \$120 million a

[5:31:09 PM]

year on the high end of the range for those first five years, I think for a lot of folks they may not -- folks in the community may not have a good sense of exactly what that means within our general fund budget. A lot of times we hear numbers that big wheern making a one time expense and not a yearly expense. So our friends at cgm could just pull up the powerpoint and let me know if any of the numbers here seem wrong to you. But I just wanted to compare what the cost of the ballot measure is to other city departments. So here is the cost at 120 million a year of the ballot proposal in front of us. If you'll hit next. Here is the cost of the parks and recreation department if you hit next. So that's -- so -- even if we shut down the entire city park system, we would not be able to pay for this. If you shut down the whole city park system plus the housing and planning department, which is the next one, then you get close to the cost of this per

[5:32:10 PM]

year. Or if you shut down the whole ems system, you still don't get very close to the cost of this. If you shut down the ems system and two-thirds of our social service contracts, then you get to the cost of this. The last example I have here is if you shut down the entire public library system and on top of that 20 ems stations, and on top of that, 16 fire stations, on top of that -- keep clicking through -- so the cost of the ballot item is the entire public library system, 20 ems stations, 16 fire stations, the entire animal shelter, which is next, and then on top of that, one more, all 22 neighborhood pools and Barton springs. So just to get my math right here, to get to 120 million a year in the general fund, the library system is 58 million.

[5:33:11 PM]

Ems stations cost about 1.1 million a year to staff. So 20 ems stations at 22 million. Fire stations cost just over 1.5 million to staff, so 16 fire stations, the animal shelter costs \$9 million to run according to animal services, and then all 22 neighborhood pools plus Barton springs costs about 5 million to run each year. >> Greg, I hate to interrupt, but I'm being told that your slides are not showing up for the public. >> I can see them. And I'm hearing that they are now showing. >> So they are up now. >> Casar: Okay. We'll make sure to share them out. And then the last example I did want to show was on the next slide, what

if we made staff reductions across city departments in the general fund? Just so people understand the cost, so here you have a pie chart that shows not

[5:34:11 PM]

support services or the enterprise fund, but our general fund, it does not include the police budget because under hb1900 we cannot reduce the police budgets. So here you have our general fund. The biggest chunk is fire. The next biggest is ems and social services and public health, parks and libraries and then housing, animal services and the municipal court. Then you can see next to it the \$120 million it would cost, which is as you can see a significant portion of the general fund. So what I asked was if we just made proportionate cuts to each department in order to keep the budget the same, what would those cuts look like? So if you'll go next. So what would this look like in staff reductions? So the first biggest would be to the fire department at 40 million. That is 400 fewer firefighters. But that 40 million of course is just a third of the cost. So then you'd have to go to the ems department or sorry

[5:35:12 PM]

parks and libraries to make a proportionate cut. That's \$30 million. I calculated this at 75,000 per civilian. That's the median salary and benefit cost of civilian employees. So it would be those 400 firefighters and the 400 parks and library staff and ems is the next biggest part of the general fund budget. Proportionate cuts would mean 210 fewer medics, and the figures appears is that is 210. The next cut would be to health and social services at 75k per civilian. That is 255 fewer health and social service staff. And then the last piece would be 10% of our budget, general fund budget is the courts, housing and animal services that, would be 160 fewer of those positions. Add it all up, 400

[5:36:16 PM]

firefighters, 400 parks and library staff, 210 medics, 255 health and social service staff and 160 courts and other staff totals the 120 million a year for 1,425 fewer city staff positions. And if you hit next you can see all of them. So that is the number of firefighters, parks and library staff, medics, and court staff that it would cost us to -- if we just went and cut 120 million a year out of the budget. Of course some of this could be reduced if there were significant tax increase. We could keep some of these services. I don't see that folks pushing for the petition asking for a tax increase, but th is just a sense of just how big and how devastating it would be to our budget. And frankly I think also to public safety because I think that our firefighters, our medics, our parks and library staff, our violence

[5:37:16 PM]

prevention staff, they all help keep our city safe and running and that's why I chose not to vote to adopt this ordinance, to put it on the ballot because I believe that we should pass a budget like the one we're passing which does hire some new police officers but also firefighters, but also medics, but also park staff. We're trying to provide a comprehensive set of services and this would just devastate our existing city services. >> Mayor Adler: Council member Casar, could you put a copy of that presentation to backup and give it to the clerk so if people are looking for it in the record, they can see it. You also made reference to a memo written by Ed anino, August 10, 2021 that was the fiscal analysis of this. Can you also please post that in backup if someone wants to see it, they know how to easily find it.

[5:38:21 PM]

Yes, council member Kelly. >> Kelly: Thank you, my understanding is our firefighters have civil service protection, is that correct? >> They do. >> Kelly: Okay, so we wouldn't be able to just cut 400 positions of the fire department overnight in order to make up that part of the budget, correct? >> I would really need to defer to our human resources director, our labor relations officer. I'm not aware that there is a protection against a reduction in force in our labor contract, but I would really need to defer to them. >> Kelly: Okay, if you could circle back with me about that, that would be great. Do I appreciate the visual eyes lyings from council member Casar and the work and effort that went into that, I want to make sure that is an accurate statement. I don't know if you can speak to it. >> Casar: I sure can. While we could go and look at the provisions as relate to reduction in force, part of what I'm doing here is not layoffs because I would do everything I could to prevent any lay offs at our city. What it does visualize is if we were to make proportionate cuts what that

[5:39:21 PM]

would take. It also visualizes what we could not pay for otherwise and so in another world if we had 120 million more dollars, that is the kind of positions that we could add. So again, this is not me making a proposal to layoff our staff, it is just showing if there is 120 million-dollar impact to our budget and we proportionately had to cut in each department, then if you take the salary and benefits that our staff used to calculate those positions that, is the positions as they appear. And then the fact each fire station or ems station that would close or the whole public library system or park system, that is pulled from the all funds summary document from our budget as presented to us in July. >> Kelly: I appreciate that clarification there. I think it's important for the public to be able to visualize where cuts could happen, but they would come from somewhere. So thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, council member Fuentes. And then council member

[5:40:21 PM]

pool. My gosh. Hearing that number is just staggering. It's a striking number to hear as an elected official to 2340e that our hands would be tied, knowing that that would be the size of our entire library system and all of our pools. You know, the library in my district -- it was critical during this pandemic and continues to be. It's where our community goes to get tested for the vaccine. At one point, it was where -- sorry -- at one point it was where our community goes to get tested and now it is a vaccine center. And as you know our libraries the nucleus of our neighborhood. And just knowing that this amount, this impact should this proposition pass would have in our community, would have in our ability as local elected officials, which

[5:41:23 PM]

whichs our ems and firefighters is staggering and I hope our public is tuning in and is engaging in these next few months to see what that fiscal impact could be on local government and how that could translate into some really harsh cuts if so. >> Pool: Yeah, I have to agree. I find this item to be fiscally irresponsible and certainly not a very conservative approach to our municipal budgeting. It ties our hands financially, and for that reason alone, unchecked increases to future budgets where this council and future councils would have no real say. For that reason alone I -- if I could vote no on item 10 today, I would do that.

[5:42:25 PM]

Instead, I will vote to put it on the ballot and hope to educate the community sufficient bely so that they understand how fiscally irresponsible this measure is. >> Mayor -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes, council member kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, I would just echo what my colleagues have said. The other thing about it it's not effective. I think that we all share the concern with our community that we continue to be a safe community, and we all understand that we need police officers to help us be safe. This doesn't do this. It's not effective. The requirement for two officers per 1,000 is not hitting the bull's eye in terms of what we need for safety. We had a very good

[5:43:26 PM]

conversation earlier this morning about the importance of actually analyzing why we have violence in the community and directing our -- directing our solutions directly at that so we can be sure and get effective results, we had a good discussion about why simply relying on measures per capita type measures for officers is not going to get us the result that we want. And we don't even know that two officers per 1,000 is the right number. So I think that given the high cost of this, the fact that it's not

going to be effective, I can't support it. I mean, I have to vote to put it on the ballot, but I hope we have good conversations with the community like we had this morning with former council

[5:44:26 PM]

member bill Spellman and professor Spellman who is a national expert on how we can keep communities safe. And as he said, this measure, two officers per 1,000 is not effective. We obviously need more officers in the future, but we have provided for that. We have future cadet classes coming forward, and we'll continue to provide for that. So I think that it's important that we keep our community safe. That we continue as a safe community as we've been in the past, but we really need to know that we're doing that and bankrupting our -- tying our hand, bankrupting our budget in a way that's not effective for safety is just not the way to do it. >> Mayor Adler: Council member alter. Council member Ellis and then council member alter.

[5:45:27 PM]

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I agree with a lot of these sentiments that my colleagues are sharing. I'm also very seriously concerned that what the testimony we heard this morning claimed that people may have been misled or didn't know what they were signing and then subsequently -- at least one person said they asked to have their name removed and was not aware of how the clerk's office can handle removing your name from a petition. That's extremely unfortunate to hear and so on top of the other concerns that my colleagues are sharing here, I really hope that people aren't doing this with petitions if that's the case because that's really unacceptable and not a part of our democratic process as far as I'm concerned. >> Mayor Adler: Council member alter. >> Alter: So this petition is fiscally irresponsible as council member Casar

[5:46:29 PM]

indicated. It is socially irresponsible as council member kitchen has mentioned. There is a lot of questions about the validity of this petition as council member Ellis has raised, and I would add that I think it is also legally questionable. Our charter does not allow a voter-initiated ordinance to appropriate money. That's not on the ballot and we have to vote to put forward a petition if it comes with signatures that have been validated, but I think we also need to keep that in mind. Finally, I wanted to just add one more piece to what council member Casar said about the cost. This evening and tomorrow we're going to be talking about what is the appropriate tax rate, whether we want to stick with the 3.5% cap or consider going up more. We have a chart that was shared with us that tells us how much money we would be able to raise if we

[5:47:29 PM]

increased from 3.5%. If we were to go from 3.5% to 8% which is the max we can go, the most amount of money in this year with our tax base as it is, is a letter bit over \$25 million. So basically every single year we would have to go to 8% and we'd have to go to the voters to do that tax rate election. And if the voters don't want to go to 8% every year, then we have to do the cuts plus, you know, so we have to cut and then we'd have to cut even more if we couldn't get the tax rate election. So it's really fiscally very impactful and given all of the other things that we've said, I think I couldn't support item 9. >> Mayor Adler: Anyone else? >> Thank you, mayor. And I just can't believe

[5:48:29 PM]

this group that brought this petition is so irresponsible for them. You know the first thing that we would have to cut is library, parks, swimming pools, all our rec centers. And that is what's keeping us safe, it's keeping young people active and with activities year-round, including during the summer, and for us to have to cut any of these programs, you're just going to put more people on the streets not having anything to do. It's going to bring chaos. I just cannot believe that this group did not do their homework and [indiscernible] Something like this. I've been through some of these surveys that they put out there and it is so misleading. They ask you if you agree with this and then they reversed the question on a second question, and then they keep doing that to

[5:49:32 PM]

confuse you so that they can get a good survey out there and that's not the way that Austin operates. And I hope our citizens really wake up to see what they are trying to do to us and vote it down. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, anything else before we take a vote? >> Yes, mayor. >> Tovo: Yes, council member tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you. Thanks to my colleagues and especially to those who really articulated well the page costs of this petition. Thank you to Mr. [Indiscernible] For laying those out. You know this does as my colleagues have said -- let me start with council member alter what you said about it being legally questionable. I share that viewpoint. I think it is in conflict with our charter, and would really caution anyone who is considering voting for it to make sure they understand that before they cast their ballot. As one of my colleagues said, this does tie the --

[5:50:32 PM]

absolutely does tie the hands of the city in terms of our future budgets and it ties us to unsustainable increases. Anyone who is thinking about voting for this measure should really take a look at the city budget and understand well the impact of being tied to this unsustainable cost, and make sure that they understand that this measure passes, we would have to cut city services across most city departments. I absolutely support having a safe city as we've discussed. The city manager's budget this year includes funding for police academies. I intend to support those, but this budget, this petition that has been brought forward for the voters is hugely, hugely of concern. And again I think I really want to make sure that anybody who is considering voting for it really well understands the budget and understands the impact that would happen in terms of the cuts to city

[5:51:32 PM]

services across all of our city departments. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Any other comments? Ready to take a vote? This has been moved and seconded. Those in favor on item no. 10, please raise your hand. I'm showing that as being unanimous on the dais. This item is put on the ballot. Let's now go to item no. 8, which is another potential ballot item. Again, this one is in backup the same way we got to the other one. It's also been e-mailed out, colleagues, to those of us on the dais, but it's available to the public in backup and associated with the agenda. Is there a motion to approve

[5:52:34 PM]

this item 8? Council member Renteria makes the motion. Is there a second? >> I'll second. >> Mayor Adler: The mayor pro tem seconds the motion. Discussion on this item? Council member Renteria. >> Renteria: Yeah, I'm trying to get up to the motion itself. I'm trying to get to the wording right now. >> Mayor Adler: I have it up. You want me to read the language for you? >> Renteria: I found it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Renteria: The ordinance ordering a special municipal election to be held in the city of Austin on November 2nd, 2021 on the question of authorizing the city council to convey or

[5:53:38 PM]

lease approximately 9 acres of parkland located at 2525 south lakeshore boulevard. Also known as the central maintenance complex. It provides -- in providing the terms and conditions under which such a conveyance or lease would be made authorizing the city clerk to enter into the joint election agreement with other local political subdivisions may be necessary for orderly conduct of the election and declaring an emergency. I don't have the other wording there that is going to be posted. Mayor, do you have that or that's the one? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, proposition B shall the city council be authorized to convey or lease approximately nine acres of parkland currently used as the central maintenance complex, the cmc,

located at 2525 south lakeshore boulevard, through a public bidding process with a total value of the bid is equal to or greater than the appraised fair market value

[5:54:39 PM]

of cmc, in exchange for at a minimum, one, at least 48 acres of waterfront land contiguous to an existing city park, and two, the cost or construction of a new maintenance facility for the parks and recreation department on other city owned land and, three, partial or full funding for removal of fiesta gardens existing facility and restoration of that land to parkland. Okay, further discussion of this matter? So my understanding of this, colleagues, is we have an opportunity to be able to get a really desirable piece of land that I know our parks staff has indicated that they want to get. Something that the staff has inquired about in the past and never been able to

[5:55:40 PM]

actually acquire an important piece of river fronting property that could be used right now for recreational purposes, also provides a connection for trails and provides continuity in our city, and I appreciate your effort, council member Renteria, in helping to bring this forward and finally put us in a position where if the community wants, we can make a swap of parkland for what will be parkland, but an important piece of parkland plus getting those other two things, the construction of that new maintenance facility for parks & recreation that we've needed to do and never been able to find the budget space to get it done, as well as something I know that has always been dear to your heart since I've known you I think, and that's being able to restore and reclaim to

[5:56:44 PM]

parkland that also maintenance facility on fiesta gardens. But when you are trading parkland like this, it obviously has to be voted and approved by the community to get it done. So this necessitates an election and this would be proposition B. On the November election if this passes. Any further discussion of this item? We'll go ahead and take a vote. Those in favor of this item -- council member kitchen. >> Kitchen: And I had something, too. I think council member pool had her hand up first. I'll go after her. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, it was a tie. I was look at you both. Nobody was raising your hand. I called the vote, you threw up your hands. >> Kitchen: It's okay, I would rather go after her. >> Mayor Adler: That's okay. Council member pool. >> Pool: I just wanted to say that this is a pretty

[5:57:44 PM]

exciting proposal and proposition for the voters to cast a ballot on and especially in light of the connection to existing parkland hopefully with some waterfront acreage and so forth, and it just is presenting a unique opportunity for the city of Austin for a really nice expansion of our parkland and, as many think you mentioned earlier, this is something that our parks & rec department and our parks director have been looking forward to accomplishing for quite awhile. So congratulations to council member Renteria for bringing this really great proposal and here is to good success in its ballot status. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Couch kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, I just wanted to say -- I wanted to thank council member Renteria as well as council member pool. I know they both have been

[5:58:45 PM]

working on this. I'm excited about this possibility and so I really -- I'm pleased to be able to support putting this on the ballot for the public to consider. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, council member Ellis. >> Ellis: I look forward to supporting council member Renteria and council member pool's work on this. I think this is a creative way to possibly move forward into having more parkland and being able to reclaim land that is being used as maintenance facility at festival beach so it can be more usable to the public. And I think that's a really, sighting thing for to us do and look forward to this going to the voters. >> Mayor Adler: Great. Anybody else want to speak on this? Been moved and seconded. Item no. 8. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais. >> I would like to abstain.

[5:59:46 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. Council member alter abstaining. Council member Casar also abstaining. Others voting aye. Council member Fuentes off the dais. So it's 8-0-2-1. All right, let's go on then to the - - so that takes care of those items. Colleagues, that gets us to item no. 13. This is the candle wood matter. Colleagues, I move passage of item no. 13. Is there a second to this motion? Council member Casar seconds. Discussion? I brought the motion. I want to go first and then I'll come straight to you, council member el I.

[6:00:49 PM]

Kelly. These kind of resolutions where we're locating facilities associated with meeting the challenge of middle linebackers in our -- challenge of homelessness in our community, the challenge of deeply affordable in our community are hard votes. And we've seen that on so many votes and so many situations that we have -- we have been in. You know part of the issue is that nobody -- nobody likes

that we have these challenges of affordability or homelessness in our city, and everybody wants it to be -- everybody wants it to be fixed. This is a compassionate community, and most everybody is and wanting terribly to be able to resolve these challenges. We also recognize that as we resolve these challenges, it's requiring us to raise

[6:01:50 PM]

issues and concerns pretty much anywhere it is that we venture forward to try and find good places for people to be. There is no such thing as a perfect place. But in this community recognizing we have a challenge, recognizing that there is no way to meet this challenge, but to help people have good and healthy and sustainable places for them to live, we have to do the best we can, even in really difficult situations. This vote is no less difficult. I've had the opportunity to spend a fair amount of time out at the property, to be able to spend time with neighbors living or operating businesses in and around this property, and I hear, and I understand the concerns that are being

[6:02:51 PM]

presented. I also know that some of the things that folks come in and express frustration about is existing circumstances, talking about some of the folks that talked today, talked about the fact that there were people in their area or that they think were folks experiencing homelessness or impacts in their community they think that came from that community. That's pre-existing before anything has happened. And the best way for to us deal with those challenges anywhere and everywhere in our city is to help people get off the streets and into good places to live because if we can do that, then we can get them services for the challenges that they might be facing so that they can sustain their lives. We know that when we do this, find people places to be able to be and help them get the services they need, the organizations doing that in this community are 95%

[6:03:56 PM]

successful in helping folks sustain their lives. But even still, it's hard to locate the places for people to be. But it's something that we have to do. Manager, we have talked. You have talked to several members of the council about this. You know, I understand as we're beginning to open things up, people remember what the arch used to look like. And everybody thinks when we do something like this, that's what's being set up and we have to make sure, as our absolute duty, that that will not happen as we move forward with this program. And that if this passes, that this will not happen there. I recommend it to you that you consider putting a full-time person out there to help ensure the facility looks like an apartment building, which is what these things should be

[6:04:57 PM]

looking like, a contribution to the area. And not something that is of concern or ultimately generates fear, anxiety. It should be a benefit to the community and we have to promise ourselves and the community that if this passes, this is what we'll do here as we will do this with the other locations in our city. We have several of these that are located around the city. We have people that formerly experiencing homelessness that are living in apartments and motels all over our city. And it's happening without people noticing that it's happening. In fact, the only time it most especially gets noticed is when you're finding a new location to be able to open up. So I recognize I want the commissioner of Williamson county, the judge of Williamson county to know that I have also heard them. I have had the opportunity to speak with them on numerous occasions about this. I understand the concerns

[6:05:59 PM]

that they are raising. And I think that provides us exactly what it is that we need to do as we move forward. I want to compliment our staff in being able to relocate people from the library just east of I-35 on 1st street into housing and on a path to housing. At Menchaca to Ben white. Cesar Chavez across the street from where we are, we're moving -- helping relocate the people in those camp tent areas from that area into housing or a path to housing. We need to do that in more and more places. We have a plan in this city that's now being supported by everybody from the chamber of commerce and the downtown Austin alliance all the way to the justice coalition to help house

[6:07:00 PM]

3,000 people experiencing onyou can homelessness in our city over the next three years. And incremental -- an additional 23,000 people to what we were otherwise doing -- 3,000 people to what we were otherwise doing. That's how we get head of this challenge. We're able to did that where our challenge is of a scale where we can resolve it, but it is our duty to do that now, because if we ignore this challenge and don't take the hard actions and the difficult decisions now, then in six to eight years this challenge will be too big for us to wrap our arms around. We'll be facing the same scale of challenge as being faced in Seattle and San Francisco or Portland and L.A. And we are not there today, which is why we have to act. And I see this as a step in that direction albeit as hard as this one is. So I'll be voting for this even recognizing the issues. Council member Kelly.

[6:08:00 PM]

>> Kelly: Thank you, mayor. I remain concerned that we've not adequately addressed the concerns of nearby residents or engaged our Williamson county partners per resolution 2001 that was passed June 10th with council member Casar off the dais for the vote. Furthermore, a council resolution 28th, 2021 memo from our homeless strategy officer Diana Gray, individualized that staff would not have an update for us regarding clapping with our neighboring counties until August 21, 2021. Moving forward on this item without consensus puts us at greater risk of litigation and avoidable use of city resources. Today we heard overwhelmingly from district 6 residents and others in the community who are against this location and its use for permanent supportive housing. I want to thank everyone who took time to speak. I want to thank those advocating on behalf of the

[6:09:00 PM]

community. Thank you to city staff here and my colleagues for taking time to make this decision. It is my hope that we can continue to work together through this outcome. As for this facility being used as a domestic violence shelter, we have a letter from Safe Austin that says this is not an appropriate location. It's available in the backup on item 13. I echo that sentiment and for no other reason the address has been so widely publicized that I would fear for the safety and privacy of domestic violence survivors. If it is the will of this council to move the purchase forward, I will continue to fight tirelessly and advocate for extensive collaboration and set forth the expectation that this property should be an outstanding example of permanent supportive housing that is both an asset to the clients who reside there and the neighborhood. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Council member Kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, I want to explain the reason that I

[6:10:03 PM]

cannot support moving forward with Candlewood. I have been a strong supporter for housing for the homeless and have fought very hard for lots of different locations and funding, and for the Heal Initiative which was the examples that you mentioned, Mayor. So you know, I wish that I was in a position to support this particular location, but I am not. And I want to explain the reasons. First off, I don't think that this location is about whether we want housing or not. Or whether we want housing for permanent supportive housing or whether we want to move forward quickly with housing for homeless individuals. We all want that. But we want to do it in the most appropriate way and in the best way. I don't believe this location is the best location. I've been out to see it. I think there are issues with it, but beyond that, we pledged to work with

[6:11:04 PM]

Williamson county to find other locations. I think that L are options -- potentially there are other options that we perhaps have not fully explored and so I think moving forward with what is not the best option is not appropriate for us to do today. And I'm disappointed that we're doing that. I also want to say that council member Kelly has worked hard to support housing for homeless individuals, and I know that she is working hard in district 6 to find the most appropriate location. And so I respect her judgment when she is suggesting to us that perhaps this is not the best location. And so I will continue to fight hard as I have in the past for locations for permanent supportive housing for our homeless individuals and I just don't think this that this is the right

[6:12:04 PM]

approach right now. I also am quite concerned that we're not acting in good faith with our partners, and Williamson county. So I'm not going to be able to support this. >> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, anyone else? Council member Casar. >> Casar: The resolution today is to authorize the same price that we voted on several months ago, and I think it's just important to note how the hotel strategy can help house people who badly need it and also is cost effective strategy. Terrace at oak springs which is a really excellent housing intervention for people experiencing homelessness that I fully support, I know so many on the dais do, costs about 440 thou dollars per home. The single room occupancy project for foundation communities and again projects that we really appreciate and need more of costs 200,000 to 250,000 per

[6:13:06 PM]

home. And they really do end homelessness for people. They're not a temporary solution, but the hotel here before us is about \$120,000 a unit. It may cost a little more depending on the level of renovation, but this is a relatively new hotel. Not every property is exactly the right property, but the recommendation from our homeless strategy officer for use of this property is important to me. And we can see right now how with the hotel purchased in my district, the hotel purchased in council member Renteria's district, how that is being used successfully to pull folks out from camps and into homes. And I believe that that strategy -- we can see it working right now and I want to continue seeing that strategy work here as well so I'll be voting in favor. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Any further discussion before we vote? >> Mayor -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Yeah, thank you. I want to echo my thanks to

[6:14:08 PM]

our staff who have really worked diligently over the last few years. Our staff in real estate as well as our staff in the homeless strategy office to identify properties. I know it hasn't happened as quickly or as smoothly as any of us envisioned, but that a Y not for a lack of the effort and I appreciate the effort

you've put into bringing different properties to us for consideration. I also want to thank our colleague, council member Kelly. I know that you are really well representing the concerns that you're hearing from your constituents and are working productively towards solutions as well, and as you demonstrated in your support of the heal initiative and all the work that you put into that effort that was brought forward by council member kitchen. I am going to support the purchase today for reasons some of my colleagues have mentioned. We need permanent housing for individuals experiencing homelessness to go. I look to the examples that foundation communities and

[6:15:09 PM]

other organizations that I'm most familiar with, foundation communities that they have set for us. They have set high standard of communities that are positive and really provide stable, safe, healthy housing for individuals who were previously homeless. They are communities that are rich with resources and programming and are really an asset to the neighborhoods in which they reside and, manager, I echo the call that the mayor made to make sure that the facilities that the city owns are every bit the assets that some of our nonprofit partners have brought to the city. They should be places that are -- where neighbors are involved and that there are programs that extend beyond the city development into the community and just the very same way foundation communities does and that we are really setting a great

[6:16:09 PM]

example for this city. As you mentioned before I think it's unfortunate that as we begin to talk about different kinds of strategies, we are always up against some of the public concerns that are generated by some of those areas the city has managed not well, including some of the outside environment at the arch until that shifted, including some of the undesignated public encampments that have been throughout our city and so I would ask you -- I will call on you to please make sure that this meets expectations. Everyone's expectations for the safety and health of those who will live there as well as the community around it. >> Mayor -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead. Mayor pro tem. No. Who was it? Was that council member pool? >> Pool: Yeah, thank you. The purchase of this

[6:17:09 PM]

property has not been without significant controversy, and that's really unfortunate. I had hoped that we could bring the community together and come to a reasonable accommodation that would heal the divisions that this particular proposal has caused. I want to thank council member Kelly for her diligence in talking with her new constituents. She was dropped right into this issue shortly after her inauguration, and that is not an easy road to navigate. So kudos to you, council member Kelly, for the work that you've

done getting up to speed on this issue and bringing a high level of understanding and education to your constituency. I know they appreciate you and it is not an easy job

[6:18:09 PM]

trying to communicate broadly on complicated topics. It just isn't easy. I do hope that this -- should this item pass today and this property be purchased and converted into permanent supportive housing for homeless people in Austin, that it is a stellar example of the city of Austin in Williamson county in this instance, but for the city of Austin that is a stellar example of how we can properly house people, provide services to them, and help them move forward in their lives and out of permanent supportive housing if they're able to. So I hope that our staff and whoever is brought on board to help with the management

[6:19:11 PM]

and the operation of this site do the best darn job that anybody's ever seen. Because I think we owe it to the community because the high level of question and concern because of the high levels of questioning and concern so we need to prove up that the city of Austin can in fact operate and administer and bring these kinds of services to all parts of the community and do it well. And satisfy the concerns that have been I also want to remind all of us that the hotels are not enough. In the housing of people who are sleeping on the streets and for that reason I continue to support finding locations for the encampment strategy that I voted for back in June. That I have not abandoned that position. I think we need to continue

[6:20:13 PM]

to press forward with all of the tools available to us and all of the options that are out there. It's not -- one size doesn't fit all. There aren't enough hotels in Austin and we don't have the budget in order to purchase all that we might need for -- I hate to say it hurricane season a potentially growing number of people who are homeless coming to our community that we then are responsible to serve and take care of. So I will not be voting for this particular item today. I join my colleague in opposing it, and saying that I will reiterate that I really do hope that if this does come to fruition and it is purchased and it becomes supportive housing, that it is the best darn operation of this kind in our city. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[6:21:15 PM]

Council member Ellis. >> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I do think that it's important that we continue moving forward on our hotel/motel conversion strategy. It seems to be one that is working well for our community and as some of my other colleagues have said, you know, we do need to increase our permanent supportive housing stock and we do need to provide spaces for folks to be close to services than these units will continue to be available even after people are able to move into their own apartments or homes later on in their journey with or without housing. We want to make sure people have a safe, warm place to go so they can get back on their feet and take control of their lives and I think it's important that we listen to our homeless strategy office and officer and support the work they are doing and to choose solutions that will help people exist homelessness and give them a safe place to go. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[6:22:17 PM]

Mayor pro tem. >> Harper-madison: If you'll bear with me, I think we sent an image over that I'd like to show my colleagues and the general public. And I certainly can't tell when it's up. I guess it will be on the screen behind you all. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. Clerk, do we have the image? >> Checking. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. No, I don't think they have the image. Clerk -- >> Harper-madison: The really important part of what I'd like to say.

[6:23:17 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Try to e-mail it to me and I'll see if I can get it to them. >> Harper-madison: I'll check with my team. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor. I appreciate the grace.

[6:24:18 PM]

They're going send it over now. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. They are sending it directly to the clerk? >> Harper-madison: They are sending it directly to you. That's it. I'd like to propose we take a quick five-minute break. Is that okay? >> Mayor Adler: You okay with that, colleagues? >> Mayor, can I ask real quick -- is this the last item that we're taking up? >> Mayor Adler: Then we're take a break for dinner. Yes. >> I'm going to be driving home. So I may step away and then rejoin when I get home after dinner. >> Can I just -- if we're really taking a dinner break and then ending at 8, we're getting to the point where there is -- that just doesn't make sense. So I wonder if we need to evaluate that plan. If we take a 45 minute break -- if this discussion concludes at 6:35 and take an hour break we're back at 7:35 to wrap up at 8. >> Mayor Adler: So the

[6:25:18 PM]

other question is -- >> We need to work longer or not come back after dinner or do something different. >> Mayor, I would rather work longer and not take a dinner break. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> I'm going to need a dinner break whether we take one or not because I'm going to drive home and rejoin the meeting from home rather than stay here late tonight. >> What about -- >> Harper-madison: Whenever you're ready, I'll go ahead and go without the image. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, why don't you go and we'll finish this up. >> Harper-madison: I'll describe the image for you. The image was of the McCabe center which is in district 1 just off of mlk right across the street from a coffee shop. You've probably seen it a big square brick building. I had the opportunity to

[6:26:21 PM]

take a tour? There was some folks working on perm permanent supportive, and I had the opportunity to take a tour and just got to see how amazing the facilities were first of all. But the image that I was going to show you all is an aerial of the McCabe center. Just so folks who are kernal about what it might look like to have permanent supportive housing in your neighborhood, just to get an image of it. I think that's a part of the problem. I don't know that some of the folks who are standing in opposition had the opportunity to tour a space that would potentially be what it is, that they are going to have in their neighborhood. All that said, I know that I recently had an opportunity to have unsheltered camping in my district and rejected it. If it were a structure, and it were permanent supportive

[6:27:22 PM]

housing I would easily have said yes. I also should acknowledge I was going to vote no on this item. I was going to vote no on this item for lots of reasons, including I lived in far northwest Austin in that Anderson mill area. They are very close to the candlewood and we frequented frita's restaurant right there and having heard these folks talk about the impact they thought it would have to their businesses made me remember a night where my husband and I sat on the patio and a gentleman came and asked us for money. And it happened often. It happened at the grocery store. It happened in the shopping center at Anderson mill and 183. There were lots of folks who camped there, lots of folks who -- what they call flying a flag who panhandle, and that said, my concern was that if we allow for a space that's going to help get people on their feet, people who are not inclined to engage in -- like the

[6:28:22 PM]

gentleman said earlier, his truck was broken into. These are people who already live in your neighborhood. I'm very concerned that the folks who'll be moving there to get their lives together, to get the help they need are going to be targeted for some -- and accused of some of those acts. And that really scared me. And I agree with my colleagues, this isn't the best location for permanent supportive housing. It's not exactly transit-friendly. It's not walkable. But we also need to remember that a lot of our unhoused neighbors do have cars. They have to make the choice about being able to get around and be able to sleep with a roof over their heads. And I'm landing on the fact that we badly need housing. Permanent supportive housing in my mind's eye is a great tool, very much like councilmember pool said, all the options, a suite of options, the whole toolbox. A great tool in our toolbox to resolve homelessness. I wanted to bring up that

[6:29:23 PM]

image if for no other reason I pass by that building for probably 30 years and I had absolutely no idea what it was. And until the moment that I walked in I had absolutely no -- I had no idea what was happening in there. So I just wonder if some of the fears and anxieties maybe a little overstated. And I really look forward to much like I don't recall who said it, making sure that they offer some assurances to our neighbors in Williamson county that will make sure to be considerably more communicative next time if that should happen. And all neighboring counties, we should have been more communicative. And I recognize that that would cause frustration. That said, I hope we can commit to being more conscientious and careful in the future with our neighbors, our neighboring governmental bodies and the neighbors. And that said, I have moved in the direction of being

[6:30:24 PM]

able to support this item. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ready to take a vote on item number 13. Those in favor of this item please raise your hand? Those opposed? Voting no, council members pool, kitchen, Kelly, alter. Those in favor please raise your hand, just to make sure. The others voting aye. This passed 7-4. All right, colleagues. It is 6:30. The question is do you want to kind of lay out -- go through kind of people's amendments, have a conversation about where people think they generally are on the tax rate, which I think is as far as we could really realistically go, or do you want to take a break for dinner and come back and do that, or do you want to just take a break and come back tomorrow at 10:00?

[6:31:25 PM]

I think those are the three choices. Councilmember Casar and then councilmember alter. >> Casar: If we broke for 45 minutes I think we could be back for 45 minutes to an hour, be out at 8:00 arrest 8:15, but I defer to the group. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I would prefer that we take a break

and then come back and I don't care if it's 45 minutes or an hour break, a I'm willing to go somewhat past eight, but not past 9:00. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I couldn't quite hear councilmember alter, but I would prefer that we go ahead and take a break now as we had planned, and then I'm fine coming back. I don't care if it's 30 minute break or 45 minute break. Then we can come back and talk through as you suggested, but I had planned on a break right now, which is what we talked about, and I'd like for us to go ahead

[6:32:25 PM]

and do that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I am also fine taking a break and coming back at 7:15. Councilmember Ellis? >> Ellis: I could be okay with coming back at 7:15. I could also go until about 8:30, but may not want to go beyond that. >> Mayor Adler: All right. Looks like that's what we're doing. So we're going to take a recess now at 6:30. We'll come back here at 7:15. When we come back it's for people to kind of lay out what their amendments are, not exhaustively. I think we've all read them multiple times. I think we all pretty much know. But to get through that fairly quickly. And then see if we can have kind of a general conversation about tax rates. If we have more time people can start asking questions or talking generally about the things that they like or how they would see us proceeding. We will stop meeting at 8:30. We'll go from 7:15 to 8:30

[6:33:28 PM]

and then we will take a break for tomorrow and come back at 10:00. We're in recess. See y'all at 7:15.

[7:05:50 PM]

. [Music]. >>

[7:26:42 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We are back at 7:26, Austin city council meeting. And we will work until 8:30. So we have about an hour to kind of orient ourselves and help make for an efficient start tomorrow. And I thought what we'd do is we'd give everybody just a quick second to kind of run through the things that they had put on, recognizing that probably all of us have read through them multiple times right now, so we probably know them. But if there's stuff you think we should know that we might not know, but it's to do that. And then have a conversation about tax rates. Yes. >> Are we going over amendments, riders

and directives or just amendments for now? >> Mayor Adler: Focusing on the amendments. The riders pick up, but I don't want to tell somebody

[7:27:43 PM]

this first meeting that they can't identify riders. I'll say everything. At this point we're kind of trying to orient people to what we're going to spend tomorrow doing. If it's important you can raise that as well. I do want to hopefully get a couple more people here because you think that makes this most valuable. It looks like we're missing just Ann and Greg. >> Tovo: I'm here, just finishing my meal. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So we have a quorum here. I see Abby is back in. We're going to reconvene the meeting until 8:30.

[7:28:43 PM]

It's a chance for people to talk about what it is they have. Let's see if we can get that done in the next 15 to 20 minute and then start talking about people's -- where they think they are tolerances for tax rates. Does anybody want to go first in laying out their stuff? Mayor pro tem. >> Harper-madison: I only have one. This is something you've heard us talk about a lot. It's an amendment for our northeast Austin. Sorry about that. It's our northeast area development. And we've spent a lot of time on this. Lauren in my office has worked exhaustively to work on this comprehensive plan

[7:29:44 PM]

for east Austin. We need a one I'm 480,000-dollar investment and that will come out of the general fund sales tax recalculation. So I will say a few words about the project if you don't mind. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Harper-madison: So -- for the sake of the people watching at home, last November we passed a resolution to kick start the development of the northeast Austin district plan. This covers a wide swath of land that's east of 183, south of 290 and north of 969. That includes pilot park, lake side, sendero hills, all those neighborhoods, as well as Walter E long park and the Travis county expo center. The goal is to really get this incredible growth that's already coming down in the pipeline in the far eastern crescent. We need a cohesive overall vision for what is basically now been the wild, wild east. It's our opportunity to steer incoming growth to

[7:30:46 PM]

shape complete communities. I'd like to repeat that, shape complete communities, with mixed income neighborhoods, opportunity, multi-modal opportunities and quality park spaces. To do all that they have to fund the planning process. So this summer we got a memo from housing and planning that put the cost estimate at \$1.8 million. Therefore the proposed budget only earmarks just over half of that amount for the planning effort. So my amendment fills the gap and assures staff can get to work on a fully funded process this year. Additionally other offices have expressed interests in doing similar projects in their districts, so that's why I'm included an additional direction for staff to return at the midyear with funding scenarios for additional district planning efforts based on the process modeled by the -- we'll call it npadp for areas to be

[7:31:47 PM]

determined by council. Thank you. >> Great, thank you, mayor pro tem. Councilmember Fuentes. >> Fuentes: Thank you. And colleagues, I posted a message on our message board that has links to my amendments and budget riders and amendments but also supplemental documents are also included on the message board. So I'm bringing forward two amendments. The first one is focused on community health workers. This is for a request of 957,000. As you all know, getting through the pandemic is extremely important to us in our communities so this is one way for us to get to the other side by investing in community health workers. In the amendment you will see that we laid out kind of a blend of new community health workers as well as the promotion of current staff to the community health worker level, as well as an expansion of current

[7:32:48 PM]

or initiate new contracts with community partners. The second amendment that I'm bringing forward is related to the Austin public library. This is a one-time increase of 63,000 and it would be focused on a laptop lending program and this will ensure that we get six more laptops at each library branch through the city and this is important for digital equity. As far as budget riders that I'm bringing forward, I have five of them. The first one is centered around displacement prevention and would dedicate staff for a pilot prevention staff navigator program. We worked very closely with staff in the direction for this one and it will take one of the ftes and have them work on this pilot program. The next amendment I have is related to the flood mitigation task force. This is centered around continuing our focus on flood resilience and ask that one of the at the times be focused on the

[7:33:49 PM]

recommendations that came out of the task force a few years ago and having them focus on that work. The third budget rider that we're bringing forward is around the grocery store co-op. This is something

that we were able to get some seed funding during the American rescue plan act dollars conversation and this will put a date in which we would like staff to come back and report on the status of the study and as well as to lay out a timeline. For the fifth budget rider it's focused on a feasibility study of what it would take for us to enter into an interlocal agreement with Travis county to provide -- waive library fees for kids under the age of six years old. This is a huge need in my district. I get the city requests all the time or for individuals who live in the etj and they have toddlers and they would love to participate in our programs but are not eligible. We have interlocal agreements with the school

[7:34:49 PM]

districts, but there is a gap with kids under six. So this would give us an amount that we could approach Travis county and entering into an interlocal agreement. And then the last one is around digital equity. This lays out direction on how we would like staff to come back with a budget spending plan for next year's budget knowing that both Travis county is investing in their digital equity strategies and that we may have some more opportunities with president Biden's infrastructure package. This will have a framework for us to continue the conversation around digital equity and inclusion. And last but not least, we have a policy directive. This is as I mentioned earlier, through a neutral -- revenue neutral amendment that would allow for increased funding for cultural artists and non-profits at the time when funding is most needed. This takes available funding

[7:35:49 PM]

that is in our budget and just asks staff to ensure that it gets out as quickly as possible. It's a dedication of 6.7 million and it is a revenue neutral amendment. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Kelly. >> Kelly: Thank you. I have one amendment and one budget rider. My amendment is to fund a full-time public health educator for the animal services department. They currently have that individual working there. He was grant funded for two years working directly with our neighbors experiencing homelessness and the needs of their pets. He's prevented shelter intakes and because of the prevalence of homelessness in our community, animal services suggests adding a dedicated full-time position to continue the work of this full-time position. The 40 hour a week position

[7:36:50 PM]

would cost \$85,595 in salary and benefits and would need to be added to the general fund. My budget rider is to approve a modified cadet academy class for the Austin police departments, and that is under the impression that APD would already have funding for it and it would not add any additional funding to the budget, it would just give them the option to do this class. It would also need to include the recommendations of the academy curriculum review committee and to fall in line with the reimagining

process that our other cadet academies have gone through. Right now we are experiencing nine minute or more response time to some calls, and we have a lot of vacancies. As of August 9th there were 168 police vacancies. And in order to hire more officers I would like this provided as an option. Thank you to my co-sponsors

[7:37:53 PM]

on that. >> Okay, thank you. Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: Mayor, I've posted my amendments to provide additional stipend for our staff along with our violence prevention items, anti-displacement items. And I appreciate my co-sponsors on that. I also posted last night a spreadsheet that includes all of the budget amendments that were posted as of last night in the general fund from across the dais and just wanted to make sure that the members of the dais and people in the community had seen that. It's clear to me that at just five% we can have a greater savings for the typical homeowner than was presented on July 9th as the anticipated savings while still addressing all of these community needs. And I appreciate councilmember kitchen,

[7:38:53 PM]

councilmember Fuentes and councilmember Ellis looking over that spreadsheet with me yesterday. I think there's still a need for conversation about what we do about recurring versus one time funds and obviously there are new amendments and additional things for us to discuss, but I just wanted to put this out there because I think it provides a hopeful outlook for us resolving this budget tomorrow because I think we can invest in all of these community needs while still reducing the tax bill for the typical homeowner even more than we anticipated at the beginning of the month -- sorry, last month. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Colleagues, councilmember Ellis? >> Thank you, mayor. I am bringing two amendments. One of which has been revised. I just want to bring everyone's attention to that. The first one is going to be four and a half full-time employees for facilities maintenance, and three

[7:39:55 PM]

fes, full-time employees for grounds member at a cost of \$300,000. The first line item is \$315,000 for a total of 615,000. Part is delivering the largest bond program to date in building new land and park based facility amenities. In my amendment sheet you will see a list of some of the identified projects that they would be working on that are located all over the city, including sea local am. Improving givens district park, brownie neighborhood park, alderbrook pocket park and improving trails along slaughter creek greenbelt, northern walnut creek greenbelt and contracting to the veloway in district 8. So these are good projects that need to be worked on all over the city.

[7:40:55 PM]

The second amendment I'm bringing is regarding park rangers, which I had brought an amendment last year as well about looking at the park ranger program. So this particular amendment has 439,939 ongoing ask for six park rangers. I have lord it to one team -- lowered it to one team to make our dollars go as far as possible. Those would come out of the general fund. And 370,000 in one time debt funding to cover the start-up equipment needs of getting new park rangers. \$100,000 in one time funding would cover spring and summer seasonal staff and 75,000 in one-time funding would cover delegislation and diversity, equity and inclusion training for all new and existing park pagers. So those are my two amendments and I'm also proud to be co-sponsor on another -- number of other amendments that people will

[7:41:55 PM]

be presenting tonight. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen. Councilmember pool. >> Kitchen: Oh, okay. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Okay, great. Thanks. Colleagues, I had as you know two amendments. One of them has two items on it. The first is the essential childcare at city recreation centers. This one is scalable. And I wanted to make sure you were reminded about the four rec centers that would exceed the additional childcare capacity. It's the Duffy rec center and the turner Roberts rec center in district 1. Dove springs rec center in district 2 and Gus Garcia rec center in district 4. So this is the out of school time, the essential elementary aged childcare, the quality childcare that the city of Austin is so well-known for offering.

[7:42:59 PM]

And that we have a lot of demand for. So for every \$100,000 in funding the childcare program can serve 50 students everyday. So depending on how much money we have available to this, I'm asking for the maximum of \$900,000. It is scalable. The second item that benefits the parks and rec department and the quality childcare centers is using our KO's, our contractual obligations debt, to purchase six vans for a total of \$300,000, which saves us significant money and for the second year of ownership. And I commend this approach to my colleagues, some of whom are also adding some new tech in rather than leasing them. We may want to look carefully at purchasing some more. [Indiscernible]. It's fairly short run.

[7:44:00 PM]

Wednesday up saving money. So the total for the essential childcare at rec centers is 1.2 million max. And I remind you this is one of director Mcneeley's favorite children requests. She was asked [indiscernible] Her favorite children and I am now wishing to have included in budget. It was the expansion of the out of school time. So I'm asking for that childcare and then the second different amendment, but it's amendment number three is an expansion of our existing workforce first program for people experiencing homelessness. We know that this program has been a success. The other ones foundation has pioneered this effort and done really brilliant

[7:45:04 PM]

work assisting with encampment abatement in the public parks and open spaces. It's a win-win for our community and people who are experiencing homelessness have regular employment. They have job training, support services and assistance with finding housing and the city gets much help encampment cleanup and help in our open spaces. And again this is a program that the other ones foundation has been rightly congratulated for pioneering and leading in. The dollar figure that is affected is \$141,000, 167. It is coming from the drainage utility fund as recommended by watershed direction. The other three departments that are continuing to support this effort, parks and rec, public health, Austin resource recovery, with flat funding with watershed protection adding 141, a little over 141,000 to this effort because of

[7:46:09 PM]

the great need, the very great need in watershed protection area of the lands that they are responsible for. So the total impact for fiscal '22 of this funding request is the 141,167. The other monies are already in there. Thanks very much. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Now councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Okay. I have six amendments or six amendments/riders. And -- total. And so I have a budget amendment for the iconic venue fund. That one is 2.5 million out of one-time funds and it is the installment payment for this year on the resolution that we passed in December of last year. It deposes towards the fund that the Austin economic

[7:47:09 PM]

development corporation is managing for us that relates to the protection and preservation of iconic venues and some of those are music venues, some of them are bars and music venues or restaurants and things like that. The second one I have is the heal initiative. This is for phase 2 of the heal initiative. It is six million dollars out of the arpa budget. Then the third one is the Austin cares contract extension. Austin cares being the mental health diversion that I think everybody is familiar with program. What this one does is there's no new additional dollars for this one. It's budget neutral. But it's for two things. It's

for an extension of the contract with meadows to complete the work that she started for us last year in terms of the implementation of this program and also for

[7:48:10 PM]

funding for overtime for the call takers to do training. Both of these items are part of -- being taken out of savings from dollars that were not spent last year, so they're budget neutral. Then the fourth one -- the rest of these are budget riders. There's a budget rider related to curriculum review, the cadet curriculum review. And that one specifies that for upcoming -- for additional cadet classes that assuming we authorize those, which I do support them, it specifies that we're going to adhere to the requirements in the resolution that we started last year, which means that the recommendations from the evaluation review of our curriculum review process will be incorporated into the next cadet class.

[7:49:11 PM]

And that's required before we start the next cadet class. Also that we will be getting a progress report and that authorization for the next cadet class has to come back to us before they can start it. This is all consistent with the -- what we passed in the spring in terms of specifying the intent that the curriculum review occur before we finish another class. So that is -- we begin another class. So there is no dollars there, that is a direction. And then we also -- I also have one related to parental leave for public safety personnel. This is also direction, it's budget neutral. We do not have -- parental leave is not particular as relates to childbirth is not currently a benefit that's available to our public safety personnel, our fire, ems and police. And so this just asks for -- directs the city manager to

[7:50:13 PM]

develop options for us to extend those parental leave benefits and have those come back to us for consideration. So that's what that one does. And then finally, I have an amendment -- a budget rider related to joint partnership agreement with cap metro and the Austin transit partnership. I have posted a revised version of that, which is on the message board now, which I hope states more clearly what my intent is with that. It's basically a policy statement recognizing the importance of preserving funding directly for the benefit of people in our community at risk of displacement. And recognizing that addressing equity and anti-displacement is central to mobility and the intent of project connect to benefit all people in our community.

[7:51:14 PM]

Andrew Rivera when we consider the joint powers agreement to bring us back an option so that we can consider options for funding the staffing to carry out the anti-displacement activities around project connect to fund that in a way that does not take money away from people directly. Does not take people away from the 300 million that is part that the 300 million at project connect that is contemplated to go to strategies to directly help people. I don't want to -- I don't want to reduce that amount. So at this point in time it's a policy statement because the decisions around all that will be made later in October and its decisions that we don't make on our own. It's a city council decision, a cap metro decision, atp. I think it's important for us to make a policy statement about what we would like to see and of course the language specifies that whatever it3

[7:52:14 PM]

is that we're able to come up with it will have to legally align with the contract with the voters. So that's all of mine. That's six of them for everybody who -- maybe -- I know we've got a lot -- everybody -- there's a long list and it's a little confusing for folks. Just to clarify if you will remember that I have six and only one of them has any dollars coming out of our budget now. Two of them have dollars from other sources and three budget riders that are totally budget neutral. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right, councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I will try to be brief because we're pushing eight on oak here. I am pushing four amendments. My first is utilizing

[7:53:15 PM]

savings, 4.5 million of savings from the stations delayed, staffing savings to help fund ems training and equipment needs related to resilience. This will help to extend the wildfire training to the full force in the fire department and provide one time resilient investments in wildfire equipment, ballistic vests and generators. And the other half of the funding that goes to ems will help extend attacker training to the whole department and provide funding for improved ballistic vests. The second amendment has three parts. It's really focused on investing in medical services and response within the office of the chief medical officer which we launched last budget as well as within ems. So this funds phase 2 of the office of the chief medical officer. Funds three new paramedic

[7:54:17 PM]

practitioners to provide additional health access across our community and provide a relief valve for ems and provides funding for three new division chiefs to provide some of the leadership that we need with ems that we have grown greatly over the last several years. I will point out that the interim chief is

also changing a position to assistant chief so there will be four positions with that. ING this funded through a convoluted practice, but you see we had the system fees so there will be several fees that we will be using to fund most of it and then there's a one-time funding requirement for 297,951 because those fees accrue and we need to take care of that one time expense. My third is for victim services and this utilizes

[7:55:19 PM]

funding that has been freed up from the crime victims money to help victims. And this will fund two new positions, provide a little bit of funding for the victim services emergency assistance fund, and then the remainder will be allocated to implement a recommendation from the reimagining public safety work group, which recommended expanding funding for community emergency financial assistance programs. My fourth amendment is new today which I posted earlier. This would add a million dollars to the Austin arts and cultural relief grant fund. I believe that a one-million-dollar infusion into this grant fund would be very timely to help our creative sector we had funding for about 100 grantees. There were 17 or 18 who applied and of those over 100 are still eligible and in need of the funding. And because the process is already underway they have

[7:56:21 PM]

the applications, we'd be able to get this funding out as soon as the city manager felt appropriate to get the money out of the door given the fiscal year starts October 1st. So that's a new one. Those are the four amendments that I'm offering and I have self co-sponsors on all of them, which are posted and I really appreciate their support. I have three budget riders that I'm individually offering and I've drafted a few others of colleagues. The first one is a compensation review for APD 911 call takers, dispatch and for victim services. We talked a lot about the problems that were happening in the emergency communications department and victim services in our earlier conversations and this is a process that we've worked out with hrd to try to get to the bottom of the process and just provide some outline of some additional direction related to the study that they have agreed to undertake. And then my second rider goes back to our long discussion the other day

[7:57:21 PM]

about the dispatch equity study and the billing backlog in ems and provides direction to address that billing backlog and provide plans to improve the billing system in the future, which will help us generate revenue, conduct a study regarding the cost to provide ems services so we can recoup funds. Conduct a full evaluation of the optimization opportunities that were within that study. And evaluate -- this is an important part because I know a lot of my colleagues really want us to move to a 12-person staffing for

ems over the next four years. So this sets up both the revenue side of being able to do that by being able to bring in more revenue as well as provides direction that we want to see a plan that does that and in that process to see if we can have additional resources for downtown if that needs to be part of it once we're staffed up >> And then the third rider I just posted this evening. This is a direction to the city manager to highlight

[7:58:23 PM]

investments related to greenhouse gas reductions. In our declaration we had asked for this to be done in the budget so that we can see the carbon impact of what we're doing. We found in that process that it was easier to be able to highlight the things that we were reducing than be able to capture every little thing where we had a carbon impact. This year there was a shift to resilience indicators which is fine to have that information, but we really need to be able to see what we're focusing on with respect to that greenhouse gas reduction to get us to net zero. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Council member tovo, you want to present yours. >> Tovo: Thank you, I won't read this all. I'll just kind of flash through some of the my amendments and budget direction most tiff is upright now. I still have not resolved the dilemma that I presented you all with earlier which is the one regarding our

[7:59:24 PM]

inshowrings some of our additional staff members. You'll see among my amendments there is a range from continuing to support and leveraging the real success that our family resource centers have had to provide some additional funding of placing community liaisons or community school liaisons in some additional schools so they can connect familiarlies to the resources of the family resource centers. There is a very small budget amendment that would allow a pocket park to become dedicated parkland which has a very small fiscal impact, but also raises a policy question I want to address at the appropriate time. There is very importantly some equipment for ems that they have suggested would be very helpful in the downtown area especially as we saw during the mass shooting.

[8:00:25 PM]

It was very challenging for ems to get to the scene and so having those small vehicles that would get folks back and some additional materials along those lines would be very helpful and really, I believe, help us save lives in the future. There is an additional small -- relatively small budget amendment to implement a recommendation that was brought to us by the college student commission and we had several really great speakers about that last week. So I wouldn't really talk about that. And then there are a series of amendments related to the downtown Austin community court. So last year during our budget amendments, I had put forward a budget direction that asked the downtown Austin community

court to really assess their needs and their gaps and to come back to us with some recommendations. They did so in April. This material is up on the message board as backup to my amendments. They identified a few areas

[8:01:26 PM]

from vehicles. Right now they have case managers who are sharing vehicles and also are leasing a large number of vehicles because they own -- they don't have in their possession enough. One of the successes of the dac is that they are able to really walk with the individuals they are working with through the process rather than giving them a phone number and E. Mail address and sending them out there. They are walking individuals through the process and that often involves transportation and they do a range of other wonderful services. They are our front-line diversion court. And so they are doing great work and I believe we should work to meet their needs. There is also a budget amendment in a midst the others for the dac that would seek to continue the increase in funding for mental health supports. This was a need that was brought to us by the downtown -- identified by the downtown Austin alliance there. Is a long wait list of clients at the downtown community court who have expressed a need and an

[8:02:26 PM]

interest in seeking mental health support and so we had put in some additional funding midyear to support that pilot program. The downtown Austin alliance has money in its budget to support this. So this would extend our work in that -- our investment in that area. And then I believe the last amendment I want to highlight is one related to code. We had a little discussion about this on the dais I think it was last week about those additional ftes and I would point to you some of the responses that we've gotten. I think the very last response in the q&a is some follow up information that will help I think identify and highlight some of the issues I am -- that are prompting me to ask you all to for now delay consideration of the rate increase until at least midyear, asking the manager to take a look at the scheduling, take a look at other options for staggering

[8:03:26 PM]

scheduling and relying less on overtime and really looking more comprehensively at our Austin code department and seeing whether there are some shifts and other efficiencies that could be made to better prioritize some of the areas we want to see those officers. Budget direction ranges -- my budget drecks is also now posted. It ranges from asking the manager to look at ways to expedite the west campus lighting which is in this year's budget to install the 288 new street lamps throughout west campus that were called for in the west campus lighting survey to some other -- following up some

other issues from neighborhood centers to resilience hubs and putting in place the mechanisms for us to get more regular update on some of those projects to make sure they are moving forward in the way that our council contemplated. And then also among the budget direction that you've provided, are some very specific elements related to the dac and I likely will follow up with an ifc.

[8:04:29 PM]

I haven't decided whether to embed is the other elements from the ifc that I've drafted in the budget direction or do both. You'll see some of the elements in the budget direction that talks about making sure we're on track with our intent of redeveloping one Texas center to create affordable housing, making sure we're setting very rigorous deadlines for identifying a permanent home for the dac and making progress and seeing that plan into fruition. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Colleagues, I have several. First the -- making sure we have staffing for the homeless strategy office. Some of those positions are currently there but they are temporary people. We need to make them recurring. We're putting a lot of investment into this challenge and this is our

[8:05:30 PM]

no. 1 priority. >> Mayor, I'm sorry. It's little hard to hear you. >> Mayor Adler: All right, I'll speak up. I have three budget amendments. The first one is to staff Diana gray with permanent recurring staff. She has some staff now. It's temporary, but she needs to augment that. She is the office lead of our no. 1 priority in our strategic plan. A lot more dollars headed that way. She's just constantly working and we need to help bring capacity to her. I appreciate the colleagues that have joined on that and folks not signed up for it because we're limited, but who have spoken in favor of that, and I appreciate that. Second one is a vaccine incentive. We're your honoring employers all over -- urging employers all over the city

[8:06:31 PM]

to provide incentives to their employees to a range for vaccinations on site. We're facilitate that and I think it's important that we lead by example. So the budget amendment that is presented would actually have 100-dollar stipend for all civilian and sworn full-time, part-time and temporary folks. So it's everybody who can attest that they've gotten a vaccine. There is a supplemented version of this that's posted that really just includes the phrase any extra money or nondeployed money be reinvested by the public health in vaccination efforts elsewhere in the city, vaccination promotion. And then the last one is guaranteed income pilot. We put some money in the budget previously to deal with this. It was about \$250,000.

[8:07:33 PM]

In looking at deploying that, it didn't look like the impact from how it was originally intended would help us. This is a concept that we actually employed in a pretty significant way as a city during the pandemic with the funding that we -- the funding that we brought to people, but we didn't -- because we were trying to get it out so quickly, we weren't set up to really evaluate it to learn lessons from it to see how it would work as an ongoing project. There is an existing pilot that's happening right now and I don't know that we want to just expand that pilot. I leave that to our staff experts, but that goes up to I think 200% of mfi, we may want to have a program that looks lower than that. So while I spoke to the existing pilot program consistent with the required, I would suggest that we give it to staff and

[8:08:35 PM]

say figure out what is the best way to deploy this with a focus on actually getting dollars out to people and let's look at that. More and more cities are doing this with success, and this might very well be a way for communities to more efficiently and productively make sure that everybody in the community is benefiting from opportunity. A couple of riders that presented, one rider is something that I think several of us have spoken about in the past. I know council member pool has been a champion of taking a look at compensation for council offices and the like, and for folks that are difficult to politically be able to deal with. I'm headed into my last year here, so if there was ever a time for me to bring forward a proposal that we should

[8:09:37 PM]

actually take a look at compensation levels for people on the dais this is it. I have such great appreciation for my colleagues on this dais now having spent several years recognizing that this is a 24/7 job and my colleagues and their staffs spend two, three times as much time and effort on this job than anybody in the community is aware. And I think it's important that we, as a community, provide compensation that is appropriate given the amount of attention time resources that council members put to this job. I found out it would not impact me directly because I don't take the salary as offered by the city.

[8:10:38 PM]

And I'll be gone before this would happen anyhow. But just preemptively, I just wanted to throw that out there. The last rider I had, I'll be taking a look at. I've gotten some suggestions from colleagues since I posted it. It is just what you heard me say on the dais for the last six years, that I'm uncomfortable on the dais picking vendors because we have a process for that. We have a process to make sure that whatever it is that is the goal that we're trying to achieve, the vendor or agency that we use is the one that is best able to do that. And there is a lot of background. I recognize I don't have in making those decisions in terms of information that might be relevant to make that decision. I think the budget amendments we've all identified properly as a council function identify the need or the challenge that we want to prioritize and put resources against, but the actual mechanics of

[8:11:39 PM]

picking the vendor or the like, there are best practices for that and opportunities for perhaps for greater equity or greater opportunity as we identify who the recipient is of funds in order to be able to get things done. So it's a rider that basically says to the staff, please focus on what it is that we want to get accomplished here. Please note the particular entities or agencies that the council have identified because obviously they of confidence and maybe a track record. May very well be the entity that would be best to be charged with that, but don't necessarily feel bound by that and I think that's -- as I've been saying for six years and every time I speak on this, I just think that's the best practice for us. All right, colleagues, I

[8:12:41 PM]

think those are all the things in front of us. We said we were going to stop at 8:30. That is in 18 minutes from now. So I would propose that we talk about just generally where we are with respect to tax rates as we had said earlier. I see a couple of hands have raised, both Leslie's and Ann's. So Leslie you want to go and then Ann. >> Pool: I just wanted to make sure that folks knew -- and thank you, mayor, for mentioning me when you were discussing the compensation package and the market study of council member pay and office support. The piece that I have talked about in the past being interested in bringing was not actually the increase in council member salaries, but it was the changing of state law to include council members in the retirement system. That's also on your list and I really appreciate you

[8:13:41 PM]

mentioning that and that's an initiative that I'm very interested in. I agree that these changes would not happen probably during my time on the dais, but I think that having an adjustment to state law that would allow council members to participate in the city of Austin employees retirement system would be a real positive impact for future council members. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Got it. Thank you. Council

member kitchen, did you raise your hand? >> Kitchen: Well, I just -- you may have already answered it and I just didn't hear it. I'm just trying to understand what our process will be tomorrow. That's all. But I guess I'm getting a little ahead of myself because you wanted to go ahead and dis-- discuss what people are thinking right now in terms of the tax rate. I couldn't quite hear what

[8:14:42 PM]

you were -- >> Mayor Adler: The tolerance for tax rate issues. I think that will set a parameter if we can get a feel for where people are. I know that -- I know that -- well, is it time for people to be able to comment and indicate? I don't need to go first. I am happy to but I don't need to. >> Kitchen: Mayor, I can speak to that. >> Mayor Adler: Ann, why don't you go first. >> Kitchen: The reason that I was happy to sign on to what council member Casar had put forward, and I appreciate him doing -- his office doing the work to pull out the list for us -- was that I feel like the list -- I feel like the dollar amounts that he included on that list were ones that would allow us to

[8:15:44 PM]

continue to provide a benefit to the public in terms of a reduction in taxes, not to mention what we already did with the homestead and the senior exemption, but still get to a level of the priorities that everyone has mentioned. And I believe that that would set us at about a 5% tax rate, which would still provide almost \$200 in savings for seniors, and I'm not quite certain what the amount is just from the tax rate, but it does allow us to continue to provide a savings for the public and particularly for seniors. And so I am comfortable with that level. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, colleagues. Council member alter. >> Alter: So we have 8.9 million available just from the tax revenue changes. I believe that if we put some work into looking

[8:16:44 PM]

carefully at some of the propose as that we could stick to 3.5% without a huge amount of that work, we certainly could be at 4%, but I think we do need to take the time to really carefully look at each item to determine the appropriate level and how far along the ideas are from -- in terms of their development at this point in time there. Is a lot of really good stuff and I understand the desire to do everything, but I think we also owe it to our taxpayers to pay careful attention and try to see if we can get to 3.5%, which I think there is an opportunity to do that and accomplish quite a lot of what we want to do. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues?

[8:17:45 PM]

Pio. >> Renteria: Mayor, I agree with my colleague that I cosigned with Greg Casar and I feel very uncomfortable going too far from 3.5. I think we made a commitment and we need to keep our words. I had a couple -- you know, \$100,000 worth of what I needed in my district but I didn't submit it because there has been a big need for a canopy over the Rudy Mendez park which used to be a splash pool there and it would cost about 50,000 to \$60,000, but I didn't want to submit that because I know that we have a lot of other urgent needs that we need to address. And so that's why I didn't go that route.

[8:18:48 PM]

So I'm willing to make that sacrifice if we can keep our rate at 3.5. >> Mayor Adler: So as I look at the numbers, I think that the manager's budget was received really well at the levels that were presented. The manager's budget as presented to the community resulted in a decrease in absolute taxes to be paid by the typical homeowner of about \$9. And it kept the total yearly impact of not only absolute dollar impact of city taxes, but also city energy fees, water fees, resource recovery fees, community fees, clean community fees, transportation user fees, drainage utility, all those things together, the manager was able to present a budget that only increased the total absolute tax bill by

[8:19:49 PM]

about \$38. Over the course of a year. And that was received really well. Those numbers by the way were the lowest increases that anybody can ever remember in recent history other than hand three years ago. But that time and this time represent the lowest increase in absolute taxes that anyone can remember. And being one of those two years I think is really special. So I think the community saw that. I think it created an expectation in this community and I think it's important that we -- for me it's important that we not -- that we maintain at least that level of property tax savings for people in our community in absolute dollars, and at least that level of total yearly impact and not increase it at all.

[8:20:54 PM]

Given where the numbers have come in, we're able to do that and still generate with revised budget numbers, we're still able to do that raise of the tax rate, but still end up with a greater absolute tax savings by going up to that 5% increase in revenue of taxing property that existed the year before. The 5% is a really technical number and some people use it as a 5% increase in taxes. And some people use it as a 5% increase in rates, and it's none of those things. But in any event, that would give us additional dollars to spend, still be able to deliver all of the tax savings that the manager had in his, which I think

we need to do, and with those additional dollars, I think we could take care of some investments. Most of them one time investments, and I think that the community wants us

[8:21:55 PM]

to make those kinds of investments. I believe we should do that, and I would go to that number even if we left some of the dollars undesignated or put them in a reserve to help create a larger balance in the rainy day fund. I'm concerned about what we see in the year out numbers on our budget in a year through five years, where the deficit is continuing to grow. I think these are going to be bumpy times. You know, pray that the community is not going to adopt any propositions that put us even in further holes in their actions, but I think we need to be prepared. So I think taking it up to raising the tax rates, still maintaining the tax savings that the manager had is a place I would be comfortable going to. So that percentage, whatever

[8:22:55 PM]

that percentage is, is the plagues that I would support. Council member Fuentes. >> Fuentes: Thank you, mayor. I just wanted to join you in the comments. I echo the sentiments you just laid out, having the opportunity to provide cost savings to the average homeowner at a greater level than what the city manager presented just a month ago is definitely needed and I think when we look at our priority list of critical needs that we still have in our community as we are in this stage 5 of the pandemic, are exactly what we should be doing right now. The no. 1 thing we can do is invest from these strategies to help our community get through the pandemic. So filling these unmet needs are critical importance. I love that we have a proposal here to invest robustly in anti-displacement prevention initiatives and I hope tomorrow when we have a conversation about updating our stray dog you can

[8:23:57 PM]

direction -- strategic direction that we can include displacement prevention as part of that direction for our community. So I really think that these investments are critical in nature and they definitely are forward-thinking understanding the needs of what it takes to have community resilience. And I support us at the 5% rate that would give the typical homeowner a cost savings of about \$13 on their property tax portion of their bill. And I think council member kitchen you mentioned that up to 200 for seniors. And so I welcome the conversation that we'll have tomorrow on this topic. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, council member Kelly. >> Kelly: Thank you. Last week I voted not to set the tax rate for possibly at the maximum and I have a really hard time with raising it any more than 3.5%. It's clear to me we have an

[8:24:59 PM]

affordability issue here in Austin. A lot of hard working men and women who are struggling to get by and I believe that the budget that we have currently will allow us to continue the necessary services that we need as a city and so I will not budge on the numbers, but most of you probably already know that. So thank you. >> Mayor -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes, council member Ellis. >> Ellis: Thank you. As I laid out on the message board before, my no. 1 goal is to be able to reduce the tax burden for residents. I think that's an important aspect to moving to 20% homestead exemption which is a historic move for us, and to increase the senior and disabled exemption. And so I'm uncomfortable getting to a level where we negate those savings for people. So I think that starting with the spreadsheet is a great place. I don't know how I feel

[8:26:01 PM]

about [indiscernible] And see how that conversation moves also forward tomorrow. And of course what's in the spreadsheet is up to us as a dais to try to make work in the best way we see fit. I don't know that this is an exact number per se, but I do think it's important that people see relief, understanding that this is a year where a lot of people a lot of recovery issues with covid and the winter storm. And I want to make sure that we are providing that relief for folks in Austin. >> Mayor Adler: Anybody want to speak to this issue? Yes. >> I forgot one thing, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead, Paige. >> Ellis: I really want to find Pio his canopy. I really think we can make

[8:27:02 PM]

that work. >> Mayor Adler: Leslie. >> Pool: I was just going to say that I want to make sure that we are husbanding our revenues for next year and future years because the unpredictability is looming and my preference is to circle as low -- circumstance around 3.5 or as low as we possibly can. I recognize that we have unmet needs. We always have unmet needs. I did endeavor to bring really modest amendments, the two that I brought was really careful to keep them low, and I always want to remain mindful that this is just one year, and as we negotiate this year and this year president budget as we keep all the needs and all of the expectations in mind, we recognize that we have next year and next year and

[8:28:03 PM]

next year. We always have a constant progression where we continue to move the ball forward. Sometimes we move it faster and sometimes we move it more slowly. So for me, circling around the city manager's 3.5% I may be willing to consider something slightly over that, but not very much. And I want

to make sure that we are putting as much of our -- and it is our one time monies when we do this, but I want to make sure when we categorize the one time monies that we assign as much as we possibly can to the arpa funds so that we actually spend 100% of them. I'm concerned that we may not and I know we have three years to spend them in, this year, next year and in 2023. Again, something to be mindful and make sure that we drain those particular revenue pots completely dry

[8:29:04 PM]

because that's what they are there for. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Cathy, you want to speak? >> Tovo: So I'd like to get as close to the 3.5 as we can as well. And I share concerns about the years ahead. I'm particularly concerned about adding fte's this year and I'm looking really carefully at the fte's that we're hiring and have sought some clarification from our staff about how many in budget question 133 are actually new versus being transferred from another department because some -- as we know, some units are shifting from one place to another. So in looking -- but having said that, I'm also as I mentioned looking really carefully at the proposals that were brought to us for making some of those employees who are performing

[8:30:05 PM]

essential services for our city permanent employees. And so that's the challenge. That's the dilemma I'm struggling with. I know there are fte's proposed from the staff and in some of your proposals, and I'm balancing that against the commitment that I feel we made to our contracted employees that we would seek to bring more of those in. By my calculations, we need -- if we could identify in ongoing funds somewhere in the neighborhood of 900,000, we could get the public libraries security proposal met for five and then the building services had developed a proposal for 25. And then there are some cost savings from -- or there is some cost offsetting I should say. Anyway, though are just some of the things I'm mulling over. How do we stick as close to 3.5 as possible?

[8:31:07 PM]

How do we really minimize where appropriate the number of fte's we bring on knowing the future budgets are going to be extremely tight, and none of us want to be in a position of making -- of proposing -- I'm sorry -- approving a budget that has cuts in the years ahead to people's jobs. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Harper-Madison: Thank you, mayor. I can't help but think surely there has to be a path forward that lands us somewhere closer to the middle. I mean I hear what all of my colleagues are saying, but I wonder if we can explore some alternative funding sources for some of these items that we're putting forward. Like I was thinking about using the hot preservation funds for the iconic venue

fund. Or looking into arpa for those community health workers. I just -- I would like very much for us to take the time

[8:32:08 PM]

here in the next couple of days to figure out if there is another path forward that doesn't actually affect our general fund. For what it's worth, I was really thinking that we were all going to be super conservative this time around. I appreciate what council member pool said, but I just keep finding myself thinking after those last couple of presentations that talked about future money, it just all sounded so dismal that I just -- I was hoping that we'd be conservative. I'd like very much to explore alternative funding sources. >> Mayor Adler: All right, with that -- >> Harper-madison: And potentially find ourselves in the middle. >> Mayor Adler: I think that has given everybody a chance to talk. Council member alter? >> Alter: So part of what I want to make sure is I'm concerned about what the overall impact is on the taxpayer and the fee payer. I am a cosponsor on the

[8:33:09 PM]

additional one time stipend, but I really don't understand the fiscal impact at this point in terms of -- in terms of fees of the support services and enterprise fund cost to that. Right now what I've seen and I did the same in my own calculations, is we just counted up the general fund piece but there is a potential fee increase that comes on the other end of the other increase. And the same thing for the vaccine piece, if we could get some idea if there would be impacts on the fees unless this would just come out of reserves because that's going to impact the overall amount and so I just think it would be good to have that full information for that so that we make sure that we're not increasing fees on other things, you know, the overall impact. I just want to be able to tell -- and it doesn't have to be absolutely to the penny, but the magnitude of

[8:34:10 PM]

the impact would be helpful because there could be some scenarios where they just take it from a reserve because it's a one-time expense and they feel like they can do it. And other ones they have to get a fee increase to do it. I just would really benefit from that piece. You know I have a scenario that I think is closer to 4. Some of it does mean that we have to think about some of the larger asks, and scaling those back a little bit. I know we often ask for more than what we think we're going to get, and I appreciate the desire and everything to do that, but I think we need to have that conversation. I think there is four or five items that I'd like to have more conversation about, whether they are ready to go forward at the level that's being asked of them. And I want to also understand the interaction with some recent actions that the city manager has initiated in certain areas

[8:35:11 PM]

to see whether that's the best use of funds that we might have at this particular time. I think there is a ton of really, really good proposals and lots of things that I really, really love, but there is few I think that we really do need to have some conversations about if that's what we want to spend it on. I do think that -- I don't see myself going up to 5 without some of that going into that rainy day option, but I would much prefer to be at the 3.5. I also want to echo what council member pool said about arpa funding. I'd like us to see -- you know particularly for the homelessness related items, use as much as we can of the arpa funding and I think that would help. And I want to also just signal that I really

[8:36:12 PM]

appreciate council member Fuentes' rider on the cultural arts. I'm really confused by what's going on in that fund. So I just want to flag that I'm going to need to be kind of walked through that and to understand from EdD what their proposal is. I understand that there were some desire to switch how we were funding things and I just don't understand it well enough to be able to understand what that shift that's proposed might mean. So I think I would really benefit from a conversation so perhaps city manager you can tee that up for part of our conversations as well. I will try -- I don't think it I'll get it tonight, but I'll try and put a [indiscernible] Out there knowing that we have to have conversations about certain items if I can pull it together before we start tomorrow. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Council member Casar. >> Casar: And mayor, I share the concern with my colleagues about the years to come. I just want to note again as -- I know we have a lot

[8:37:16 PM]

of posts on the message board, but even at the 5% we should have a conversation about recurring versus one-time expenses because it would be putting things in the recurring column that could potentially have impacts in the out years, but putting things in the one-time column actually could help our situation in the out years by, for example, covering things for multiple years or having the tax rate set at a level that if we were then at some point to have to look for approval from the voters, to continue the funding and functioning of government that we would actually have our tax rate set at a potentially higher level that could then be potentially maintained at the choice of the voters. So I'm going to send those questions over to the cfo and to the manager, but I think if we reduce recurring expenses, but move things to one-time, it actually may help with our long-term

[8:38:16 PM]

fiscal outlook. >> Mayor Adler: I'd be interested in hearing from you tomorrow on that. Maybe at the beginning. You have told us that given the 3.5% cap, that you think that it's likely that we're going to have to have recurring TRE elections periodically over time. And I'd like your assessment of how what we do here this year might impact that or what that looks like. So if there is a way for to you present that to us tomorrow, I'd like to know what your thoughts are on that. Yes, council member alter? >> Alter: Are you talking to Mr. Van eeno or Mr. Casar? >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Van eeno. I'm sure we'll hear from Greg on it, too. But Mr. Van eeno is the one I wanted to hear from. Council member alter and then council member Fuentes. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Mayor, can you see us also?

[8:39:18 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Council member alter and then I will eel come to the board. >> Alter: So I wanted to just comment on the ongoing. I think that the balance of being at 2 or 3 million max of ongoing is probably a good space for us to be as a maximum. We could decide to zero it out if we wanted, but I think there is -- I know there are some park investments that I really struggled with how to get them to be one time and just couldn't Mack that work. So I think -- and I know that the homeless strategy stuff was really important to the mayor and there is value in doing that and then having most of the rest of the stuff in arpa, but I think that sort of two or three million max of one time -- of ongoing is kind of what I'm feeling might be an accept an amount to go.

[8:40:20 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen. And then council member -- >> Kitchen: Yes, I just want to ask, council member alter had expressed -- I couldn't tell if she was concerned about the arts money or just wanted some more clarification. So as you do that, I'd also like -- I understand that you have recently just added a million dollars for arts. And so I will want to understand if you have some concerns about what several of us have put out for arts and music, we'd like to understand what you're thing is to add a million dollars now. Because I know that I've worked pretty carefully on the iconic venue fund and it's something that's been out there for awhile. And so I wouldn't -- I need to understand if you have some questions about that. I wasn't sure from what you were saying if that was one of the ones that you had concerns about.

[8:41:23 PM]

>> So I think that, you know -- first of all when I put forward the million dollars I didn't know about your rider. But I -- so I didn't think about it with respect to -- I was doing it separate from your rider because I

didn't know it was happening. And I don't fully understand the rider because I don't -- I've had a lot of confusion about how the cultural arts funding is presented in the budget. And I need to understand what it means and I believe that there was an effort by the arts commission and economic development to try to switch how we were doing the funding; but the way that they are doing it looks odd in the cultural fund and I just don't understand it. So I can't make -- I can't make a statement I support more funding for the arts, but I don't know if that's actually getting more funding over the long run or if there are risks involved and I want to understand that better. >> Okay, that helps me understand. I just didn't understand

[8:42:23 PM]

from what you said earlier what you were thinking. >> Alter: And with the nonprofit money, we know -- that came to me late because we had the grant process go through and we now know how many organizations have applied and we had 217, 218 organizations apply and we're able to fund 100. And they already have their applications done and it would be really a simple process the get that money out the door as soon as it could be made available and help 50 organizations more if we chose to did that. Those who are struggling with and with the delta, thought organizations are not going to be able to do what we thought they would do which is why I put that forward for consideration as we were talking about the money. I would love to see our expenditures really be helping with the resilience

[8:43:25 PM]

and the pandemic stuff to the ex Trent we can address those things. >> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes. >> Fuentes: I want to flag for my colleagues we did receive a memo from EdD that came out last night. Pretty late last night. So that has some really good information on follow up on the resolution we passed back in late may and some of the conversations that we were having as part of the arpa deliberation process. I, too, welcome an update from our EdD staff to talk through the funding model which is kind of impetus of why we decided to bring forward the directive that called for us to put out available funding as quickly as possible. Council member alter, you highlighted the amount of applicants that applied for the nonprofit program, and that just shows the significant need we have in our community to get these dollars out as quickly as possible. So I welcome that conversation and there have been changes to the funding model. I know certainly we have received concerns from the

[8:44:25 PM]

community about the changes that are being rolled out so that tomorrow might be a good time to start having a conversation about those changes. Also wanted to request to see if we could, as part of tomorrow's conversation, if we could have staff available to talk about the arpa spending plan. Mayor

pro tem mentioned the -- perhaps utilizing the arpa dollars for community health workers and I wanted to mention to my colleagues that was initially what we had considered, but the amount that has been allocated for aph through the arpa funds have all been dedicated. There is significant uses that we have in our community that those dollars are going toward. So it would be great if we could have staff on hand to speak to dhows dollars and how that first tranche of money that we approved back in April or may and how they are being utilized as we go through the pandemic. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: I think it would be helpful to have Diana here tomorrow. We talked about using the arpa dollars in a way that

[8:45:26 PM]

would help set up a transformative system to be able to meet a challenge. So it's really dollars that are devoted to that transformational change, building out the capacity in a broader system. It was the system that Barbara pop pi brought to us basically through years ago that we've never had the resources to implement. So I think a lot of those dollars, council member Fuentes, like you say are earmarked and scaled to make sure at the end of the spend we actually have an ongoing system that we can reach equilibrium with. So I'm not sure that's going to the source of funding for a lot of other things that are also real eval eubl. All right, everybody has had a chance to speak. We're after 8:30. Pio? >> Renteria: Mayor, this is more procedure. Are you going to have -- are there going to be spreadsheets handed out tomorrow for us to see exactly what we're going to be voting on?

[8:46:26 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, I think we'll be able to help compile a list. I don't know if you're making a list like that or whether we need to. You're not? So I think Greg posted one that would need to be augmented. But just to have a running list. I think we had talked at one point about dividing them up about sd23 goals like we had done before. I don't know how hard that would be. Pulling out of the items the revenue items, the first thing we'll go over tomorrow are revenue sources. So that we have that like we did. That worked well. And then to have people to be able to present proposals. Again, it's not going to be one person presents their entire slate. We'll go through as we have in the past. Did you have thoughts on that? >> Renteria: Is the spreadsheet would help me out a lot anding. Understanding.

[8:47:26 PM]

>> Although we'll vote on a spreadsheet and we can take rounds, I will update what we posted to include the insourcing brought up with council member tovo, whatever is appropriate from council member alter's most recent ask here and then council member Renteria, I agree with council member Ellis, let's see if we can figure out the canopy and put that in the spread sheet as well. So we'll see if we can get something updated for tomorrow. Not for it to be a motioner but just so that it's all there and I

believe it could still fit under the tax savings presented by the manager by a good amount. >> Mayor Adler: I think the intent tomorrow is to use as the base motion the motion that came from staff with its amendments today. And then we'll start making additions or subtractions to that. Anything else before we break? Council member tovo? >> Tovo: Yeah, just as an update, I'm about to post those insourcing -- that insourcing amendment. Mayor, are you suggesting that the two items just

[8:48:27 PM]

discussed are not going -- let me first clarify that the staff are not bringing forward a spreadsheet? >> Mayor Adler: Apparently not. Casar is going to be doing it. >> Alter: I'll be posting this here soon. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, Stephanie. >> Greg, I think council member Fuentes had a few smaller amendments that need to be added as well. >> Casar: I forgot. Thank you for the reminder. >> Mayor Adler: All right, it is 8:48. We're going to recess the meeting and reconvene tomorrow. We don't have a set noticed time to begin tomorrow because we didn't have a called meeting for tomorrow. This is just a recessed meeting from today. Do you want to meet tomorrow -- begin tomorrow at 9? 9:30 or 10? >> At 10. >> 10, please.

[8:49:29 PM]

>> 10. >> I'd like to sleep tonight. >> Mayor Adler: All right, we have to work hard then if we're going to start at 10. Let's work hard and fast. Ten o'clock tomorrow. We'll see you all here.

[Pt. 2 – August 12, 2021 portion of meeting]

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 8/12/2021 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 8/12/2021

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[10:19:10 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Or our recessed meeting from yesterday that was continued over to today. This is the August 11th, 2021 meeting of the Austin city council, the budget adoption meeting being held in a hybrid manner. We have a quorum that is present. Clerk, do we have any folks that are here to speak?

>> Mayor, all of the speakers were called yesterday.

>> Mayor Adler: Do we have any speakers this morning? I don't see any speakers. I'm going to ask for speakers? Seeing none, we're going to go ahead and proceed. I think there were some outstanding questions, Mr. Van eeno, that I asked you to be able to speak to this morning. The first one was the one that councilmember alter asked with respect to the amendments that have been offered by councilmembers. We see the general fund impact.

[10:20:12 AM]

Do any of those have an impact that would result in fee changes?

>> Thank you, mayor, chief financial officer. No, we don't believe they do. In terms of the enterprise rates, these dollar amount changes associated with some of the stipends and pay incentives that council is discussing would not impact enterprise rates. It would have a small impact on their bottom lines, the ending balances the enterprise departments collect, but not on their rate-setting for next year. If those dollar amounts climb, we may need to come back to you, but we'll continue to coordinate with our departments on that. Right now from what's being proposed, there would be no rate impacts.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And the next question I have, probably a little

[10:21:23 AM]

bit more difficult kind of question that I have people asking, which is what would the impact be in the future of action that we take today with respect to the budget? And let me frame up the swing that I have. We told the legislature two years ago, and you have told us that the revenue cap, because our cost drivers alone show a significant change from year to year, cost of salaries, insurance, rent, or whatever, that periodically in a world where there's a 3.5% cap, it is likely that we're going to have to do TRE elections -- not every year. But at some point, periodically we're going to have to go so the voters and seek a revenue increase above 3.5%. Is that correct?

>> Yeah. Certainly. If you look at our financial forecast, while we're balanced this year and have a small surplus, as you look down the road, as we've been talking about since the 3.5% revenue cap passed, sb2, we are projecting

[10:22:27 AM]

deficits -- \$5.5 million fiscal year '23, 15.6 million by '26. Certainly dealing with deficits -- let me step back. That's out funding the majority of council's priorities that you may have. And also not including the

additions of staff, just to keep pace with a growing city. That is a base forecast, just trying to keep the lights on we have deficits. I would anticipate tax rate elections in our future, certainly.

>> Mayor Adler: That's consistent with what we told the legislature, no surprise. We're seeing it play out as we said it would.

>> No surprise.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's say, for example, that in order to be able to make up that stagger so that we're not in a position of having to cut our budget every year in order to maintain the 3.5% with existing programs, except for -- let's assume next year we wanted to go to the

[10:23:28 AM]

voters with a TRE election and say rather than being at 3.5% revenue, because we want to be at 4.5%. We're going -- council decides that. We're taking it to the voters for them to consider November of next year. At that point, I would imagine that we would prepare, as we always do, that tax impact statement that you have given us this year. You would give us the same thing next year that would show to taxpayers what the impact would be on them of going -- of approving the TRE and being at the 4.5%. And you would show them the delta or the difference that taxpayers would be looking at. They went to 4.5 versus where they were this year, correct?

>> Yes, we'll continue to do the taxpayer impact statement. That's a council resolution that's been passed. We'll continue to present that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Here's my question.

[10:24:31 AM]

I want to know, is there a difference in that tax impact statement that will be given to voters next year should we do a TRE going from 3.5 to 4.5, is there a difference in that tax impact statement depending on whether we stay at 3.5% this year, or went to 4.9%?

>> Looking ahead to fiscal year '23 and that hypothetical 4.5% scenario, doing a tax rate election for that, the typical homeowner tax bill in fiscal year '23, it is what it is. It will be whatever it is at 4.5%. The question becomes what are you comparing it to. A bill in '22, the year before you, that tax bill is higher than the delta from that to a 4.5% increase would be lower. If the tax bill this year is lower the delta from that bill to the hypothetical 4.5% tax bill in fiscal year '23 would be

[10:25:34 AM]

greater. Yes, the delta will be different on that taxpayer impact statement dependent upon when what you do today.

>> Mayor Adler: Is it possible that if we went to 4.9% this year we would be giving taxpayers an absolute city property tax reduction relative to last year?

>> That is correct. At 5% it was \$13.32 reduction, so it would be about the same at 4.9.

>> Mayor Adler: 5% or whatever it is, it's a greater absolute property tax reduction than what the manager proposed to the smut

-- the community 30 days ago?

>> We submitted the reduction would be \$9 but with the certified tax roll even at 5% as opposed to 3.5% it would be a greater tax reduction than we're forecasting.

>> Mayor Adler: If we went to the 5% this year, and if there was a TRE next year at 4.5%, is

[10:26:37 AM]

it possible that we could then be going to the taxpayers next year and saying, approve the budget at 4.5% and similarly it doesn't result in any increase in taxes, it would be a TRE election to approve a budget?

>> It's possible. My intuition is that wouldn't happen, but it's theoretically possible a 4.5% next year, that delta could be a reduction or flat.

>> Mayor Adler: Whatever it is, it would be less of an impact on taxpayers if we were to do the 5% this year.

>> Yes. That taxpayer impact statement would show a smaller delta from '22 to '23 tax bill.

>> Mayor Adler: That would serve to kind of flatten out the impact on taxpayers over time.

>> I think the tax bill in fiscal year '23 under a 4.5%

[10:27:38 AM]

TRE, it is what it is. That tax bill is what it is. It's not going to change. It's a matter of the increase from the previous year.

>> Mayor Adler: But this year, because we're doing homestead exemptions and those kinds of things we can still offer the tax savings, but still raise the rate so that the year-to-year impact on taxpayers would be flattened out, the deltas or the changes.

>> Well, I think the year-to-year impact from '22 to '23 would be less than . . .

>> Mayor Adler: While we have Ed up here, questions?

>> Casar: What I'm trying to understand is fiscal health of the city. If we were to do, say, you know, 4.9 this year, in order to continue funding government and addressing the deficit, get to 4 or 4.5 next year, and smooth out

[10:28:38 AM]

that tax impact, doing 4.9 this year and 4.5 next year is better for our long-term outlook than doing 3.5 this year and 3.5 next year, or 4 this year and 3.5 next year.

>> It used to be that way, because it used to be that --

>> Casar: No, I understand that we would lose the one-time savings.

>> That's right.

>> Casar: What I'm asking is if we were able to do 4.9 this year and then, say, 4.5 next year because we could essentially say -- if property values wind up in a place where the tax bill stays the same, so the voters then just approve a budget without their tax bill changing, then ultimately we're able to address deficits moving forward better with, say, 4 or 4.5 next year than just not being able to do it.

>> Sure. I certainly think the 4.5 next year is going to help our fiscal situation.

[10:29:39 AM]

The 4.9 this year and whether or not it helps the fiscal situation depends on if you use it to bolster reserves or spend it on one-time priorities. Then it's been spent and isn't there to help us in the future. And it's an important same story with those recurring funds, budget staff at last week's work session projected a \$3.1 million this ongoing sales tax revenues. That surplus is allowed to stay or if council were to allocate that surplus for one-time things, that revenue is there next year to help us with that \$5.5 million deficit, it would become \$2.4 million. A 4.5% increase next year will help us balance the budget relative to 3.5. 4.9% this year is going to depend on the actions you take and what you decide to do with those funds.

>> Casar: And I understand that part, because we've talked about that. I'm trying to narrow in on, if

[10:30:41 AM]

we could get to more easily no taxpayer impact or minimal impact next year at 4.5, based on going closer to 4.5 or 5 this year, does that make sense? Because as you mentioned the taxpayer impact statement statement would be lower next year if we are at, say, 4.5 or 5, than at 3.5.

>> It might be more of a political dynamic and what helps get the TRE passed, but in terms of the amount of revenue we have at 4.5%, it is what it is. It's not going to change dependent upon you going to 4.9% this year, because we have to give that back.

>> Casar: It changes the taxpayer impact.

>> But not the amount of revenue.

>> Casar: It doesn't change the amount of money, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So, it changes what

[10:31:48 AM]

appears on the statement, but in terms of the impact on the taxpayer, it's more if you go at 4.9 this year and then 4% five than if you were at 4 and then 4.9. So, I agree that it might change the appearance on the impact taxpayer impact, but in terms of the impact on the taxpayer it's more. But we're fighting over \$15 a year. We should keep that in perspective as well. But I agree with Ed that it does matter how we were to invest anything that was above the 3.5 and whether it is something that helps our fiscal health, or it helps us survive the pandemic, etc. And it also depends on if we're on ongoing or one-time. So, I think we should also, as we're going through today, it would be really helpful to go through certain items and have the conversations that we haven't had yet about them to see where the dais is about that being the right amount of money. And we may not land on 5% when

[10:32:49 AM]

we see where people are for that. And then we can have a conversation if we want to put a certain amount into reserves or not to deal with other things, because there is a scenario where you take the -- I think it's a \$7 million difference and you put that into some investments that save us money over time, or you put it in reserves to use later to help us out with some of the shortfall for next year. And we should have that conversation. But I think first we need to talk about each item where we have questions or we have concerns. And I don't think it will take that long. I think there's probably five or six items that we need to talk about. And then we could get into nitty-gritty on others if we want to.

>> Mayor Adler: Sense, and I think we'll do that here right after we're done talking to staff. In essence, treat it almost as a

[10:33:51 AM]

pulled item kind of thing. We'll go through and see which items people want to talk about. So far only the movers had a chance to talk about their things. Kathie?

>> Mayor, what did you say?

>> Mayor Adler: The person who moved it forward.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, I couldn't tell what that word was. Yesterday I had given some rapid-fire questions. I wondered if staff were prepared to answer them. I wanted to note that councilmember alter had indicated she wanted to have a conversation with staff about the cultural arts funding. I had indicated I would like to have a conversation with staff about the historic preservation funding. So, I'm not sure what the right time is for that, but if we could get answers on those nitty-gritty quick ones, and then if we could have those conversations about cultural arts funding and historic preservation, that might set us up to have the rest. I think this is a very good

[10:34:52 AM]

conversation. And I support councilmember alter's request that we look at some of those big-dollar items.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we can start there. Kathie, is it better for us to have a conversation about the funding and the like if we -- as part of the budget amendment when it's called, or is it a more blood alcohol conversation

global conversation?>> Tovo: The rapid list of questions, I think, do impact amendments generally for me. I don't have an amendment and I don't believe anybody else does specific to historic preservation. If I understood some of the answers I might. I think there are two ways to do it. One is to just adopt some direction that will come back in a month or so and approve the historic preservation pieces of

[10:35:55 AM]

the budget. Or we have to have that conversation now so I can understand what we're approving. But right now it doesn't relate to any specific amendment. The cultural arts funding does. I think we have colleagues with amendments and riders that relate to cultural arts and we could have that conversation in the context of those particular agenda item. But we don't have anything on our agenda at the moment about historic preservation. I'm just aware that we're approving that budget when -- when we

pass the budget, we're approving the spending within historic preservation, and I'm not clear what that plan is.

>> Mayor Adler: I like that idea and I would support a direction that says sometime in the next 30 days, let's have a deep dive on a component of the budget like that. Because one, we'll have a better conversation on it if we did that. But I think it's important to do that rather than look like -- I understand your point, Kathie. If we approve it today, unless

[10:36:56 AM]

we say we're going to pull it back in 30 days to go through it, it's just not going to happen. So I would support that, in part because it makes our day simpler today and it's not something that looks like it has to happen today.

>> Tovo: If we could get confirmation from staff that it doesn't need to happen, I'm concerned about the allocations and where -- especially where we're -- yeah. But if we could just get confirmation from staff that, you know, there are no grants headed out the door in the meantime, I'm okay with that approach. It may not take more than seven minutes, but if we wanted to go through it, also.

>> Mayor Adler: Ed, did you hear that question, that issue? The question is, Kathie -- I don't want to put words in her mouth, would you ask the question of Ed?

>> Tovo: Sure. In approving the budget, we're approving the spending and allocations for the historic preservation dollars within the hotel occupancy tax.

[10:37:56 AM]

If we came to an agreement and provided direction during this process that we want to not make final decisions on that, but review it as a council here in the next 30 days, is that going to put anything -- is that going to stall any progress on city projects, the heritage grants, other kinds of things here in this next 30 days?

>> Fiscal year '22 budget, no. In the next 30 days, it would not impact anything. The budget you approve today would go into effect October 1, 2021. So we could come back before the budget goes into effect and provide you additional details that you're asking for without any impact.

>> Tovo: As long as there are no decisions being made in this next 30 days based on that fiscal date start -- fiscal start date.

>> I would say, too, mayor, that we do -- staff here present are

[10:38:57 AM]

not prepared to provide rapid-fire responses to councilmember tovo's questions, but we do have staff online who are prepared to respond to -- from the correct departments to respond to her various questions from yesterday.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. If you could get someone on staff to come up with whatever the right wording is for a rider we could adopt at the end of that process that has that conversation with that fund happening, within the next --

>> Just to the historic preservation.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, the historic preservation. It might very well be that we want to have the same kind of thing with respect to the homelessness dollars, because we know that they have to come back and tell us how they're spending the \$100 million. It's possible to get through it for them, possible to see how the conversation develops. I think it's going to be important to have those things laid out. Let's hear the questions that people have while we frame this up.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I have a question.

[10:39:57 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Just a second. I'm going to go and see what the other questions are that people have. Then I want to come back to Kathie having the opportunity to be able to ask the questions of of several of the staff. Ann?

>> Kitchen: I just wanted to ask, you had mentioned a process earlier and I wasn't clear on what that process was that you might think of this as sort of like consent in terms of people identifying which items they want to discuss?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. That's what I --

[multiple voices]

>> Kitchen: That's fine with me. I just want to have a list of all those items we're going to discuss so that I know the whole breadth of them before we start discussing them.

>> Mayor Adler: That sounds good. Yesterday, councilmember Casar had offered to pull together kind of a list of everything that's pending in front of us.

[10:40:59 AM]

Have you been able to do that?

>> Casar: Yeah, mayor. If everybody will go on the message board, we have posted a document and it's a Google document. So if a dollar figure changes, we can adapt. And the document is online. It has three tabs. One is all of the budget amendments that were submitted, as updated. One is all -- the second one is all of the budget riders. And then the third includes how I have laid it out, which puts us at 4.9, still cutting the typical homeowner taxes by with a good chunk more than the manager's projection in July while still including virtually everything with just minimal shifts fitting that 4.9. So mayor, I'll leave it to you on process, but potentially you could just ask folks to pull from the -- we could go through budget amendments first and

[10:41:59 AM]

budget riders second. They're all compiled. You'll see that some of the items are highlighted in yellow. They're highlighted in yellow because they are different from the budget document sent out by Ms. Lang because they are updated since her email to us. That is because -- for example, the laptop purchase from councilmember Fuentes, or the Austin arts and culture nonprofit relief grant from councilmember Casar, those were new items. They weren't in Ms. Lang's email. They've been added. There are some numbers that are in red and they are in red because they have been updated by the budget office as of this morning. And so when they reran numbers and checked the general fund, etc., those numbers have been updated. Those changes are slight, but it was important to update them so they're different than you'll see in the documents. On the message board also you'll see that each budget amendment and budget rider is hyperlinked.

[10:43:00 AM]

If you click that hyperlink it will take you to that councilmember's budget amendment. For those of you looking on paper, I think there was one update that had to be made online, but may not be reflected on all of the paper sheets, for those of you in chambers. Councilmember pool's childcare and rec centers is an ongoing cost, not a one-time cost. So really, best to be looking at it online because if there's any little edits or corrections we can be making those in real time, but I handed paper out for those who wanted it.

>> Mayor Adler: This is pull number 1?

>> Casar: Correct, ongoing not one-time. And that may have popped up on one or two of these papers.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, again, for this work. Stephanie tren, wherever you are, thank you, again, for this work.

[10:44:00 AM]

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Just real fast, at the end of this I'm going to ask people, I don't know if anybody's had a chance to look at this yet, but glance over it and see if this is something we can use. I know the different amendments had different numbers at different points in time. That could get confusing. If we all are working off the same piece of paper, that might help us. Ann, go ahead, continue.

>> Kitchen: I wanted to thank Stephanie and Greg. Not only is this a list, but it has hyperlinks. This is good work that's very helpful to us all and I really appreciate it.

>> Casar: Thank you, councilmember.

>> Mayor Adler: We would start, going back to Kathie with questions for staff. When we're done with that we're going to go through the list Greg has given us. I think the appropriate one to go through is the one with the \$16 million at the bottom, which

[10:45:05 AM]

is the --

>> Casar: It has all of the budget amendments as proposed. And it's my understanding of the latest proposal from each can each councilmember with the latest numbers from the office, asking for grace in case we missed one. We did our best to use your latest.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to let councilmembers ask questions of staff and then do as Alison suggested, we'll go through the list and pull things that people want to talk about. Councilmember alter?

>> Mayor. Can you have Greg explain how to get to that document again? I missed out on --

>> The second page on the message board post we've been using for the budget, there's a one and two. I don't know if we've ever gone to a second page before, but if you push the two, it's the last entry on the message board for the thread we've been using.

>> Casar: Councilmember, I've sent you an email that has the

[10:46:07 AM]

link.

>> Mayor, my suggestion was to take the top dollar items first, not just go and pull every item. We need to pull every item eventually, but it would be useful to do the higher-dollar first.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine. I didn't want to stop people from being able to talk about what they wanted to. Yes, Ann?

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think it's more appropriate -- I'm fine -- and I think what Alison is saying is good to talk about these. But I think it's more appropriate that we have the universe of items that people want to discuss. And I don't think just saying high-dollar items is really as helpful as it could be. I want to talk about the universe of items that people want to discuss.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll call on people and they can talk about whatever item they want to.

>> Kitchen: I would like to know the list.

>> Mayor Adler: The list is the one we have from councilmember Casar.

>> Kitchen: I would like to know the list of what people want to discuss. It would be helpful for

[10:47:08 AM]

everybody to say which ones they want to discuss so we know what the universe is we're discussing. I think that would be more helpful to us in our conversation.

>> Casar: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: My sense, I hope we're saying similar things. We have a process that saves us time of pulling things from consent. So I would just say if folks want to pull items, that would be great so if there is a universally accepted item, be it small or large, we can move on and save ourselves time. If everybody agrees then folks can say what they want to pull and we can discuss the ones that are pulled and leave on the ones that nobody wants to pull.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. What were the items that you wanted to discuss, councilmember alter?

>> Alter: I just thought it would be helpful to pull all the ones that were above \$750,000 and see where we were on them. There's many in there that I support fully and there's some I

[10:48:09 AM]

have questions on.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Those are the first group of pulled items. Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I agree with councilmember alter. Those are the ones I most want to discuss. Those are the ones I see us needing to make changes, expenses don't have as much as of an impact.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Councilmember alter, can you share a little bit more about how you arrived at the number of \$750,000?

>> Alter: I just picked the ones that had more money attached because we were trying to cut it down, but we should be thinking about that, and we can do all of them, but I was just trying to do that. Again, there are many in that category that I support. And there I think are a few that I might want to adjust the numbers on. And some that I have to get a lot more information on.

[10:49:11 AM]

But it seemed clearer to pull them because if I did it a different way or pull out a proposal of what I wanted, I felt like that was not the way to have our discussion.

>> Fuentes: So that would be about six of the amendments specifically that would be pulled for discussion, that are over --

>> Alter: I think it's more than six in that total group.

>> Fuentes: Okay. You're including ongoing and one-time?

>> Alter: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's appropriate. I'll pull those so we know we're talking about those. There aren't that many. I don't want us to --

>> Alter: I can tell you what --

>> Mayor Adler: Process that's longer than the conversation we might have about pulled items.

>> Fuentes: I agree. That's a good place to start. I may want to consider other items that are in a different range. I wanted to get some clarity as to the starting number and why.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. Absolutely. This is without limitation on people's ability to be able to

[10:50:12 AM]

pull up and talk about any one of these. Ann?

>> Kitchen: So, just for clarification, so, is this 750 for any item that's an ongoing or one-time? Is that what it is? What about the items that are in other?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. It's all of those things. So let's go through here. It's going to be Fuentes one, Casar one, it's going to be Casar two, it's going to be Casar three, it's going to be kitchen one, it's going to be kitchen three, it's going to be pool one, it's going to be Ellis one, it's going to be tovo 9,

[10:51:13 AM]

it's going to be alter 1, alter 2, alter 5, Adler 1, 2, and 3. We're just going to work our way down those. All right. But before we do that, I want to give folks a chance to ask questions of staff so that they have the information they need, recognizing this does not limit your ability to ask staff questions as we get into individual amendments. So this is a without limitation exercise. Yes, councilmber Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I just wanted to identify my line of thinking. Many of the options that are presented in the "Other" column that found alternative sources of funding, I felt very comfortable with keeping those in. So I'm not sure if anyone else feels this way, but I do know

[10:52:15 AM]

where folks put in the effort to look up other sources of funding I may prefer to keep those on. I don't know if that will save us time today, but wanted to say my thoughts on those particular items.

>> Mayor Adler: It may be as we go through these, several will be disposed of and we'll move on to the next within seconds, but we're identifying because it gives us a place to start. Mayor pro tem? Kathie, did you have questions of staff you wanted to raise? I didn't mean to call on --

>> Tovo: I do. I'm switching from one venue to another. I may need a minute.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I agree with you, too, councilmember Ellis, with respect to things as concerns those, kind of, enterprise funding where someone has identified dollars that could only be used for a certain purpose. So somebody that's taking a dollar out of an enterprise item will be getting to another proposed enterprise item, I'm cool with for me.

[10:53:17 AM]

Things that are identified additionally general fund or other things that could be used I'd rather that go in a revenue budget rather than being tied with an individual proposal. Pio.

>> Renteria: Mayor, you know, one time we had done it when there was -- we had concentrated on the amount of money that we have available without going over the 3.5, or are we just looking at all these requests and just whatever people agreed on, is that the amount that we're going to settle on?

>> Mayor Adler: No. We're not going to limit ourselves initially to a revenue total because we haven't agreed on a revenue total based on the conversation we had yesterday. So we're going to go through items, but recognizing that we're not putting on anything or approving anything early in the process that becomes then stuck,

[10:54:19 AM]

all the way up to the very end we can move things on and off the list. But it will give us a chance to see the magnitude of what it is we're dealing with and then people that want to could get really into serious omissions or taking things off in order to drive it down, and others can participate or not participate.

>> Renteria: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: But we're not going to be voting on things and building the tax rate as we go. That's not what we're going to do, as we have not done in the last six years, we're not going to do that now. We'll do it similar to how we've done the past years, more or less. Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So, I'm fine to pull all the ones across all the fees. I think that the -- I'm very comfortable with the \$6 million in arpa for H.E.A.L. I think there's -- most of those

[10:55:19 AM]

I think I'm comfortable with those. I think there's a question, especially now that councilmember tovo has reduced some of her arpa requests, I'm very comfortable, kind of, with that, sort of, approach there. So I don't know how controversial those ones will be. And I would -- I think that it may not be -- it may be that we should have people rather than just go in order, if there's one that's on someone's mind they really want to discuss, we discuss that. My feeling is we will find there is several million dollars we can cut to better get closer to what people's desires are that will get us closer to a 4% or 3.5% outcome and I think we can do that fairly quickly.

>> Mayor Adler: I am also comfortable with the \$6 million

[10:56:20 AM]

in arpa and many of those others. If we go through the process, some of those things we'll move through in five seconds. If we set up the process, we can go through it and find out. If it's more than five seconds, it needed to be pulled. I don't think a lot of these things are, but let's move forward, okay? Councilmember tovo, did you -- I'm sorry.

[Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: Not yet, we're still discussing. Councilmember tovo, do you want to ask your questions?

>> Tovo: These are the ones that I asked yesterday from the dais. So, if we could start first with development -- the development services questions. Among the questions I asked were why don't we start with A.C.E., why A.C.E. Is not being covered by fees.

>> And we're just moving our

[10:57:22 AM]

director over virtually, so give us one second to do that.

>> Tovo: Just as backup, I don't mean to overexplain since we talked about it yesterday, but I'm trying to determine whether there's any opportunity to reduce the general fund transfer to development services, given that development services is an enterprise fund and they may have had a fund balance last year, but there are a couple things that were in councilmember Kelly's -- the response to councilmember Kelly's question that I'm just wondering why they're not being covered by fees.

>> Director Lucas has joined us. Good morning.

>> Good morning, mayor, council, city manager. With respect to the fees for A.C.E., the ds finance team worked with the budget office to delay implementation of cost of service fees for A.C.E., recognizing that the music and

[10:58:23 AM]

entertainment industry had really been financially hit hard during the covid pandemic and it was felt that it would be better for us to increase their fees gradually over time until we get to a cost-service model so that they can have an equitable experience as well as other industries, too.

>> Tovo: Okay. So I'm understanding, the general fund transfer is necessary because A.C.E., though it should be part of the enterprise fund and paying for its costs through fees, is not at the full cost of service?

>> That is correct.

>> Tovo: So I just think, manager, that's something that should be highlighted in the budget. There was a council direction that all fees within development services be at 100% of the cost of service. We took a vote on that a couple years ago. It took councilmembers asking a couple questions to even highlight that information that we have units within the development services that are not at 100% cost of service and are requiring a general fund

[10:59:26 AM]

transfer. Of those within A.C.E., what is the cost of service recovery at this point?

>> I don't have that exact number for you now, but I can get that for you.

>> Pool: Mayor, I'd like to add a supportive comment to councilmember tovo's question of dsd director.

>> Mayor Adler: Noted.

>> Pool: If we passed resolution and direction in a past action, I would like to understand why staff would supersede that action without bringing it back to the council for an update and our input before coming to a setting like this where this sort of detail can be lost, because of the massive amount of -- the volume of information that we are dealing with. And I really appreciate councilmember tovo identifying that particular instance. And I would like to see staff correct that and really, I do believe the director should have

[11:00:26 AM]

that number at her fingertips because it is clear that that question -- where that question was going and we should have these answers today as we're sitting here.

>> Mayor Adler: Does it make sense for us, as we're trying to get through the budget today, to be compiling a to-do list or a followup list that we want the manager and the office to come back to us in 30 days and say these are the questions that were generated over the course of doing the budget, that we want better explanations on or to understand better, or that we want recognition that we need to move into a different place, or follow up with budget amendments if it was necessary to fix something, is that a way for us to be able to move forward today?

>> Tovo: That's fine. I'm still a little confused though about what events. For the most part, A.C.E. Is dealing with events, right? It's not dealing with -- I'm trying to understand the

[11:01:26 AM]

rationale for this still. And I think it is important because at the same time -- if it is really for our small arts organizations, and I'll have to really understand that, because A.C.E. Is usually dealing with bigger events that are in need of that coordination. But if it is for arts organizations, I'm fully supportive of helping them get through the pandemic. But we have super limited resources and everybody in this community is hurting. We need to understand where those supports are going. Acm Gonzalez, you're here to provide more information about the A.C.E. Piece?

>> Thank you, council, Rodney, assistant city manager. And to council's point about the cost of service direction, we fully respect that. We've done that since day one of DSC being a department, enterprise fund department. In this particular case, the A.C.E. Group moved over to dsd last fiscal year on October 1st

[11:02:26 AM]

and, of course, that coincided with us being in the middle of the pandemic. And what we wanted to do was offer the venues -- because we have a lot of local venues also that go through A.C.E. We didn't want to tax them with additional fee increases on top of the burden that they were already experiencing. But we certainly can put together the cost of service study so that way council sees the impact of what that would be on the various events, including venues. And we can bring that information to council so that way you can have that information and be informed. But it really was intended to be a relief for our local venues at a time when they needed it the most. But we fully, once again, support cost of service. That's what we've done since day one. The difference here is the pandemic.

>> Tovo: I understand that. It's just that that relief is coming -- puts pressure in some ways on our general fund. It's something we need to be aware of, because it just -- I

[11:03:26 AM]

don't know what the number is, but it's a significant amount of general fund transfer to cover what we thought was covered with fees. So that is a lost opportunity elsewhere in the general fund. How about urban forestry? In the q&a answer it says urban forestry and the city arborist. A followup questions, it appears the city arborist is covered by fees but urban forestry is not. Why is that one not being covered?

>> I'll turn it over to director Denise Lucas. She has the response for that question.

>> Thank you, acm Gonzalez. In regards to the urban forestry program, it is not a fee for service program. The urban forestry unit does work related to community outreach and community tree projects and it's not fee-related activity. This work was previously done by the parks and recreation department and was administratively moved to what was then the planning, review, and development department in

[11:04:26 AM]

fy15. And then put in the budget for fy16. The city arborist is regulatory and fee for service. We have one fte supported by the general fund, created based on a prior council action regarding the climate change resilience budget request, made in 2018 and funded in 2019.

>> If I could add, I believe that the trees functioning were combined as a result of an audit, but we can confirm that information. This was a part covered under parks and recreation, which was general fund funded and then the function was transferred to dsd and that's why the general fund continues to fund that program.

>> Tovo: Okay. Outside of this context, I think I'd like to understand what that cannot be a fee-based service, but we don't need to take time on that today. And then could you please -- the last question I have for dsd

[11:05:29 AM]

dealt with whether dsd can maintain a fund balance and if it can, it appears that it has one. So, if you could respond to that, please.

>> Absolutely. Director Lucas.

>> In fy2019 and '20 the ending balance of our fund balance was \$18,941,528 and that was carried forward to the fiscal year budget. Our current year estimate, we believe that we'll end the year with a positive balance of \$22,769,000,000. And so we followed the same process as all enterprise departments that we roll over into our enterprise fund any remaining balances that we have at the end of the budget year.

>> Tovo: You can maintain a balance and the balance that's going to roll into the next fiscal year is \$22 million?

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: I would suggest that

[11:06:30 AM]

we have a conversation about whether any of that can be used to reduce the general fund transfer. I understand because it's a fee-based service it may not be able to but it hasn't been an enterprise fund for more than a couple years. Some of that fund balance may date back to prior to it becoming an enterprise fund. Then it's accessible to us for general fund purposes this year. I had no idea it was -- looking at the budget book, where would I have found the information about ending balances? Is that in the funds towards the back?

>> It should be in the fund summary for dsd.

>> Tovo: That is thumbs-upping it, thank you. If you look at the one-pager about the dsd, you don't see the fund balance. You have to go to the back. Super. Thank you. If we could get an answer on that super quickly. If it requires going into executive session, I'm happy to do that. I think that's a real viable

[11:07:31 AM]

source of funding. Let me just add my thanks, again, councilmember Kelly. Thanks for digging into that particular issue or this wouldn't have surfaced.

>> Kelly: Thank you for following up on that.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody else have any other questions for staff? Go ahead, Kathie.

>> Tovo: That was just it for dsd.

>> Mayor Adler: Any other questions for dsd? Thank you. Go ahead.

>> Tovo: 123 was another one, similar question. I wanted to better understand the economic incentive reserve fund and where we were with regard to our -- where we are with regard to our payouts to chapter 380 businesses.

>> Councilmember, just give us one more second to get staff

[11:08:33 AM]

moved over.

>> Tovo: Sure. And maybe it's helpful if I say what's coming up.

>> Mayor Adler: That would be good. Go ahead.

>> Interim director is going to be coming online, as well as chief recovery officer Veronica vercenia.

>> Tovo: 21 and 162 were the H.O.T. Taxes, we can table those for now based on our conversation earlier. My guess is that we're going to have a conversation about homelessness funding, so I'll save the quick question I had asked yesterday about arpa allocation for something in the answer to number 12 for later. I had asked a question about nonmedical incentives for the health and wellness program. I'm not getting the name quite right. It's described in number 34. But before we start looking at trimming things that are really

[11:09:34 AM]

about staff morale as well as health and wellness I want to get the answer to development services. I'll table that question for now. I think probably this is my last area of questions before we get back to the regular thing. Thanks, colleagues, for . . . Going along with this additional questioning period.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues, anybody else have any questions for staff?

>> The interim director will answer --

>> Tovo: While we're waiting for the director, who may be on --

>> Mayor Adler: She's here.

>> Tovo: Thanks. I also, as we look for ways of balancing the priorities that the council has brought forward, along with what many of us said about wanting to keep that tax rate low, another area that we could look at is the travel

[11:10:36 AM]

budgets. And I have a question in the q&a about that. I've forgotten which number. But my guess is that all of us will be going probably less traveling in the next months than we had maybe anticipated. And some of those travel budgets are pretty high. And so as I balance the different priorities, from providing incentives to our employees, to providing incentives to our sworn officers, to, you know, bringing some of those positions in-house while we want to have as much travel and educational travel as possible, again, some of those budgets are really pretty high and I think are another source that we could look to for funding. Director Holt-Rabb, I have two quick questions on 123 on the answer, on information provided within question 123. The first was about the long center agreement. So it looks as if in 2014 the council approved an agreement to support the long center in an

[11:11:37 AM]

amount of \$300,000 a year. Can you provide me with some background on that and whether there's an end date for that, and whether we have any other agreements quite like that one?

>> I'm going to defer the longcenter agreement to financial services but I can provide --

>> Tovo: We're having trouble hearing you. I think she was saying financial services is going to answer the long center question and she's prepared to answer the economic incentives.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> So the lease agreement we have with the long center is through August of 2052. In 2014, council approved an annual \$300,000 to support the capital investments, to help make sure that we're maintaining our asset. And that is subject to annual appropriations by the city council.

[11:12:37 AM]

>> Tovo: And so is the lease -- is there -- are there any dollars changing hands for the lease? I'm sorry, I should remember this but I don't.

>> No. The lease agreement is for them to operate it. There's not dollars exchanging hands, just the \$300,000 that started up to provide capital investments dollars to maintain the facility.

>> Tovo: And so unless the council takes different action every year there will be a \$300,000 appropriation to the long center to maintain the facility that they are leasing for free?

>> Correct.

>> Tovo: Okay. Could I get -- yeah, we can switch to the economic incentives. I think at some point we -- in fiscal years that are really going to be tight we may need to just at least be aware of some of these existing agreements so that we're really clear with ourselves and with the public about where the money is going. Obviously the long center is a fabulous resource in our community and I want to support them. But I also want to know year

[11:13:38 AM]

after year exactly where those dollars are going. So, again, thanks. I've forgotten who asked this question, but this is real useful information. Councilmember Fuentes, thank you for asking the question. Director holt-rabb?

>> Yes, I'm here. Your question had to do with the economic incentive reserves and it would be our prepaying --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. We're having trouble hearing you.

>> Okay. I'm shouting as loud as I can.

[Laughing]

>> Mayor Adler: Can you all hear well enough? No? Can you hold .

>> Mayor Adler: Can you hold the microphone closer?

>> Can you hear me now?

>> Tovo: I think so.

[11:14:39 AM]

>> Okay. So again, your question had to do with are we prepaying for future years? The answer is no. The budget that is proposed has to do with the current agreements for compliance for '21. So we will hold funds with the compliance year '21 and pay out in physical '22. So there is no prepayment -- fiscal '22. There is no repayment. It's only budgeted what is needed.

>> Tovo: Okay, director --

>> Mayor Adler: Can you all repeat her answer to that question?

>> Tovo: I can sum up what I think I heard her say and that is that while awhile back we would prepay for several years in advance, what is being included in it bum is just what we anticipate being out for those agreements.

[11:15:40 AM]

>> That is correct.

>> Tovo: Thanks for verifying that, director holt-rabb.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie, was that your last set of questions in this process?

>> Tovo: It was. I think one of my colleagues may have had their hand up about that too, but I could be wrong.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I actually did have any hand up about that. I wanted to say to director rehab holt, I see you with your cast and I wanted to tell you thank you for being a trouper and for being here with us today.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else, questions for staff at this point? So let's go to the next part of the process and work this way through questions people may have for comments they wanted to make, concerns, whatever, on those items that are -- that we've identified early college high school. I'm going to run through the

[11:16:42 AM]

list here.

>> Fuentes: 1, community health workers, anybody have any questions or thought on this now?

>> Casar: Mayor, before we -- before we got started, again, because members said they may be pulling things they don't have any objection to it, it might be useful to know if there are objections from the jump as we go through them. Also as a point of information, the link we put up could only handle 100 people on it at that time, so we posted a second link because now there's over 100 people trying to join into it. So look for that second link if you have trouble with the first one. Imu for the pulling I have no objection to this one. It might be useful to know which ones folks have questions or objections.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I do have a couple of questions. And I apologize, we had a late-breaking question based on a memo we received this morning from economic development and that is it doesn't appear that the arpa

[11:17:44 AM]

funding -- there is no mention of the resilience hubs that we got this morning, and I would like to know if there is any funding as directed by council within the arpa allocations at this point. And if not I think that's something we tried to try to account for through this process. I had a couple of quick questions. The community health worker investment, councilmember Fuentes, my first question is for aph. So within their proposal they had those promotions -- they had the certification process and had notified nine employees who have reached that certification. So I'm trying to understand whether there was money in the budget that was proposed for those -- for that additional salary increase. I see that there's 25,000 that this has been reduced, councilmember Fuentes, to 25,000, but I'm wondering -- I'm trying to line that up with what the staff had proposed.

[11:18:46 AM]

>> Councilmember tovo, as we wait for someone from aph to get on the line, we asked them about the question you're raising and they said they did not with the 500,000 that was proposed by aph and thank you for proposing that in our budget, that did not include a dedicated set aside amount for the promotion of staff.

>> Tovo: So I guess I'm wondering -- I guess I want to understand why not. If they were creating a certification process and nine employees had gone through it. Were they making any adjustment to the salaries based on the certification or am I just misunderstanding?

>> We do venture interim director Adrian Sturup to answer your questions.

>> Good morning. Adrian Sturup, Austin public health. They had been looking at the community health worker job

[11:19:47 AM]

description pre-pandemic and once we found out what the financial implications were the first blush was to look within our budget to make sure that we could handle the increases. So as it stands now our finance officer sure that she can find some of the money to cover and then we would work with corporate budget to identify additional funds or make changes within our budgets to support.

>> Tovo: Director Sturup, to support the salary increases of those who have been certified?

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Tovo: So is this 25,000 for the promotions necessary or not?

>> It's appreciated. But if we have to we can look within our budget to find the additional fund necessary.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank you.

>> You're welcome.

[11:20:53 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem and then Ann.

>> Harper-madison: That was along the lines of the question that I had but I'm specifically looking at our budget document and I think to some degree some of my questions were answered there. The 500,000-dollar one time funding is sufficient for the initial year of the proposed to develop, yada yada, training structure, additional course offerings. I'm trying to figure out that additional \$42,000. The need for it, what would aph do with it and then maybe most importantly I'm looking at a lot of these larger expenditures and just really trying to find a way for us to be less bloated at the end of this process. So I just want to make certain that if there's an opportunity here to make that number sufficient for the programmatic effort, I really appreciate councilmember Fuentes bringing this forward. It's absolutely necessary. She recognizes that. She's got a background in health care. She understands the needs of the community, but it's also absolutely necessary that we

[11:21:54 AM]

all take a look at this budget and make some hard choices because it is in my opinion heavy. So I guess the question is is \$500,000 actually sufficient as it says in this budget document? And if that's the case, what's the additional \$432,000 allocated towards?

>> Thank you, mayor pro tem. Can you point me to where you are looking at right now?

>> Harper-madison: Sure, I'm going to make it really fast and easy for you. At the top of your inbox will be the link to budget index document.

>> You're referring to the 500,000 that is included in the proposed budget.

>> Harper-madison: Pardon me?

>> Are you referring to the 500,000 included in the

[11:22:54 AM]

proposed budget? Because this amendment the title right now is 957.

>> Harper-madison: I thought it said 932. That's ultimately what the question is. What is the additional funding allocated towards? What would staff do with an additional \$900,000.

>> So this is laid out in budget amendment form so as part of the funding request we will have nine new temporary community health workers, so that would come out to a total of 482,000 in one-time funding. These community health workers as I've shared before are uniquely positioned to help our community get through the pandemic and to address vaccine hesitancy. This also includes funding -- originally included funding to do staff promotion. And thank you, councilmember tovo, for asking that clarifying question of staff. That was originally 25,000 for promotions for the community workers that we have within our workforce to

[11:23:55 AM]

get promoted to the community health worker level because they do have that certification.

>> Harper-madison: Councilmember Fuentes, I hate to interrupt. I was trying to figure out what staff's take was on it. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to -- I should have articulated that better. I was trying to ask aph staff.

>> Thank you, mayor pro tem. As the council member mentioned, we could use the additional staff to assist right now with the covid pandemic. As she started to talk about, we're seeing a lot of Hess santaty in community where -- hesitancy in community where we're constantly talking about the need for the boots on the ground effort and canvassing especially in communities where the data is showing high uptake, but we know there are pockets of people that still need additional support. And it will also allow us to make -- if I'm reading the amendment correctly, to give

[11:24:56 AM]

us additional investment into trusted community partners because we know at some level of trials as we might there are trust issues with government. So making that significant investment in community to be ambassadors for the city of Austin and for Austin public health to ensure that people are getting information from trusted sources would be key. And I think the I know community health workers can also address other social determinants of health that are making these communities at greater risk for higher rates of death and disease with covidid. So it will really give us the opportunity to have that evidence-based approach that our community as a whole has been talking about for a number of years now. So this significant investment on the part of the city would help move that forward.

>> Harper-madison: I really appreciate that, you laying that out for me. It answered and inspired more questions for me.

[11:25:57 AM]

So for example, when you said one of the things that the community health workers will be able to do is go deep into the community and do some of the social determinants of health, community needs assessments. That makes me wonder are there other funding opportunities give then this is sort of a multi-tiered, multi-pronged benefit. I wonder if it all exclusively has to go in this one bucket with this one big chunk. Seems like maybe we can compartmentalize a little and find out if there are other ways to find funding opportunities to where it's not such a big ask. I'm trying to make sure everybody understands what my rationale is. Certainly not saying this is the way to go or not to go, but wanting everybody to understand what my rationale is. Thank you, councilmember Fuentes.

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we had called on councilmember kitchen next and then cool.

[11:26:59 AM]

>> Kitchen: I just had some thoughts I wanted to share on the community health workers. First I have a question for Ms. Sturup and then I wanted to share some thoughts. So Ms. Sturup you mentioned the 25,000 to go forward with that that you would make it work. But would it mean that you would have to take something away from something else? It's not like you just have 25,000, right? So could you explain a little bit more about how important that 25,000 is?

>> You're exactly right. It is appreciated if we could have the additional funding. The staff that we have trained have been working in that capacity but not being able to -- one, we needed the job description so that's the first part, but

[11:27:59 AM]

two, to be able to compensate them would be important to us. And considering everything going on with public health and covid to have the additional resources to support that would be important.

>> Kitchen: So what I would like to share is -- I don't mean this to sound like I don't recognize this. I know that all of you are pretty familiar with community health workers. I just want to share my perspective, which I view community health workers as one of the best investment of dollars that we have because these are folks that have lived experience and they were actually not even paying them that much in the scheme of things when you look at health care and they're the group that from an investment standpoint give us the biggest bang for our buck so to speak.

[11:29:00 AM]

We have learned with covid and we learned before with community health workers that we really have to get on the ground with people and community health workers are able to do that. It also provides a career path and the appropriate funding that goes with that career path to be a good job for them. So I hear the concerns and I think it's appropriate for everybody to raise questions. I just want you all to know that I support it at this level and I think it's one of the best investments we can make.

Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: Thanks. I support the community health workers too. I want to focus in on the logistics bringing people on board and so I wanted to check with director Sturup how much time -- like do you have the people lined up or

[11:30:01 AM]

do you need -- lined up or do you need to post and then do the recruitment and the interviewing and the hiring and that sort of thing? Like what is the time frame that you're looking at here?

>> I'll ask Kimberly Maddox to follow up with the specifics. Because we were granted some funding from CDC to hire people to do this work we started some of that recruitment and by the time we get this passed and pcns identified by corporate budget, we will have some candidates in view. And Ms. Maddox if you could give information about the timeline I would appreciate it.

>> Good morning. Yes, these are temporary positions so the onboarding process can be much streamlined from bringing on regular ftes and we have, as Adrian said, started that

[11:31:02 AM]

recruitment process because we did receive a grant from the CDC that does fund four temporary community health workers. So this is a combination of funding sources trying to fill this need and this gap in the community.

>> Pool: So what I would say about that is when we know we are in a hiring posture that timelines have an picture on how much of the allocation the department actually ends up spending. And what I would suggest is it may be that the top dollar, the 932,000, may or may not be actually spent in the fiscal year just depending on how quickly the positions are filled and that sort of thing. I think there's a little bit of scalability with regard to bringing on the additional temporary workers, and what I would suggest we do is just kind of bookmark this one at the level that councilmember Fuentes has offered it and

[11:32:05 AM]

see where we're at with other items that may be scalable based on timelines and how long it actually takes to implement a program or expand a program because we know from experience that then those dollars are sometimes -- they come in below budget. So there's a little bit of a margin in here and maybe what we do is would the dais be willing to put this one aside at status quo and then return to it when we see where we're at after we take up a few more of these budget amendments?

>> Mayor Adler: We're not deciding anything on any of these right now. We're just asking questions.

>> Pool: Okay. That's great. That's what I would suggest is maybe we move to the negotiation one and see where we're at in the grand scheme of things.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do that and see if other people have questions they want to ask about it. Councilmember Fuentes, this is something that I support as well and I hope that we're able to find this

[11:33:11 AM]

revenue I think it's important. Further questions on this one before we move to the next item? Councilmember Casar and then councilmember tovo.

>> Casar: Mayor, I wanted to express my support as well especially given public health limited resources and that issues with the pandemic just keep coming back up and up again. I think we would anticipate that there will be continued challenges. And just yesterday there were constituents in my district in their own volunteer capacity through their other jobs talking to their jobs who just went and got vaccinated because those neighbors still had concerns that immigration status might be important when they went and got the vaccine. So those conversations are happening still today, misinformation is still getting out today and for us to have more dedicated staff are that are doing this full-time to relief some of the people who are just talking to their neighbors at the park I think would be really important and will save us dollars many times in the long run if we're able to get more people vaccinated by making this

[11:34:12 AM]

immediate investment. So thank you, councilmember Fuentes, for bringing this forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo and then the mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Director Sturup, I just want to be very clear. I'm supportive of the budget, I'm supportive of the budget amendment, but there was -- I would hate for the message to get out to employees that they were going through the certification, but weren't necessarily going to be compensated. It was always the intent of the department to compensate those individuals for their training. So this 25,000 is just offsetting. It's relieving you of the need to find that money in your budget so it will go towards something else in your budget.

>> Director Sturup is having trouble with her computer and can't unmute.

>> Tovo: As I understand what the answer was a little bit ago that there was always an intent from aph to compensate the individuals who had gone through the certification, the intent was to find the funding within your budget. So this 25,000 in essence of

[11:35:13 AM]

ongoing funds is going towards some other need in a way is relieving you of the need to find that ongoing funding in your budget for those employees and is offsetting some other. And thus not --

>> Let me clarify, the nine staff that are currently full-time employees with Austin public health that would qualify to become and be put into the new title once it's finalized are all -- are focus who are currently providing something similar since we didn't have this title before. And they're still finalizing that so that we can move staff into it. They would be essentially reclassified into the community health worker position, which would require additional funds. So we haven't actually trained anyone or certified anyone. These are staff at this point that are doing that function as a part of their current job under the

[11:36:14 AM]

existing community worker title and will be because of what their functions are reclassified into the new title. You are correct on the money that with the new reclassification there will be a fiscal impact. We're estimating it around the 25,000-dollar mark based on the staff. And we would -- yes, we would have to find it somewhere else and move it from another function that's currently happening. But that is something that, as director Sturup said, we're willing to do. But the additional funding would be helpful to not have to defer money from other places.

>> Tovo: All right, thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you for recognizing me, chair. I wanted to make sure to also be clear that I support the program. I mean, most of my district will benefit from a program like this. I certainly support the program. I support the effort. I want to clarify that my ask was if there is a way

[11:37:15 AM]

for us to consider additional options for funding so I appreciate the effort and you bringing it forward, councilwoman.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ready to go on to the next item? Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I just wanted to offer some closing remarks. Not closing, but just to say thank you all for sharing your support for this item and understanding the need that we have in our community and I believe this is investing in human infrastructure which is all about creating community resilience and getting us through the pandemic and having a strong workforce is such a critical piece. Mayor pro tem, to your question, I think we'll be hearing later today about the arpa funds, but just know that we have had that conversation with staff and they would recommend that this come out of our general fund or the excess revenue funds that we have because the uses from the arpa dollars have been allocated and are dedicated to

[11:38:16 AM]

programming. We are at an elevated level with covid right now so perhaps if this -- if we weren't in stage 5 it could be a different conversation, but we are having to scale up our testing operations, our vaccine operations. The funding from my understanding has been dedicated for other uses.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues, let's keep moving through this. I will need to step off the dais from noon to 12:15. I don't know if we can plan on taking a lunch break at noon. If that works for people. From like noon to one. Let's plan doing that. Let's keep going and see if we can work our way through the list. Next thing I had is Casar 1. Anyone have any questions or thoughts they want to raise on Casar 1? Seeing none, let's go to Casar 2.

>> Casar: Mayor, as it relates to Casar 1, I -- in

[11:39:19 AM]

my proposal there was still some money at the bottom line and I was looking at 110,000 of that bottom line to capture currently the stipend increases at 30,000. And my understanding is some of the frontline electricians helping in the winter storm along with some of the nurses giving vaccines might make slightly more than that. So I have been really committed to trying to balance this, but depending on where we land on tax rate I would like the council to consider 110,000-dollar so that we can get to some of the frontline workers that are exhausted, that we want to retain and we want to recognize.

>> Mayor Adler: You're saying a potential \$110,000 more to reach those workers?

>> Casar: Yes, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on this one that people want to talk about? Yes, councilmember alter.

[11:40:23 AM]

>> Alter: So I'm a co-sponsor on this one and I just want to clarify that we were originally looking to put in along with councilmember Kelly additional stipends for emergency communications department and for victims services. And so I sort of see this one combined with the rider that we're doing on the study as addressing that issue in the shorter run with a goal of addressing the compensation issues in those two departments moving forward. It seemed much fairer because there may be similar issues in other departments that haven't been raised to do sort of this across the board stipend and it didn't seem to make sense to do both. So I just wanted to clarify that because we had raised that earlier.

[11:41:28 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: You were saying that in addition to the front line workers that there's a potentially larger group and we should look at that additionally?

>> Alter: I was suggesting that because we had earlier conversations about stipends for those groups on the order of \$100 a month and I'm viewing this increased stipend along with the study as the next step in addressing the challenges in their department. It is not the final step. I certainly if it's 110,000 and we have that money would support the addition of those additional workers, but those were two separate thoughts?

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Makes sense to me. Next item is Casar number 2. I think we've discussed that previously on how we're just going to approach that item. If anybody had any questions on that. Then let's go on to the next one, Casar 3. Anybody have any questions about Casar 3?

[11:42:30 AM]

Yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So this is aside from the heal initiative copping out of arpa and it's a general ask in terms of the general fund and we have been making a lot of really important investments in this area and I think that's an area where we could for the purposes of balancing this budget more reduce that amount and come to a number that more of the dais would feel comfortable with. I think we should make some investments. I would be more comfortable of something on the order of about half that or 1.5. 2.75 is a lot of money if we are really trying to get out of 10 or 11 or 12 million. And so I would propose that we think about reviewing

[11:43:31 AM]

that amount knowing that we're doing a lot of other things in that area. We have the \$300 million from project connect that we're working on and there's a lot of stuff already in our budget and along with arpa I feel like that's an area that we could reduce the amount and really give ourselves some breathing room.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I would like to ask councilmember Casar to articulate what this all goes for. It is not the same as the 300 million under project connect. It does not go for the same thing. It's labeled as anti-displacement, but when you look at what it's for, it's rental assistance and some other things which I think he can articulate better. I do think this is one of the highest needs that we have in our community, and would be reluctant to cut it. I do not think it is something that we've taken care of with other things,

[11:44:32 AM]

but I would like to understand -- I would like councilmember Casar to articulate the different aspect of it that are written into his budget amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Yes, mayor. And while it looks like a larger number on one line item, it frankly is two or three amendments. Councilmember Fuentes was working hard on this and we talked and instead of filing multiple amendments, we're working on this together alongside the other co-sponsors, including councilmember Renteria. And so it includes funds for emergency relocation assistance as we saw a gap and need in that. Councilmember Fuentes, I'm happy to have you speak to that, but with people's houses burning down or damage being done to their apartments in the storm that we should have more funds to be able to get people into a safe place. I know that's a struggle Travis county is facing right now at rosemont. It includes what councilmember Fuentes raised

[11:45:32 AM]

on tenant stabilization program which our current rental assistance funds are currently to keep the rents paid, but if someone is going through that process of getting people the access to council that they need. And then money to the housing trust fund which I think is an important part of us starting to set aside some of the housing trust fund to get unstuck some of the projects in queue that can advance our right to return and right to stay priorities that so many people have worked on. I was talking with folks that, for example, the Guadalupe neighborhood development corporation about how there are projects that could come unstuck, but for the -- in part because of our really good work for the first time we are backed up on four percent tax credit applications. Things that used to be able to sail through the process now are increasingly getting stuck. So having more subsidy available to be able to move more project forward I think would be powerful. And in my view both are

[11:46:32 AM]

transit issues, transportation issues and displacement are the two big issues that I hear about all the time in the community. And as we improve the funding, finding more and more ways to find people here makes sense to me. And knowing we could cut the taxes for the typical homeowner more than what the manager mentioned in July, while still clearly including this in all the other priorities, I just don't know why -- I just couldn't support cutting this knowing that we could -- that we could actually include all of these things and still have that tax reduction that is very significant compared to other years on this dais.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, could I ask staff to talk about -- I have no concerns about the first two and I'm not sure I have a concern about the third, though as -- I also -- it is a lot of money and I want to even

[11:47:35 AM]

understand whether that could feasibly get out the door in a year. I do want to say something about emergency relocation. We have passed at least a couple of resolutions that asked our staff to really look at holding responsible those who should be held responsible in the case of emergency relocations. And in particular we've directed that request to our code department. When there is a need for emergency relocation we need to figure out legally and through the code department how to pass that cost on to the prone whores have failed in many cases to maintain their property. So I'm supportive of the funding, but also supportive in emphasizing that previous council direction that we need the ability to hold accountable those property owners. When that's possible. So councilmember Casar --

[11:48:35 AM]

let me ask our housing staff. Staff believes there are right to return including for-profit and non-profit housing developers to incorporate the preference policy. I would like our housing staff to determine whether there are projects that are currently in the works or online that have requested this kind of funding to be able to implement a preference policy, and if so do those total an amount where 2.5 could go out the door for such programs. I'm fully supportive of our preference policy. As I mentioned last week, my staff worked for years on it before this council passed that policy. So thanks for the dais for

[11:49:35 AM]

continuing to support that. I think it's important that we encourage it not only in our own projects as we will be doing this fall, but also encourage those non-profit and for-profit developers to do so. But I guess my question is is 2.5 the amount that could be spent this year and what kinds of projects are you aware of. And I want to say I know several of our projects, I hope our projects at the health south campus and St. Johns and Ryan drive will be doing that as part of their proposal, their successful proposals so that we will not need to provide additional incentives for them to do so. So I hope we're talking about projects beyond those on city-owned land.

>> Casar: And councilmember tovo, just briefly, I don't mean to interrupt, but just to make it clear the goal is not to incentivize projects that weren't doing it to do it, but rather to provide the necessary subsidy to get the projects that are saying they will do it to the ground, if that makes sense. So it's not to say hey, you project that aren't

[11:50:36 AM]

proposing to do right to return, we'll give you money for you do it, but rather those projects that are in queue saying we want to do right to return, we need X amount of gap funding to get our affordable units on the ground that have right to return policies for those projects to be able to get through the queue. Does that make sense?

>> It's really in essence providing additional funding to affordable housing projects that are trying to get started.

>> Casar: Yes, ma'am.

>> Tovo: And making it a requirement of right to return.

>> Casar: Right.

>> Tovo: So the housing trust fund is our dollars that we're using to help get those affordable housing developments on the ground. So we're really talking about whether the amount budgeted within our affordable housing restaurant for this year plus 2.5 is all reasonably going to get out the door this year. This funding, this fiscal year.

>> Casar: Correct.

[11:51:36 AM]

This is sending the money to the housing trust fund. This would be an addition and this would be the first time that we're funding specifically those projects that are doing that kind of work. So it's an addition and prioritization of this amount.

>> Tovo: We could actually prioritize all of our housing trust fund dollars in that way and of course, I think there may have been language in that resolution that directed that prioritization. I guess director truelove can you talk about -- I've forgotten exactly what that number is in our housing trust fund this year, but it would be that plus this. Is that funding that you believe could all be utilized within this fiscal year insurance.

>> Good morning, Rosie truelove, the director of the city of Austin's housing and planning department. We are hugely oversubscribed on our rental housing assistance program. We anticipate that any dollars that we direct towards those program opportunities would go out

[11:52:37 AM]

the door this year. This is -- this I think was well explained by both councilmember Casar and you, councilmember tovo, in how we could utilize these funds to more or less sweeten the pot to get our affordable housing developments out the door. Recognizing we're approaching the tail end of our general obligation bond program and those dollars are dwindling.

>> Tovo: Great, thank you for that. And within the rest of the double trust fund dollars are projects that are deploying the right to return preference policy also being prioritized?

>> So we would utilize -- don't have anything in the works right now aside from the projects that are on city-owned land that we've talked about, but we do recognize that if we have funding available that there would be additional projects that would come forward and want to utilize that funding to take advantage of that funding to utilize the right

[11:53:39 AM]

to return policies. Additionally in the housing trust fund we have some anti-displacement activities that we have been funding that are outside of what is funded either through the federal rent program or through what we anticipate will come from project connect. We also utilize the housing trust fund for some homeless activities, some contracts related to that. We have the housing trust fund to help create our local housing voucher that helps to create that operation subsidy that's really imperative to some of our permanent supportive housing such as esparo at Rutland that just had their groundbreaking this week. So the housing trust fund is used for more than just straight gap financing for affordable units, but it's all in the name of increasing affordability.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I should have been clear that I was talking about the gap financing piece of the affordable housing trust fund. I know it also covers some

[11:54:41 AM]

staff salaries and some other things. Hopefully within the gap financing piece of the trust fund we are prioritizing those projects that are implementing a right of preference policy. Okay. Thank you for that additional context.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. I know we often talk about our affordability crisis, but I think it's also important that we frame it as a displacement crisis that we're in and that we have in our city. There's not a week that goes by that I don't hear about another family who is having to move out of the city and individuals in my community that don't know about our programs. I wanted to point out that this amendment that which are is bringing, and thank you for your leadership, councilmember Casar, because I share with you in the priority of anti-displacement, is that we -- should our budget rider pass on a displacement navigator program, it means we will have more individuals out in our community sharing about the

[11:55:44 AM]

resources that we have available within the city of Austin. So it will be critical that we have these funds, the 250,000 allocated to the tenant stabilization fund that will help us increase our services. It will -- we'll be forward thinking and understanding that we're going to have an increased need and that more people are going to be hearing about the programs that we have available so it would be wise and incumbent upon us to invest in these increases to these programs. And also the emergency relocation assistance is definitely needed. As councilmember Casar pointed out, during the fourth of July we had two families who were displaced because there was illegal you usage of fireworks in the neighborhood. And one family, the father, lost his work truck, which was his livelihood. Had his supplies in his work truck that was also burned down. And if we could provide him assistance in a time of need so this is another critical component that would help

[11:56:44 AM]

show our commitment as a city council to anti-displacement. Very happy that project connect passed and that included and the voters supported that 300 million dedicated to anti-displacement, but I think this will also send a strong message from this council that we are committed to ensuring that the families of today have a place in the Austin of tomorrow. I'm super supportive of this amendment. I think the amount it's at right now is a good amount. It's definitely a good Saturday starting point in my opinion, but I know we have several critical needs that we're considering and I wanted to share my support for keeping this at the amount that it's proposed.

>> I also support this element as well and the budget amendment. It's kind of ironic, a lot of this work people on this dais are already doing out in the community and certainly having more resources and more voices

[11:57:47 AM]

and having more on this will be helpful. So thank you. I do appreciate us getting to talk through some of the details. I was thinking that this might be duplicating the efforts of other anti-displacement dollars that have already been allotted and so I appreciate councilmember kitchen's clarification on that. I also know that housing trust fund is something that we will make sure if there are any dollars that need to be parked somewhere that we always know there's money needed in that fund and that the work far out weighs the resources that we often times are able to lot. And so even though when I originally looked at this I wondered if there might be more wiggle room in it, I really appreciate this clarification because it sounds like really important programs. So I want to certainly make sure that people aren't getting displaced, especially given what a tough year it's been and that people are still financially recovering this year.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[11:58:47 AM]

Councilmember pool and then councilmember kitchen.

>> Pool: Yeah. Everything is super important, I agree. I agree. Thanks for voicing that, councilmember Ellis. What I would like to suggest is if we are looking to scale these that we also consider that we can come back at midyear in January, February, and revisit where we're at so if we park some funds in reserves or tag them for additional expansion, once new programs and new hires are underway then in looking at what our revenues may be once we are actually in fiscal '22, that may ease some of the pressure that we're feeling. These are all really, really needed programs. There is no question about that. But I think the dollar figure amount on here may be a little bit higher than a number of us are comfortable with so I do think we need to be able to scale this down a little bit. But I would like to begin

[11:59:49 AM]

and reiterate that that does not mean that we will not come back in a few months at midyear. In fact, I would urge that we do and have a direction to the city manager to that effect so that we can then go -- them we can measure our progress and including additional funds, because when we do come back in February we will have gotten our property tax revenues and have a better sense of what our going forward numbers are and then we can top off the allocations and the appropriations at that time.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> I wanted to reiterate something that councilmember Casar said. I was concerned about the rate that housing and planning is able to help new projects get off the ground because of the resources that are available to them. And I know that at least -- I know there are projects in my district and in other

[12:00:49 PM]

districts too that could get on the ground faster with -- and could provide more housing for people faster if we could provide some supports. Otherwise we have them queued up and it's taking us years to get in place the kind of housing we need. We've all been talking about how important it is to get our affordable housing up as quickly as possible. We've had that conversation as part of permanent supportive housing and some of these groups are that kind of housing. Some are affordable housing for other populations. I just think that this is not something that we can afford to wait on. And I would rather have our staff know that they could use this money and work on it. I respect everybody's thinking here, but I don't think we gain much by not using it for something that we know is a really high priority as quickly as possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Thank you. Folks, it is noon. Let's take our recess. We'll come back down here at

[12:01:49 PM]

1:00. And we'll begin with the next item.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think Pio had something. I don't know if you can see him.

>> Mayor Adler: Pio. You're muted.

>> Renteria: I'm sorry. Thank you. We do have a big need for this money. I have -- there's a non-profit in district 1 and 2, like Guadalupe, is sitting on vacant lots that just doesn't have the resources to build houses. These non-profit groups are the ones that not only build houses, low income housing at a very affordable rate, but they also have the right to return program implemented in their project. So this is really not that much money at all when it comes to affordable housing.

[12:02:50 PM]

It's a great need for that. And I think we need to do as much as we can even if it hurts to give as much money as we can so that we can build more housing. That's the big outcry in this city is that we don't have enough affordable housing, and it's true. So we need these type of programs.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mayor pro tem?

>> Harper-madison: I'll be brief. I know you have to run. In addition to the resources that we need, I'd also like to point out that we need to clear the red tape and the permitting process and make it less difficult to build affordable housing so we can't talk about one without the other.

>> Mayor Adler: I concur with that as well. All right, guys, see you back here at 1:00.

[1:28:06 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Here at 1:27, we're going to reconvene. Colleagues, we were in the process of going through the larger items just to give people a chance to be able to ask questions about them. We're going to continue to pick up that process again. The next item we had was the kitchen 1. Any thoughts or questions on kitchen 1? Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So, I very much support investing in iconic venues. Depending on where we come at the end and what we want to talk about, this is a high dollar amount and we could consider it. I'm not advocating for that. I just want to flag that for later. I think we have a lot we need to do to support our arts community right now. I just want to flag that for

[1:29:07 PM]

right now. I don't want to have a whole argument about it right now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other comments on this item? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, I appreciate that, councilmember alter. And that's fine. Just to explain what it is, it's a small piece of what we already voted to put towards protecting our iconic venues. We voted last December to create this fund and we voted to have a five-year group of installment payments. This is the payment for this year. And we voted for the goal of doing this amount every year. And again, this is the amount that supports protecting and preserving our iconic music and restaurants, and other valued cultural assets. So, it is something that we directed our staff to include every year. And it was not included.

[1:30:07 PM]

And so that's why I put it forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I want to thank folks for bringing this forward. Given the spike in the delta variant, you know, this has become a higher priority than when we were maybe even shaping up the budgets. So, thank you. And I support the amount listed here.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I'm sorry. I think I'm working off -- I was working on the spreadsheet my staff put together and not the other spreadsheet. Can you clarify which -- what is number 1? What item is it?

>> Mayor Adler: Kitchen 1, the iconic venue fund item.

>> Harper-madison: I have a question for staff.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Harper-madison: The question there is, I'd like to talk about our preservation acquisition fund, historic

[1:31:07 PM]

preservation acquisition fund.

>> Natasha, you know this is not that.

>> Harper-madison: That's what I'm asking.

>> Kitchen: Would you like me to explain it? These are different funds.

>> Harper-madison: Right. I'm not asking them to tell me whether or not these funds have been applied to this initiative already. I'd like to know if they are eligible for it.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So, let me just take a stab and see if I'm answering your question, then of course you can ask the staff to weigh in.

>> Do you mind if we go the reverse?

>> Kitchen: Go ahead.

>> Mayor Adler: The question for staff is the relationship, if any, or could be, between the historic preservation fund and the iconic venue fund. Is there someone on staff that can address that? I think we're bringing somebody.

>> They're getting moved over

[1:32:09 PM]

there.

>> Harper-madison: That's probably the economic development department?

>> Exactly. Thank you, mayor pro tem. It looks like they have moved over. We have our interim director holt-rabb available.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Harper-madison: So much better.

>> Thank you.

>> Harper-madison: The

[1:33:09 PM]

question I have for you is whether or not there are funds in the preservation fund, in the historic preservation fund for acquisitions, because it's my understanding that some of those funds could be applicable for this historic venue preservation.

>> Good afternoon, holt-rabb, acting director, you're correct, mayor pro tem. There is a line item in the fy22 proposed budget for acquisition. As before, the funds that were transferred to the iconic venue fund were part of the historic preservation transfer that could occur. And so these are funds in the historic preservation fund for acquisition.

>> Harper-madison: So with the historic venue -- I'm sorry, iconic venue amendment benefit, is there money in this fund that could go towards this item?

>> There is a line item in fy22

[1:34:10 PM]

budget for acquisition.

>> Harper-madison: So the 2.5 . . .

>> If directed or approved by council, that is the purpose of the -- we would like a portion of that used. It would have to follow the guidance of the historic preservation guidelines as outlined by state statute.

>> Harper-madison: I understand. I would like to explore that if it's an option. Everything else, you guys, I want to explore what options we might have. I think we have to be as creative as possible given that I still think we're really heavy on this budget. I'm asking questions because I'm curious where we might be able to make some adjustments.

>> Kitchen: Director holt-rabb, that's not exactly accurate, what you just said. And you may not be understanding the distinction. As a reminder, when we pass the resolution for the iconic venue fund, the council specifically

[1:35:12 PM]

directed that we were not going to eat into the 15% cultural arts and the 15% historic preservation fund. So, in other words, when we passed this back in December, we recognized the importance of that historic preservation fund and what it's been used for over the years. And we said that we were not going to use that money and that we were creating a separate pot for our iconic venues. And so in your response to the mayor pro tem, is there another bucket? I'm fine if there is another bucket to take -- I just -- we made a commitment that we were not going to take the iconic venue fund money out of the 15% historic preservation. So, is there another bucket that I'm not aware of? I thought the mayor pro tem was asking about the bucket that was available for the 15 -- out of

[1:36:15 PM]

the 15% historic preservation allocation.

>> The way I understood the question is could it. But yes, you are right, referencing the resolution that that's not where you wanted the funds to come from.

>> Kitchen: It's not where the council voted to take the funds from. So mayor pro tem, you know, theoretically that is another fund, but this council, you know, when we had these conversations back in December, we were very clear that that 15% historic preservation was for different purposes and that we did not want to use the -- we meaning the council as a whole voted that we did not want to take the iconic venue dollars out of that bucket.

>> Harper-madison: I appreciate that very much. But I think like everything else, we have transitioned multiple times since December. We have evolved over and over

[1:37:16 PM]

and over again. And like everything else, sometimes we can reconsider a decision we made previously. And if that's an option, and we could reconsider, and we could put this money that we're talking about for iconic venues back into our general fund, I don't see why we wouldn't do that. Some of those projects, like the iconic venue fund, are often venues suffering because of our current circumstances. Some of those projects we made a priority before aren't a priority right now. It's worth exploring

whether or not there's some room to change our previous decision. And if that's the case then I'd like very much to do that.

>> Kitchen: Well mayor pro tem -- councilmember tovo would need to be on the dais for that conversation, because she was very -- it was very important to her not to take the --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's give some other people a

[1:38:16 PM]

chance to talk, too. Councilmember Ellis, then councilmember tovo.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. Director holt-rabb, could you help me understand how those funding sources might play with the economic development corporation? I seem to remember that part of the conversation happening then.

>> You are correct. The funds were transferred to the Austin economic development corporation for them to explore the best options for use of those funds.

>> Ellis: Okay. Thank you. If I have another question, I will raise my hand again.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you, mayor. And I'm sorry, councilmember kitchen, thank you. I am actually here. But thanks for that, because I do absolutely want to participate in this conversation. First of all, I think it's really important that we do always keep our options on the table. And mayor pro tem, I really

[1:39:17 PM]

appreciate you pursuing the line of question if only because -- or in part because for years we did not interrogate or did not successfully interrogate how the hotel occupancy tax was being spent and continued to spend it in the same way. It's healthy to have that dialogue about whether we want to reconsider previous decisions. Having said that, one thing that happened in the course of doing the iconic venue is that we went back in time and captured some of what would have been historic preservation dollars and moved it into iconic venues. And in doing so, took some money away that I had thought we were saving for acquisition. So, it did get complicated. And I agree that -- and I want to continue to stay away from the 15% for -- well, I want --

[1:40:19 PM]

one of the reasons why I pulled the conversation about the historic preservation fund is because I do think we should take a look at how we're spending it and see, and just really understand those different components. But what I don't want to do is tap the acquisition piece of it, because we are -- we have several -- we have two really important potential acquisitions. And we don't currently have enough funding in our reserves to really complete either of those transactions, I don't believe. So, I'm going to continue to look for ways to preserve the historic preservation fund acquisition line and indeed, maybe even move -- re-prioritize some of the expenditures that staff have proposed so that we can really look to doing that. I appreciate what both of you said. As I said, we should always look at previous decisions and see if they're still the right

[1:41:20 PM]

priorities. And especially when it comes to some funding decisions that can become sort of just ongoing streams. But I also concur, councilmember kitchen, that for the venue support, for the iconic venue support, we don't want to tap the historic preservation fund if it's going to cut into -- especially if it's going to cut into the acquisition piece, which we need to bolster. So I don't know whether we need to then have that conversation now, mayor, or super soon about how that historic preservation fund is -- to answer some of the questions I had so we understand whether there are any opportunities within here, but that's what I've got for right now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go ahead and move on and see if there's a critical mass to have that conversation today. If not, similar to the question you asked as an obvious question following up this budget over the next immediate timeframe, manager, I think we would need

[1:42:21 PM]

to get back to that preservation fund and figure out how we're doing. There have been a lot of calls for that, to be able to identify the projects and the directions that we're doing. So I think that's an important conversation to have, if it doesn't turn out we have it today, because it's not necessary. All right. Let's continue on. Anything on this item? Yes, councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. I just wanted to echo support for keeping the historic preservation funds distinct. And thank you, councilmember tovo, for exploring additional ways for us to increase revenue in that fund, because there are some really important cultural assets in our community that we need to have those -- and we are having those conversations about acquiring, and having the opportunity to pursue increased revenue is sorely needed. Thank you. And I will support you in those efforts. I also want to thank councilmember kitchen for your leadership and bringing forward this amendment for the iconic

[1:43:22 PM]

venue fund. Certainly this funding is critically needed in our community right now. We've seen the impact that our venues and restaurants have had amid the pandemic and continue to have. Restaurants are having to deal with stage five and some are having to -- they are requiring vaccination cards, now have had to pull back because of that. The impacts in our restaurant community and also in our iconic venues continue to remain. And so I think I support -- I want to say I support this amendment and would like to keep the funding as councilmember kitchen submitted. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, let's go to the next item then. The next one that I'm seeing indicated here is kitchen three, which is the heal -- the \$6 million.

[1:44:23 PM]

Is Diana here? Can we bring in our homeless strategy officer? Hmm?

>> [Indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor, while we're waiting for Diana to come on, I just want to say that I think this is a really good use of our funds. I think that was the intention. I think this is a program that has proven success and I think that councilmember kitchen -- I thank councilmember kitchen for her leadership. And I was proud to ultimately co-sponsor that. I think this is an important next step. We're definitely seeing some really positive results in terms of getting folks into housing and allowing those public spaces to be, um, accessible for everyone.

>> Mayor Adler: The question -- the question that I have -- hang on a second -- the question that I have for Diana, who I think is coming on is -- again, I also

[1:45:23 PM]

concur, and I appreciate councilmember kitchen's leadership on heal and I think that the communities say that we can, in fact, get people out of tents and put them into homes. We're on track for homes. And I -- I like that we're doing it in a way that is designed to lead to long-term sustainability. I just want to make sure -- I think that this kind of expenditure falls within the scope of the 100 million or so that was put towards building out the system in conjunction with our -- our partners. And we want to do something which is truly transformative and not ad hoc projects but to help to build capacity in the system as we move people off. And I want to make sure if we do this, if those are charged to the funds that it is consistent with the commitment that we are making to actually build out a

[1:46:24 PM]

system and so can you address that miss gray?

>> Yes, the heal initiative expenditures are largely rapid re-housing and re-housing is the primary areas contemplated under the summit plan and so this spending fits squarely within the framework, the preliminary framework that's been established and does not overinvest in the past what was contemplated in that -- that spending framework.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Further comment? Councilmember pool, did you have something?

>> Pool: Yeah. My wholehearted support -- this is phase two of heal and we have seen tremendous results and let's keep going. And I do agree that our guy is appropriate.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember

[1:47:25 PM]

Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. My question first is for Ms. Gray. After you do the sites and you go out and you clear them, is there some sort of after-action review process that occurs? I know that it's a dynamic process and I just want to make sure that there's learning going on regarding what y'all are doing. You're muted.

>> Thank you, councilmember Kelly. We are -- as you know, we have completed the first three sites of the four contemplated in phase one of heal. We certainly have been -- been collecting it over time. We have not instituted a site-by-site after-action report though I think that is something that we'd like to do in the future. And one of the things that was contemplated in the resolution that established the heal initiative was that after we complete these four sites we would come back to council with feedback about what we want, any revisions or improvements that

[1:48:27 PM]

might be available to us or necessary to maximize the effectiveness of the project. And we will anticipate doing that after we complete site four.

>> Kelly: Thank you for your response to that. I want to also thank councilmember kitchen for bringing me on to this as a co-sponsor. It was one of the very first things that I was asked to co-sponsor when I was brought on to council and I was honored to be alongside my colleagues in doing that. I know that it was always the idea of the heal initiative to move forward with phase two and after visiting the site at Caesar Chavez and the staff and seeing the reaction to the individuals over there who are experiencing

homelessness, when they were given an opportunity to be lifted out of their situation it was entirely worth all of the work that went into this. So I'm incredibly thankful and proud to be at the city have staff who do care about those experiencing homelessness, and now we have a plan to move forward. I'd like to see that happen. And I hope that it can be

[1:49:28 PM]

replicated and be a model of use all across the country, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right, let's go ahead to the next item. Let's do that. The next item that we have is pool number 1, childcare at rec centers. Does anybody have questions or thoughts on this? Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: Sir, I'm very excited about this. I'm a co-sponsor on it. I just want to flag as we're talking about options, because I am one of the equal opportunity about the options, um, is that this could be one time and as councilmember pool has said it could be scaled if we so choose. I'm not advocating it. I just want to flag it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I'm also excited about this one. I like the way that it's went presented. I like the effort of looking at some part of it for the 300,000,

[1:50:31 PM]

and so I appreciate councilmember pool bringing this forward and I'd like to -- I am supportive of it as she has presented it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Yeah, I just need clarity -- councilmember pool, you had presented it as ongoing and then you had presented it -- I think updated it to one time. Now I see it in the proposal -- I mean, I see it in the list as "Ongoing."

>> Pool: Right. It's bounced around. Well, it's a result of our talking over time with our budget staff in an attempt to try to mitigate the impacts because we all were talking about that, and to look for scalability. And I ventured with the concept that it could be one time and scalable. It's still scalable. But the staff has been adamant that once these programs are

[1:51:32 PM]

introduced they become very popular that we, in fact, would not want to retreat from having the additional quality childcare programming. So in acknowledgement of that and staff recognized that I was trying to fit, you know, within all of the parameters for compromise, but I have agreed and ceded to their good points that this be ongoing. So once we offer these childcare programs we can continue to offer them.

>> Tovo: And most are permanent staff so that would be challenging. So it needs to be ongoing. And then our staff in cob currency that these are eligible expenses for the \$300,000? I have lost -- temporarily lost the sheet.

>> Pool: Yeah, that specifically is our contractual obligations for the purchase of the vehicles.

>> Tovo: I was just trying to get a sense whether those were

[1:52:32 PM]

staff --

>> Pool: Yes, that's where we got them.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, any other comments on this? Yes, councilmember Ellis and then councilmember Fuentes.

>> Tovo: I hadn't finished my question before Leslie answered it.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry.

>> Tovo: Unless the staff have anything else to say? Yeah, I am not sure -- I was trying to ask the question of whether staff had identified this as an eligible fund for Kos and councilmember pool said it had. So, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Ready for the next speaker. Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Ellis: I thought that I was next.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, that's correct. I did call on you. Thank you, councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I wanted to extend my thanks to councilmember pool for bringing this item forward. I do think this is something that we should be doing as a city and I very much look

[1:53:33 PM]

forward to seeing how this program works. So if it ended up having to change it all, that would be one of my last options for trying to change things within this budget. So I think that this is a really exciting initiative that I hope that can continue to be ongoing through the years.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Couple member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you, councilmember pool, for bringing this forward. I'm very excited about this amendment and I know that it will help a hundred kids in dove springs with after-school programs, and dove springs rec center. So I'm super looking forward to it and I would echo councilmember Ellis saying that this would be the last thing that I would want to see cut. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I was curious to know if the opportunities would be available to charter school students as well?

>> I believe these are all children who live in the city of Austin. So it's a quality after-school

[1:54:34 PM]

care, and childcare, so -- but Kim Mcneely, is she on? On the grid here --

>> Mayor Adler: Staff is shaking her head yes that this is available to all kids.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you for your leadership on this, and I think that childcare is critically important in the community in so many different ways. It's really the tool that enables families to really be able to ladder up and to be able to take advantage of what opportunities we -- we offer. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Not to pile on too much, but I said thank you privately and I want to say it publicly. And while investing in the rec centers along the eastern crescent that our districts all overlap, and it's right there at the intersection of district 7 and 1 and 4, so this really is for kids all over the city. So thank you for bringing it forward again.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, we ready to move on to the next one?

[1:55:36 PM]

>> Thanks, everybody for your support, I appreciate it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go on to the next one which I think that is pool number -- nope, it's Ellis, number 1 on park rangers. Does anyone want to discuss that one? Councilmember Kelly and then councilmember alter.

>> Kelly: I was just wondering what the history of this program is and why the additional need is necessary for the park rangers?

>> I'm happy to answer that question. I think that director Mcneely moved away and may need to come back if she wants to add her voice into this. The city of Austin has very few park rangers in comparison to how much park space we have. So this has been a program that has never had enough person power behind it. My original proposal actually

[1:56:36 PM]

had two teams of six, and I went ahead and amended that, just given the need for balancing our financial decisions over the next day. And so this is something that we know needs to be added to. The benefit of park rangers is incredibly valuable to our environmental sensitivity here because what they do is they help to steward and educate people on how to be good patrons of our park system, how to keep themselves safe, their pets safe, and make sure they don't have things like glass in the creeks as they enjoy greenbelts and things like that. So it's an incredibly valuable part of safety and environmental education in our community. And it has been vastly understaffed historically. So we're always looking for ways to bring more education into the park system and this is a fantastic way to do it.

>> Kelly: I thank you for that background, councilmember Ellis, and I thank for bringing this forward. And I'm a fan of the park ranger

[1:57:38 PM]

program they have here so I hope that can continue after covid comes to a close. I'm supportive of this item.

>> Ellis: I also love the park ranger program, it's fantastic.

>> Mayor Adler: Director Mcneely, do you want to speak to this?

>> No, sir. Councilmember Ellis absolutely covered it all. The only thing that I would add just for a frame of reference is that there's three parks that we patrol, or that 21 regions are expected to patrol and that equals approximately 17,000 acres of land so it's a little tough for 21 folks who work seven days a week. We have two shifts working seven days a week to have us to meet all the needs of the folks in our park system. Other than that I have nothing else to say, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Great, thank you. Anything else on this before we move on, councilmember pool and then councilmember kitchen.

>> Pool: I support this as well and I support councilmember Ellis' willingness to scale it and we can always build it more

[1:58:39 PM]

in the future budget years. So thank you very much, and I support this.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen -- I'm sorry, I think that I skipped over you.

>> I appreciate councilmember Ellis bringing this forward and I would like to co-sponsor and I appreciate her willingness to scale this. I do hope that in future years we can be increasing some of the investments in pard so that we don't always have to be doing it at budget. Pard is a department that everyone on council really embraces and I would like to see that reflected more and more in the budget in the future. So I think this is a really important first step with respect to the park rangers, and I look forward to working with councilmember Ellis, director Mcneely, and any other colleagues on future investments in this area as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Renteria and then councilmember kitchen.

[1:59:42 PM]

>> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. And I also support that. I used to see a lot of them patrolling in our area because I live right there in the downtown area, and a lot of people like to go out there and jog. And we have been getting some assaults there at the trail. And rape attempts, sexual assault attempts. So I think that it's really needed. So that's why I'm supporting it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, anything else on this one before we move on? Let's move on then to --

>> Kitchen: Mayor, you had called on me.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: That's all right. Very, very quickly I want to say thank you councilmember Ellis for bringing this forward and I do support it also.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ready? Let's go to tovo nine. The contract labor.

[2:00:42 PM]

Any discussions on this? I know this is something that we had talked about and maybe even scaling up and starting lower but I'm supportive of this if we can make it fit within the available funds. Just doing it all. And I appreciate you bringing this forward. I think that it's been our goal to do this for our employees for some time. And I appreciate your leadership on this issue and making it happen.

>> This is not all of it across the organization but it's pushing our first start a little further.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: Mayor, I would certainly support everything that councilmember tovo has listed here. I would note that in order to not go over the amount of recurring funds available, if we were to only go to 5%, then the proposal I have listed here has us do about half of tovo nine,

[2:01:44 PM]

by doing the enterprise fund side but not the general fund side this year. Again though -- and the way that I decided that was just sort of a -- a last-up on board, last in approach, given everything that folks had posted beforehand seemed to already cover all of the recurring funds that were available. And so we could do, you know, over \$350,000 of this in the enterprise funds but on the general fund side we would be going over the balance that we have. So if we wanted to stay at 5%, we could do the enterprise fund side and not the general fund side. Again, I'm open to and supportive of doing as much as we can, but just to make that point clear we've done pretty much everything proposed by the council in and under 5% if this one just covered the enterprises.

>> Tovo: Just to be clear, I think that we should make decisions about our funding allocations based when they come forward [indiscernible] So I

[2:02:44 PM]

would say that we need to take my amendment on its merit and if it makes sense to do it a little differently, with what I have proposed, we can certainly have that conversation. Also I think that we need to hear from staff. It's in our conversations back and forth with our staff, some of it is attributable to enterprise fund legitimately because of -- because the buildings are a mix of different departments. So, I mean, I understand what you're saying councilmember Casar, and thanks for pointing out the difference between what you have on your spreadsheet and what I brought forward.

>> Casar: Yeah, I don't disagree with anything that you have said, so thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I want to ask councilmember tovo, what you just said, it can't be split that way because the buildings are split -- because you'd have to outsource half of the building, which is would make no

[2:03:44 PM]

sense?

>> Tovo: This is where we need staff to help us to understand which piece. I think that they were suggesting -- so in the answer to, what is it, 17 -- they gave us a proposal will \$700,000 for building

departments and in additional conversation, in response to that additional conversation, about half of that 700 can be attributed to enterprise funds because there's some buildings like one Texas center where you have a mixed enterprise plus non-enterprise departments. But if staff could help us to clarify in my original amendment, whether any of my original amendment can be attributable to -- can be attributed to -- or allocated to enterprise funds, that would be helpful.

>> Mayor Adler: Now we can hear you.

>> Kerry Langer, budget officer. Yes, to clarify the building services department is a part of the support services fund and that support services allocation is generally split 50/50 between

[2:04:47 PM]

the general fund and the enterprise funds. So when you look at the updated numbers, it shows that representation of half of that cost for the 700 or about \$350,000, moving into the general fund and then the remaining being attributed to the enterprise funds as they will be responsible for that portion as we do the support services allocation.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you -- go over the numbers at the beginning of that. Sorry, say that again.

>> Say that again?

>> Mayor Adler: Would you say that --

>> Sure. So the building services department is a part of the support services fund. And so when you look at that fund, it is generally allocated 50/50 between the general fund and the enterprise departments. And so when we did the split, we -- that 700,000 that is projected for building services, we split it 50/50 to the general fund and the remaining goes to

[2:05:48 PM]

the enterprise funds.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> And it will be split amongst the enterprise funds.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. So you just can't do the 350, because it's only half -- I got it now. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Sorry, but I want to understand. Are any these contracts specifically for enterprise funds buildings? So if it was -- I want to understand -- if this was, for example, custodial contract for Austin energy or Austin water I assume that we wouldn't pay for that out of the general fund and we could

keep it straight enterprise, but correct me if I'm wrong. We finally stumped you. We have been doing this for weeks.

>> I think that Darryl is around too and I just talked to Darryl about this. This contract allows us to in source one public health facility and one other facility worked by multiple departments.

[2:06:48 PM]

We do have in this budget -- there were two contract in-sourcing items that we did. One specifically to the water utility and they're paying for all that, and one specific to Austin energy and they're paying for all of that. But this in-sourcing is to billing sources and it's supporting multiple facilities with multiple departments, thus, the cost allocation dynamic.

>> The additional building was -- the campus, Darryl Alexander, the building service officer for the building service department.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> May I clarify?

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Tovo: So you had a proposal to -- to bring -- to in-source 25 F.T.E.S for building services at a cost of \$700,000. And that -- so the cost of those

[2:07:49 PM]

ftes was 1.6 as I understand the answer to number 17. It is just set by the possible reduction of 900 which is how you get the balance of 700?

>> Right. But it's an additional -- \$700,000 is additional. So it's an off -- yes, it is.

>> Tovo: Right. So of that 700, so my amendment was to provide for -- my amendment is to provide an additional \$700,000 of ongoing funds for you to do that proposal. So what we're trying to determine now is of that -- of those 25 new -- how many will be working in enterprise -- in buildings that house enterprise funds? Enterprise departments.

>> So I have -- I have [multiple voice] And I have other departments there. So I would have to break it down.

>> Tovo: Sure.

>> But there are several builds

[2:08:51 PM]

that have some enterprise there, yes. The --

>> Tovo: It's just a question mark that we need to mail down. My amendment is for \$700,000 and if the staff could help us to figure out how much of that -- whether and how much of that, um, \$700,000 gap can be attributed or allocated to enterprise fund departments, that would be helpful. Right? I think -- I think that -- I think that's the question that we're trying to answer.

>> So councilmember tovo, if your amendment is for \$700,000, what is on this sheet is higher than that, because it's \$890,000.

>> Tovo: My amendment is for \$190,000 for the five employees at the library.

>> Okay.

>> Tovo: Which allow them -- as I understand it -- and would look to staff for confirmation -- their proposal, the library's proposal are the building services proposal, was

[2:09:51 PM]

that with \$190,000 we could close the gap and allow those five security -- I believe that it was security staff -- to be in-sourced for the library. And then the additional \$700,000 was for the 25 new positions within building services, for a total of 30 new F.T.E.S and the gap between the contract -- the gap between the contracted cost of services and the cost of having those ftes is a total of \$890,000. Some of the --

>> Including the library?

>> Tovo: Yeah.

>> Okay.

>> Tovo: So I think that it's probably on this one easier just to look at the original amendment and to go from my original amendment and then to figure out how much of my original amendment can be -- could be eligible for non-general fund -- could be attributed to enterprise funds. Is that right?

[2:10:52 PM]

>> That is right. But when we do things on the fly like this a little bit, and we have used and generally served as well, like Harry said, 50%. It typically comes to the general fund, and in this case it depends on the rental rates which we set each year at the beginning of the process and it's a complicated process to determine rental rates that will be charged to all of the different departments that use those facilities.

Honestly, I don't think that we could come up with anything real, real specific in the time frame that we have for adopting this budget, but I think that 50/50 will get us close, which got us to \$540,000 in the general fund and \$350,000 within our enterprise departments and within there we'll make it work the best that we can within all of that. I didn't want to leave the podium without mentions that Darryl Alexander has indicated to me that he's going to be real, real hard for him to hire 25 new people, just given the market out there for custodial

[2:11:54 PM]

staff and security staff. And so there may be an opportunity -- you might want to discuss for phasing that in, doing a dozen this year or a dozen next year, something like that. And I think that he could speak more to that. But the practicality of hiring that many staff this year is pretty low so we'll have to still use that contract anyhow while we make this transition.

>> Tovo: That makes sense. I was going with what I saw in the answer as the proposal. I didn't know if it made it more complicated if we said half, because then you've got -- then you've got two different systems working. But what do you think that would make sense? I understand the intent but we want to work with what is feasible. So what makes sense?

>> Excuse me. We'll have a hybrid, right. And we'll always have a little contracting because it's event driven and you can do some in-sourcing. Right now to hire 25 security guards is just tough. We have seven open positions right now. So we would do something like this, and do 10 this year and do

[2:12:55 PM]

either 10 next year and get the remaining the following year. As you know the market in Austin is just crazy right now. It's hard for us to keep security guards. It's hard for us to get tradespeople. So something that -- if we're going to do this I would only do it in a phased approach where you do no more than 10 at a time. I know that it seems like a long process, but we want to be successful -- 25 is going to take forever to hire that.

>> Tovo: Okay, that's really helpful, thank you. I know that we met about this but it was a long while ago and I appreciate this additional information. I had thought this was the phased approach so it's good to be if this is more than what could be accomplished. When you say 10 is where you would set the cap -- is that 10 between the library and the buildings? Is it 10 total? So right now --

>> So I'm looking at 10 for dsd. And you have the library and you have Austin water, we're pulling

[2:13:56 PM]

from the same pool.

>> Tovo: I know that we're doing Austin water.

>> There's where your challenges come from, so 10 for vsd.

>> Tovo: I sure appreciate it. Thank you very much. So I will reduce that -- though I'm not going to be able to figure out in this moment exactly by how much, so that it responds -- well, I'll reduce it down -- you think that 10 is feasible?

>> Yes, I think that is feasible, yes, I do.

>> Tovo: Okay, thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: So you had me taking a look at the five library employees and the 10 of 25 building services, I'm trying to figure out roughly what that cost is.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I may need -- I may need staff's help to make sure that I reduce the \$700,000 by an appropriate amount.

>> Can I just clarify you saying that you would do some with the library and some with vsd -- or is that just 10 with vsd?

>> Tovo: Yeah, that was my understanding.

[2:14:56 PM]

Five of the library, and 10 of the 25 proposed for vsd. And hopefully our staff will help us to figure out how best to --

>> Sure.

>> Tovo: To recast that amendment.

>> So I think that the -- the library one is still 190, and the building services department is now \$280,000, and \$140,000 to the general fund and \$140,000 to enterprise, so I think that \$540,000 on your sheet you could revise down to \$330,000 in terms of keeping the general fund in balance.

>> Tovo: Sorry, I'm writing and reading and writing as quickly as possible.

>> The \$140,000 to the G.F. And the 190 for the library positions is \$330,000 in total.

>> Tovo: You know -- thank you. That's really super helpful and I really appreciate you working on this proposal and the kind of

[2:15:57 PM]

commitment that you put into the intent. And let me just note to our colleagues, you know, as I think that I told a few of you off the dais yesterday, we focused our work on security and custodial, but we have other -- some long-time contracted employees here at the city and I think that we should work hard to bring those on as regular city of Austin employees. The only gap -- the reason that there is a gap is because they're not being compensated for many cases for benefits and for uniforms and other kinds of costs that we really just need to do right by for the people that serve this city. So thank you so much again.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We go to the next one. Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: I appreciate councilmember tovo's leadership with the task force and staying on top of this. So in summary, just because we ran through those numbers fast, general fund, \$330,000, is that right, recurring general fund, councilmember?

>> Tovo: Yeah, I think so, but I now need staff to double check

[2:16:58 PM]

the equipment costs, because one of those numbers -- I think that it was the \$190,000 had equipment costs as well and we did not get a number -- let's circle around back to this, but I believe in answer 17 there were some equipment costs built in.

>> Casar: But as far as recurring it's \$330,000?

>> Tovo: It depends on equipment cost. If the 190 is in equipment costs we need to sub those out.

>> Casar: Understood, thank you, councilmember.

>> Mayor Adler: If there's a way to figure out how to fund this -- if there's a way to figure out how to fund this recurring and still stay below the four [indiscernible] I want to try to figure out how to do this. We may take a look at some of the things that I have proposed but I want to try to make room for this. All right, anything else on this?

>> Kitchen: I had a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

[2:17:58 PM]

>> Kitchen: I think that I understand, but the target that we're working towards on the ongoing is how much? \$3 million? Or -- or what? I mean, what is the target that we're working for for the total of ongoing? You just mentioned, mayor --

>> Mayor Adler: So the question is if we were to do the 4.9, that is the greater tax savings than what the manager was proposing. How much -- how much of the additional revenue would you look at, say, everything is ongoing?

>> Mayor -- I have that here on the sheet that I handed out. It really doesn't matter which tax rate we set. We still -- we have \$3.1 million ongoing available right now unless we make reductions. So given everything that's been posted, that \$330,000 ongoing, which the manager just told me is likely what we should calculate here, that would put us \$200,000 over the available

[2:19:03 PM]

ongoing, more or less.

>> Kitchen: Okay. That's what I was trying to understand.

>> We have \$3.1 million ongoing. Anything that I said wrong?

>> No, the \$3,100,000 is correct with the sales taxes and there were proposals with the way that it netted out to zero. You know, so there was a proposal that would generate \$950,000 of additional fee revenue but then that was tied to a proposal so it netted out to zero. So depends how you're looking at it. If we talk about revenues first and budget reduction first and create a pool of money it changes the dynamic than if you are just looking at sales tax revenues as being available.

>> Mayor Adler: So I guess that the sheet that I'm looking at that we're working off of, okay, from councilmember Casar posted earlier today, that had everybody's proposals the way

[2:20:06 PM]

that they put in their proposals worked at 4.9 if we were to cut, um, that -- that number, the 210. The \$200,000 from somewhere -- in recurring expenses? Do I understand that correctly?

>> Yeah. I think that's all correct. I was just --

>> Mayor Adler: No, no, I understand. But to your question that is laid out here, if we were to do that spreadsheet as it was laid out this morning, it works in staying under 4.9, that gives us the tax savings if we are to reduce ongoing by that \$200,000 number?

>> With this \$330,000 being added.

>> Mayor Adler: With the \$330,000 add. Thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I have a follow-up question.

[2:21:06 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: So, Ed, I wasn't quite sure what you were saying. Were you also saying that we have some things in our other category that we allocated to things that might actually -- if we treated them separately, they might raise the amount of money that we had for ongoing? I wasn't quite understanding what you just said.

>> Sure. I'll try -- I'll try to explain. So what staff presented last week, it works out with amendments that resulted in \$3.1 million of additional funding ongoing, that really came from higher sales tax revenues.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> \$5.8 million of one-time expenditures which has to do with this year we're doing better than we expected so our reserves are higher than expected, so it will be above 14%. That's what the staff -- that's what the current staff proposed budget is. The proposed budget before you with the 3.5% tax increase and

[2:22:08 PM]

\$3.1 million ongoing, and \$5.8 million one time. When you drill down on the council amendments there is one amendment from councilmember alter, alter two, that would generate \$950,000 of additional fee revenue and the proposal first is to allocate that to EMS and fire services. But from our perspective that's revenue and expenditures. So there's another proposal on the expenditure side for \$1.5 million savings for the delay of the opening of the fire station. \$1.5 million of savings that could be allocated anywhere but the proposal is to allocate it to AFD and EMS needs. So that's all I was trying to clarify. I think that the only one that I have in mind is there's a proposal, Casar four, which is to debt finance to the police department, by debt financing

[2:23:08 PM]

those that frees up \$300,000 in the police budget. And they have a plan to spend that money on violence prevention. So the question of how much money do we have to the balance due, if we do it the way that the mayor described yesterday which is to first identify all of the sources of funding and then determine how they're allocated to, it would be a different number than \$3.1 and \$5.8.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. So I was checking to see if potentially -- we'll talk about it in a second -- where we could skip those steps and I don't know if it's the will of the council to do that or not, but if it were the will of the council to do this spreadsheet as it was handed out this morning with the change to the

\$330,000 that we just saw, that sheet would work, assuming that we cut an additional \$200,000 out of ongoing.

[2:24:13 PM]

>> 168,951 is my specific number.

>> Mayor Adler: 168, 951. Thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: We could cut it or we could consider about whether there's any room in the three allocations that he just mentioned. Those are all good allocations for very good things and I'm not suggesting that we do that, because I support them all. I just wanted to say that to get at 168 doesn't have to come out of the items that are under the ongoing column if there's any room for phasing or something like that in those others that are -- that Ed mentioned.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Good point.

>> Kitchen: Like I said, I do support those others, I just want us all to be clear since we're asking about all of these what is the potential on the table.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: Just I wanted to note, I think that councilmember tovo mentioned something earlier

[2:25:13 PM]

about the travel budget, \$168,000. If that's the difference, it's kind of small, and we could just, say, make that ongoing next year. I mean, I think that the worry is if we were millions over, but we could find it from the travel budget if we had to.

>> Mayor Adler: That's a good idea too. All right, let's continue on. Let's go through this process. The next thing that I see, the next thing that I see here is alter one, which is AFD ems resilience. Any question or discussion on this item? Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. Looking at the -- I mean, I do think that it is necessary, but I would like further clarity if

[2:26:18 PM]

ballistic vests are to be replaced, because that the integrity might lost. So I don't know if somebody could speak to that? I think that ems could probably speak to that.

>> My understanding is they have some money in the budget for the vests now but the transitioning process costs money so they have some basic amount for the replacements and over time there would be costs that they would have to factor. But I think that right now they don't have them.

>> Kelly: Okay. That's great.

>> If chief brown is on.

>> Thank you for the question, mayor and council. The ballistic vests have a five-year -- once they are issued -- life span. And we do have money in our current budget to replace the ballistic vests. So we'd be using our current replacement dollars in the future to purchase those that they became out of warranty.

>> Kelly: Okay. Thank you, I'm very supportive

[2:27:19 PM]

of this and I'm glad that you brought it forward. Thank you very much, councilmember alter.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes. And then councilmember Ellis.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. I just wanted to thank councilmember alter for your strong leadership in this area. I had the opportunity to attend a training where we got to see the type of training needed for our firefighters to prepare for a wildfire event, and this type of training is desperately needed. It's kind of a train the trainer type of model. So I am super supportive of this amendment and I appreciate your leadership on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Ellis: Mayor, I want to echo councilmember Fuentes and I appreciate councilmember alter taking leadership on this and really digging into the numbers and finding creative funding solutions, given that this is such a high priority area for

[2:28:20 PM]

our city. So I really appreciate that and I wanted to extend my thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Colleagues, on to the next item. All right. I think that the next one is alter number 2. The ems investments. Any questions or comments about this? Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I do support this, and I appreciate councilmember alter's leadership on it. I think that it's worth an explanation because she's been very creative with this, which I appreciate. But it might be helpful to understand it.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter, you want to explain it.

>> Alter: Yeah, let me find the sheet so I don't miss something. Okay, so councilmember kitchen is right that I am being creative here. So what -- let me first talk about what we're funding.

[2:29:20 PM]

So we're funding phase two of the chief medical officer, and so that would be funding an additional deputy medical director over health equity and professional development as well as three coordinators who will work on system research and development, cardiovascular service lines and trauma and cardiac arrest service lines. And just as a reminder, the -- all of our emts, etc., have their medical practice ability that comes through the chief medical officers, and the physicians in that office. And so their ability to provide the development and the ability to help to make sure that the steps that we're taking and the procedures that we're using are most effective for the particular situations really helps all of our medics and emts throughout the system, paramedics. And then the second part is three additional practitioners

[2:30:21 PM]

within the office of the chief medical officer. These paramedic practitioners will generate fees. We have the fees that have been set, and we're estimating on the low side what kind of fees we will get from these folks and that will fund them in the future. The third part is ems leadership positions. So there's three ems division chiefs that we're adding to our ranks that will help to redistribute the workload and approve direct oversight personnel and emergency operations. Chief brown can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we have added something like 180 some medics without any additional management levels over the past several years. So these chiefs will focus on key programs, including communication, education, mental health response and infrastructure and specialty programs, and one of them will be in charge of the billing system which will ultimately help us to generate more

[2:31:22 PM]

revenue. In terms of the funding sources, we've identified roughly \$950,000 of fees that are new in this budget. The \$350,000 would come from an increase in the ems transport fee. The second \$400,000 that we estimated would be a non-resident ems transport fee. And then finally, we're estimating on the low side for revenue from the paramedic practitioners that would cover that. Over and above that, there are some one-time funding costs that are needed for vehicles, etc. And then there is a one-time funding required to make this all work of \$297,951 which covers some of the one-time costs and some of the ongoing for this one year until we can

[2:32:24 PM]

be confident that the fees will be in place and moving forward being ongoing. So thank you for the opportunity to explain it. It is creative. I think that it really helps us to deliver and to improve the access to medical care in Austin and I'm really excited about it and I appreciate the help that chief brown and Dr. Asad gave my office and myself and my staff member who works on this with me to make all of these work, as well as the budget office who had to run a lot of numbers on the fees. So, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. I just wanted to just say how incredible what you just laid out, councilmember alter. And I really admire your policy and your creativeness and just appreciate the work that you're doing.

>> Mayor Adler: All righty, let's go to the next item.

[2:33:24 PM]

Staff, thank you for being here in case there had been questioning, chief and Dr. Escott. The next item that I think that we're up to here is alter number five. Does anybody have any questions or comments about alter number five.

Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Yes, I just wanted to understand what this is contemplated for.

>> We allocated \$2 million to the non-profit fund for cultural arts, which is a fund that we created last may when we created the various funds for the non-profits to provide direct relief. Our staff in EdD have worked really hard to get this program up and out -- you know, up and running. They have gone through the process of soliciting

[2:34:24 PM]

applications and reviewing the applications and they are about to announce awards of 100 grants of \$20,000 each to non-profits who serve in cultural arts with a heavy diversity component in the scoring. There were 218 or 217 applications and of those over 100 that are left will be left without funding. So this is proposing putting a million dollars into that fund, which would allow them as soon as the city manager is able to move the funds over -- which I don't know that we could do before October 1st -- to provide that \$20,000 per organization to another 50 arts organizations around the city. So the work is already done and it's just just a matter of saying that it's moving over there. I understand from the arts commission, chair, that the need is desperate. I have checked in with EdD and they said that this would be a

[2:35:25 PM]

very impactful investment. And as you can imagine I think that there's a lot of organizations right now in the artings community who were hoping at this point to have their doors open and generate revenue, who are now concerned about with delta what that's going to mean over the next couple months. So I think this is an easy way to get more out the door. This could be scaled up or scaled down. It would just mean fewer organizations would be getting the funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other comments or questions on this item? All right, colleagues, that then gets us to next item, which I think is Adler, one. This is the homeless strategy office. Putting the dollars in for staff.

[2:36:26 PM]

Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I want to thank

[multiple voices]

>> Mayor Adler: If you're not speaking can you mute.

>> Kitchen: Okay, mayor, I wanted to thank you for bringing this forward. I really appreciate your leadership in making sure that this is brought forward for us. I'm excited about it. It is so necessary and I have just been overjoyed at the expertise of our homeless strategy officer. And this is what she needs to continue the excellent work that she's done so far. So again, mayor, thank you for bringing this. I'm proud to co-sponsor it.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Any else have questions or comments on this? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, the initial amendment had different funding proposals, and I think that I had also suggested one that was

[2:37:27 PM]

not reflected in your amendment of different funding streams. So I'd like to have a conversation about -- about what the most appropriate funding stream is. And whether a portion could be shifted to the American rescue plan dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think that it was -- the intent of it was to get the staffing in place. Certainly, preferable to do it as a recurring charge, rather than a three-year grant. Which I think that were the two different things that we had looked at. And we didn't dip into the million dollars in the American rescue

plan, so that those dollars could be used and invested in, you know, the direct investments in the people that were -- we're helping and into that system. But I was -- I was thinking on the basis for that.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I think that at some point the American rescue plan dollars that were going to

[2:38:29 PM]

have to be accompanied by staff to help to support those investments. So I'm not sure that I see -- I mean, I would expect to see staffing costs within the American rescue plan dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll have Diana address tattoo here in just a -- that too, if she could be brought in. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I understand what you are asking councilmember tovo. My thought is that it is clear that it is ongoing. And it's very important to have those staff be ongoing staff. You know, we're wanting to bring people in house and I do -- I support the effort that we talked about a few minutes go about in-sourcing contract labor and I do appreciate and support you bringing that forward to me this is as important or more important, because I think that it is important for the staff that we hire and the homeless strategy office that they know

[2:39:29 PM]

that they are permanent staff and that we are -- we have this put into our ongoing. I don't consider them grants. I think that taking them out of arpa sends a wrong message to the staff that we're trying to include.

>> Tovo: So just -- I think it's really important that -- that I provide some context for my comments, because it almost sounds as if maybe there's some uncertainty about whether I regard these as important staff positions, which I do. I have also sat on the dais and suggested that our homeless strategy officer needs more staff. But I think that it's also really important that we recognize that the years ahead are going to be very lean ones, and any staff -- I mean, we need to be asking these questions about any ftes that we're approving in this year's budget, and there are quite a number of them. If you look at -- I think that it's question 187, the way that

[2:40:30 PM]

it was labeled earlier this morning is 133 and I think that it's 187ish and it has a long list of ftes that we're adding to this budget. None of us want to be in the position income year or in the years, or putting the next council in the position of having to lay people off, approving a budget that lays people

off. So my questions are, one, about how best we use our scarce dollars to fund as many priorities as possible. And, two, asking hard questions about -- about the ftes that we're adding to our budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo, I think it is obviously really good points as we are looking at the budget items. My sense for me, I'm real comfortable with this being in the budget this way and recurring, because it fits within our policies and how we treat ongoing dollars as they're

[2:41:33 PM]

generated based on the assumptions, I think pretty conservative, that our financial stats are making. So even recognizing that, I'm comfortable putting this in, because I think this is not a challenge that's going to go away. And I think that it is really important that the people that are being hired for this know that these are coming from recurring sums. But I appreciate the sentiments and the warnings that you raised. Okay. Any further on this one? Go to the next one. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Yeah, I think that the question revolves around whether we will drain out the arpa funds completely, which is something that we have -- I have brought up in the past, and I know that others are concerned about. And I suppose if we allocate money and the hires can't happen

[2:42:36 PM]

or the money is not spent, then count the unexpended balances and then looking to build the funds for fiscal 2023. Is that how that works?

>> I

>> Can you repeat the question?

>> Pool: If we allocate money, from whatever category, arpa, general revenue or one-time and we don't spend it, that money becomes an un-expended balance which moves over to the next fiscal year for reallocation, is that right?

>> For operating funds, correct. Capital funds carry over. Operating funds, that's how they work.

>> Pool: We do want to be as specific today for the approval of the budget, because I join my colleagues who have indicated an interest in keeping the tax rate as low as possible. Yesterday I said I wanted to

[2:43:37 PM]

circle around 3.5%. I have a little bit of a tolerance for an increase, but not very much. Obviously these additional investments here speak to a slightly higher tax rate than 3.5. But I also want us to remember

that even if we allocate this and we set the tax rate in order to fund it, it might not get spent this year, which is why I have suggested that we also consider scaling things at this point to keep the tax rate down, knowing that there is a time lag in hiring. It can take up to six months sometimes to fill positions. And we can come back at mid-year after we get all our property tax revenues in when we convene

[2:44:38 PM]

in February, six months from now, and do additional appropriations and allocations. We have not done the specific mid-year review of the budget in the past few years, but we have approved new budget spending and new items for our budgets as they have been needed to come before us. And the city manager has been good about bringing those to us as the needs arise. So, this isn't the -- our only bite at this apple. So I just offer that again as a piece of strategy if we're thinking about how to approach getting to our final decision on what the tax rate will be today, because that, along with support for expanded operations that are needed and really great programs that we all support, that's also what we're talking about. But we do have other opportunities through the fiscal year to expand programs, improve

[2:45:39 PM]

on their funding, and reassess where needed. So on this one, I just want to -- I support the homeless strategy office expanding staffing. I would like to get a sense from our staff how quickly these decisions can be filled, and what kind of a timeline do you have.

>> Ms. Gray, do you want to respond to councilmember pool? Is this something we should be scaling? Is this something you're going to be able to implement in year? Year -- this year?

>> We are in the process, certainly, of drafting the progressions. Positions. We need to go through the process with hrd. That can take some time, but are prepared to be fairly aggressive. And a reminder that while we'll have an open process, we do have some temporary staff on our team

[2:46:40 PM]

currently who we hope would be interested in joining us on a permanent basis. But if council's direction is to look at some proration to ensure that we do not have unspent funds in that personnel category, I'm happy to do some calculation there, or discuss that.

>> Mayor Adler: I think the question, do you think you could fill these staff positions this year? I recognize you'll accommodate whatever it is that council wants to do. But I think the question that would be helpful for me and my colleagues is, can you fill these position this is year?

>> Pool: Timeline for filling them. They won't all begin on the 1st of October. That's the point that I'm hoping to drive home.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Ms. Grey?

>> That's correct. I was responding to councilmember pool's clarified question there. Yes. I absolutely can hire these

[2:47:42 PM]

positions. I think not only is there a lot of great work to do, there are a -- there's a lot of great talent in the community that would love to join us. The question of whether we can do so all by October 1st is the question. But would anticipate doing so soon thereafter for any positions that were not filled at that time.

>> Mayor Adler: October 1st of next year?

>> Pool: This year.

>> This year.

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

>> Kitchen: I appreciate -- I think these are appropriate questions that are being asked. I would ask of all of the staffing items, we have quite a few staffing items in here, not just the homeless strategy officer. And from my perspective, the staffing for the homeless strategy officer is the number 1 priority. And if we're going to need to be talking about reducing that then I'm going to have to go back and think about my support for some of these other staff positions. So I think -- I appreciate

[2:48:45 PM]

everyone's -- and respect everybody's perspective, but I think that the staffing for this position has been very well thought-out and is appropriate. And it's not an area that I would support reducing or taking any chances on slowing down.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Colleagues, are you ready to go to the next one? Let's move to the next one, Adler 2, vaccine incentive. Colleagues, after proposing this, which I think is a really important thing for us to do to be able to one, promote vaccinations and second, to be modeling to employers across the city that we're taking a really active role in providing incentives for our employees. We want our employees to be healthy. But as this has been posted and people in the community can see it, and as we've had discussions

[2:49:46 PM]

with hr, they've suggested an alternative way for us to do this that probably incidentally has less of a budget impact. But I understand in talking to afscme and hr there's a better incentive that they would suggest we consider, which I will turn this proposal into, or my recommendation to the group. So, joy, if you're there, do you want to teach us all?

>> Yes, sir. Thank you so much, joy Hayes, human resources director. I have a powerpoint that they will pull up for me. And the powerpoint just walks you through the alternative plan and options if you still want to do a \$100 stipend. As I wait for it to come up, let me just tell you in conversations with our -- some of our peers around those groups

[2:50:49 PM]

including ACC and others, they're still working through what those strategies would be. For us -- and that is not my -- here we go. So, some of the options that we have -- keep in mind that if we were to do a stipend we would have to pay taxes on whatever we give to employees. Giving out gift cards or money would also require us to run it through payroll for taxes. This is not my powerpoint that I provided. The options that we would like for you to consider, which is an option that afscme recommended, one that allows us the opportunity to give quarantine leave. San Antonio is currently doing quarantine leave. And the department provided some opportunity to talk to afscme. And afscme suggested that in their research and benchmarking what they have seen to be more consistent is quarantine leave. Let me explain what that would look like. Right now if an employee were to get exposed they would have to stay home and/or telework if

[2:51:51 PM]

they have the option to telework with their position until they confirm whether or not they have been infected by the virus. For those employees who have confirmed that they have the virus, they would have to take off two weeks or at least some time of leave to support that. As you know, we had a federal entity that allowed us last year to give them time off. That ended. And so the quarantine leave would allow us to one, for any employee who is vaccinated, and show proof of vaccination, if they come in contact with someone, they would get 40 hours of leave just to confirm that they are not infected with the virus and able to come back to work. If they are infected they would get two weeks of leave. We believe that that would be an incentive plan that would encourage more people to get it because they would have to burn their leave as they continue to have to engage in the public and potentially be exposed. And so that is a plan that we have seen. That could potentially work.

[2:52:52 PM]

And that plan would allow not to pay people out money but to allow them to create -- hr to create a leave program that would allow us an opportunity to ensure that these employees are incentivized as they are in positions to have to deal with the vaccination. If we were to give people time off there would be no incentive to get the vaccination. We really strongly believe -- if we could go to the last slide in our powerpoint. We believe that would be a plan. It would cost the city less. Its value is far greater than \$100. And it would give us the opportunity -- that one -- the opportunity to do that. And so that is one that afsome supports, that hr believes still meets the goal, which is to incentivize people to do it. During our session that we hosted at the city we got about 6,000 people vaccinated through the city of Austin. But our vaccinations came out later. So people did go to their

[2:53:52 PM]

doctors to receive it. And we believe that this would create another opportunity. If you all were still looking at the \$100 incentive, understand we would have to execute that. Here's an overview of what those options would be. We could go to open enrollment, allow employees during the open enrollment period to say I've been vaccinated, upload that information. But the open enrollment period goes through November. We couldn't execute that until January. We don't believe you want to wait that long for the incentive. We believe that many employees would probably be more comfortable providing vaccination data to a third party, not giving it to city employees or city staff. We could hire a third party to create a portal. And that portal would allow people to upload their information. And we could give that list directly to payroll for execution. If we were to do that, just understand we could do it in October with a November payout. But we are a little challenged with payouts because as you know we cannot do more than one major

[2:54:55 PM]

payout in any one pay period. We've got sip, a bonus you're talking about, the 2%. And we've got to execute pay increases for all of our sworn. And so the pay periods that will give us the opportunity to do this between thousand and the end of the -- now and the end of the year would be limited because of the other major actions that need to take place, but we can try to do that through a third party. We can create an internal portal for employees to upload information. My concern is employees are uncomfortable uploading personal data and medical data to the city. We also have many employees who are not as comfortable with technology. Our operational teams. It would take a great deal of staff to ensure that those members have the opportunity to participate in this and upload that data. And then of course we could do this by departments. But again, I think that would be a major amount of work in a short period of time for department

[2:55:56 PM]

staff to have to ensure they receive documentation for the vaccination in order to be able to provide us with a list of employees who were vaccinated. So here are some options that speak to everything we've heard you all discuss. Again, we are in great deal of support of the two-week paid leave and the one-week paid leave for those who are in a process of being exposed and waiting to determine whether or not they have been infected. We are available to answer any questions and I provided you the timelines associated.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, it would be my recommendation, I'd like to change my amendment to just provide for what afscme and joy have proposed, which is the vaccination leave element. I think that would change the spreadsheet that we're all looking at by taking out the "Other" column, \$854,000.

[2:56:57 PM]

It would also take out the \$969,550 out of the one-time. And I would suggest we just let that drop to the bottom. I would like to see us still stay at the 4.9%. That gives our taxpayers even more tax savings than what the manager proposed. But it would leave that money going into reserve for us to decide at some future time how to handle that. I think that takes care of the reserve issue that our staff identified with some of the other elements that we're making. And it drops a little bit more into the reserve balance. That's what I'd recommend.

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: First councilmember alter, then Pio, and then mayor pro tem, and then councilmember tovo.

>> Alter: So, if Ms. Hayes could put up the presentation part that discusses option five, because I'm a little confused. I understand that option 1-4 are not operationally great.

[2:57:57 PM]

I didn't quite catch that it was costless. And I'm not totally understanding what the proposal is. You went through it really quickly. I know I would benefit from the illustration you had on your slide. I think you have an option five slide, I'm assuming?

>> I do. It's one slide up. If we could go one slide back up.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> To look at option five.

>> Alter: One more time

>> Mayor Adler: I have a covid call I need to take. I'm going to give the chair to the mayor pro tem. I'll join you back here just as quickly as I can. Please don't vote this down while I'm away.

>> You said it wasn't going to cost anything.

[Laughing] Could you explain it? Thank you.

>> Yes. What we would do is -- this is two weeks of paid leave, 80 hours. If you contract the virus and you are not able to work, as you go out we would give you up to 80 hours of leave without having to utilize your accrued sick and

[2:59:00 PM]

vacation. So we can establish the leave the same way we did under the federal fmla program of 2020, which gives you a bank of time to use if you are infected with the virus. If you show us proof of vaccination, and you are exposed and you provide that information, you can receive two-week of weeks of pay. For employees who come in contact with someone who are not able to telework during the period while they wait for the testing we would also provide them one week, 40 hours of pay, providing them ample time for the period in which they need to in order to test to ensure that they have not been infected with it. Those employees who telework and feel fine can. Those employees who get sick and believe they have covid can have up to 40 hours to determine that. This is the same plan that San Antonio put in place. The pros to this is that it's

[3:00:00 PM]

very similar to what we did in 2021 with the federal plan. We already have codes created, so we could effectively start this October 1st. The value of 80 hours of time off is far greater at any pay level than an actual \$100 that is taxed. There would not be a need for a budget amendment. The con, unless a copy of the card is requested, the benefit could be misused by the unvaccinated. We need to see the vaccination in order to confirm the employee qualifies for this. And it may provide sick leave to employees that contracted covid outside of work. Someone, if -- I had an employee yesterday, their 10-year-old infected the employee. That employee is getting the time off even though their exposure was not in the work place. But we could begin this as early as October 1st.

>> Alter: Thank you, Ms. Hayes. I think this is a really

[3:01:02 PM]

interesting approach. I just want to clarify. This would only apply to employees who are vaccinated, correct?

>> Yes. They would have to show proof of vaccination in order to receive the leave.

>> Alter: So the idea is that this encourages people to get vaccinated, but it doesn't help us keep people who get covid from working and exposing others.

>> We have safety plans in place now. If an employee feels sick or like they're uncomfortable, they report it to us and are immediately removed. We do have safety plans to clean the office spaces when someone has been exposed. And if that person does show proof that they have contracted the virus we do have safety plans in place. It doesn't create no safety plan, but it's an added incentive so that employees know if and when in any space they come in contact with covid, delta or any other variant, there is protection in knowing one, we will give them the vaccination and two, they will

[3:02:03 PM]

have additional time off so they're not personally impacted with their personal time.

>> Alter: I see how this is a good incentive for those to get vaccinated. I was just concerned about the flip side of the unvaccinated and what it means for them in terms of how they're handling their situation. But I'm sure my colleagues -- thank you.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. Before the mayor stepped off the dais he said Alison. I didn't hear the second name.

>> Renteria: I thought he said Pio.

>> Harper-madison: There was a second name. He said Alison, somebody else, Pio, mayor pro tem. Anyway. I'm going to call Pio and then myself, and I see Leslie's hand, and Ann's hand. If there's anybody in chambers with your hand up, I can't see chambers, so if you want to holler out real quick, I'll put you in the queue.

[3:03:03 PM]

>> Mayor pro tem, I had a question as well, Kathie tovo.

>> Harper-madison: I'll put you down after Ann.

>> Renteria: Mine is going to be quick. I did talk to the union. I have a concern about the \$100 -- people to tell people that they have been vaccinated or show their card. And it's been very difficult to administer that -- big supporter of it. When I talked to the union and they explained to me what would

be better for them, I got on board because think it's a great idea. And it's going -- they're going to be able to administer that without headaches. And so I'm totally behind it. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, councilmember Renteria. I have to say the same for me. It's too bad that mayor Adler isn't here, but I was really hesitant on this item. But after your presentation,

[3:04:03 PM]

director Hayes, all my hesitations are gone and this makes sense to me. Every bit of it makes sense to me. I appreciate that there's an actual incentive, that there's an actual opportunity for employees to take care of themselves when they're unwell. All my fears have been absolved. Thank you. I appreciate it. Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: Thanks so much, mayor pro tem. I love this, too. It's more valuable to our employees, way more valuable, and even more practical. I share the mayor pro tem's skepticism about the original incentive idea and I think this is a really brilliant and much more useful solution. So, thank you so much and also to our good friends at afscme, thank you for helping us bridge this gap.

>> Harper-madison: Absolutely. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Yes. I would echo what everyone said. The other nice thing is it

[3:05:04 PM]

aligns the incentive with what we're trying to accomplish here. So it says if you do the responsible thing and you get a vaccine, we're going to take care of you. If you get sick, or if you're exposed. We're going to cover you with paid leave. And if you don't get vaccinated, we're going to recognize that there's really -- here. So I echo my -- echo the sentiments of my colleagues. Thank you, joy, and afscme, for putting your heads together and coming up with this. It is a much better and more appropriate incentive.

>> Thank you.

>> Harper-madison: I believe councilmember tovo. Is there anybody else in chambers that I can't see with your hand raised?

>> Councilmember Kelly would like to speak, too.

>> Harper-madison: Okay. Councilmember tovo and then councilmember Kelly.

>> Tovo: And mayor pro tem, it's actually about -- I'm going to skip my comment on this, but

[3:06:06 PM]

if you could come back to me, mayor, when we're moving on.

>> Harper-madison: Absolutely.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll do that. I've come back. There are a couple other people who have indicated they want to take a break, 3:30 to 3:45. Let's keep working as we go into a 3:30 time. Mayor pro tem, thank you. And I ask hear your comments. I appreciate that as well. Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I shared a lot of the same concerns about this item and the \$100 stipend. And so I'm glad to see that the city was able to come together with our partners there and come up with a solution that works for everyone, and that does have more value for those who do get the vaccine, because the vaccine is important. The best thing we can do to protect ourselves and others. We really need to exercise that personal responsibility in order to reach a place where we all don't have to wear masks all the time and we can be safe around each other.

[3:07:07 PM]

Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. I'd also like to share my support for this new incentive and encourage other employers in Austin to consider something similar. These incentives will go a long way toward helping us get through that tipping point. The incentive we have for the public is a \$50 H-E-B gift card for the first dose and another one for the second dose. We should also consider upping that if we feel as a dais that a \$100 stipend for staff isn't enough, we should also consider when it comes to the public if there's an opportunity to increase that incentive level. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Any more comments on this one? I don't see any hands. That gets us to the last thing. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, excuse me.

[3:08:07 PM]

Made a comment about your proposal, would be not to use -- I think your proposal was to keep the funding request in there, but to put it toward reserves.

>> Mayor Adler: No. I didn't mean that. What I just meant was I'm recommending now the 969 come off the chart. The net effect of that is that we're now underspending one-time by that amount. For me, I would leave it there. But that's not part of the proposal.

>> Tovo: Okay. So it just prompted in me a desire to really get a sense from the full dais before we start voting, what the will of the dais is. I know we started off the day by talking about the tax rate and where we are, but it's just a different path. If the majority of the dais want to go to 4.9, then that's one

[3:09:11 PM]

path. In the majority of the dais want to try to stick as close to 3.5 it's a different path. Several people have spoken up. Not everybody has. When we finish this wrap-up, I wonder if we could go around again and get a sense of that because I think we can be more efficient with our time.

>> Mayor Adler: That's a really good idea. We have one more item and then let's do as councilmember tovo provides. We'll double back to see this conversation about do we want to stay with this kind of chart at the 4.9, delivering the little bit greater tax benefit to people.

>> Casar: Mayor, I have three errata things to mention when you're done.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We are one thing shy of working our way through the whole list, so let's finish that up. The last thing that we have to talk about is Adler 3, the guaranteed income pilot. This was something that was brought to us in part by the equity office, suggesting a

[3:10:12 PM]

different approach to this and one I support. Is Brian oak with us? Hey, Mr. Oak? Would you talk about this program, this level of program, and why it's something you're proposing?

>> Sure, Brian oak, chief equity officer. We really welcome the policy direction of this amendment to shift from a guaranteed income study to a guaranteed income pilot. When we began the initial research around guaranteed income programs we were able to actually identify 27 cities that have guaranteed income pilot projects, either full programs that are already implemented. We looked to Stockton, California, which has one of the sort of better-evaluated

[3:11:13 PM]

guaranteed income programs, as well as Jackson, Mississippi, actually has a three-year study of cohorts of families that they've had go through a guaranteed income program. So we really felt that we were beyond the phase of studying and really in the phase of wanting to be able to pilot and actually sort of

prove or demonstrate the concept of the impact of a guaranteed income program. And this amendment allows us to be able to do that. With the current estimates, I believe that if we follow some of the national models, which we saw, which on average families were receiving \$1,000 a month of a guaranteed income stipend, that would allow us to be able to enroll about 115 families into a pilot program. It also sort of mirrors an existing program that's going on locally, privately by a group called up together. And this would allow us to be

[3:12:13 PM]

able to identify additional zip codes that we could look at for families that we could make eligible for this program. Also, give us an opportunity to look at how we could pair existing city services and resources such as workforce development programs to families that we would have enrolled into this guaranteed income project. And then overall, I think from the data that we've seen with other cities that have done these initiatives, it really seems to be a great strategy to create economic mobility for low-income families. Many families sort of report being able to get into higher levels of employment, better-paying jobs, more financial substantiality for the family, which impacts things like reducing the risk of displacement and all those things. So we thought that was a really great body of work that's out there that shows us that guaranteed income projects have had a significant impact on helping families improve their

[3:13:16 PM]

economic mobility.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, Brian. That's the proposal. Councilmember kitchen, then councilmember pool.

>> Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Oaks. I'm not familiar with the program. So, I wanted to understand a little bit better about it. How does it work exactly in the funding that's proposed for it? In other words, is -- are the families paid a stipend, so are or , or is the dollar amount the cost of paying for staff to support them?

>> Sure. The dollar amount is actually a full cash stipend that's made available to the family on a monthly basis. And most guaranteed income programs usually range from between a year all the way up to two years. We've seen models that have gone from as short as six months up to 18 months or two years.

[3:14:16 PM]

That's some of the things we'd like to be allowed the flexibility to play around with. We would ultimately want to bring council a full recommendation on the full model of what the program looks like for us. The findings that you usually see within guaranteed income programs is that this influx of monthly cash into a family sort of allows a family to sort of free up resources in other areas so that they can make investments and greater economic mobility. So, for example, in the Stockton study they found that families were able to get this stipend and sort of, you know, free you up from having to do multiple part-time jobs or gig jobs that you were trying to do to get money, to get into a full employment, higher-paying position. Or it freed up enough time within the family to be able to go to a job certification program, or be able to take coursework in school so that elevates you to be able to get

[3:15:18 PM]

into better financial situations and positions in your work, and ultimately helping the family be better off overall.

>> Kitchen: Okay. And I have a lot of questions about it. I think it's a very intriguing concept to pilot. I won't ask all the questions now. I may want to follow up on them. But just one quick thing. Can you summarize the extent to which the city or perhaps it's the nonprofit provides support for the families so that the stipend comes with support for the family to have a plan of action to -- that the stipend can help them? If it's a year, what are they going -- for them personally what's going to work for them over the next year to help them move to a better position so they won't need the stipend in the future. Is there a component where that

[3:16:19 PM]

is provided also in addition to the stipend?

>> It is. So, we've seen many programs that have a component of wraparound services, for example, being able to connect families to workforce development programs or in addition to rent assistance programs. We've seen some models that actually take families and put them into what they call cohort models, where they meet with each other on a regular basis as they participate in this program. They actually often learn and share from each other around how to improve their economic stability and they try to create environments in which families may be able to begin to share or create these local economies or local connections with each other. So for example, you and I may be in the same cohort for the guaranteed income assistance programs and we find out that our kids go to the same school. And I may be able to say that I have a car and I can pick up all

[3:17:20 PM]

the kids in the morning and be able to drop them off. So oftentimes, programs that try to help establish what we call informal connections and help build communities within cohorts so that families can support and build off of each other.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Brian, you mentioned something significant that I overlooked. There's \$250,000 currently in the budget that was intended to review somebody else's pilot program. And this request is to augment that with these dollars, the 888. And then our equity office would be coming back to the council with the program that they've designed, because there were different elements of it. I understand that they wanted to do differently than what the other pilot may have been doing. But they would be coming back to the council with that proposal. All right. I think that after councilmember kitchen it was councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Right. Thanks.

[3:18:21 PM]

So, I have many questions, too. I voted for the resolution to commence the study, but we haven't yet seen the results of the study, is that right, Mr. Oaks?

>> No. We actually, as we looked out nationally, there's a lot of studies that have already been done. And so we actually don't feel the need for us to really replicate or do another study, because we have really good data that comes from other cities who have done this program. I think the best study I can share with you all is Jackson, Mississippi, which has a three-year running program of cohorts of families that have gone through their initiative, it's called springboard.

>> Pool: Thank you. My question was, the resolution requested that staff do a study. And I'm hearing today that staff decided not to do the study. So I'm just trying to fill that gap, because we did not know

[3:19:23 PM]

that decision had been made, even though we had voted on a resolution for that action to occur. So let's back-fill on that and make sure that we're following what the resolution was. I don't think there's any issue with not proceeding with the resolution. That happens a lot. But we do tend to get notice from staff when they intend to deviate from something that has been a direction from us. I want to say that -- I want to be supportive of something like this. And possibly the studies that I haven't yet seen, but that I'm sure Mr. Oaks will send us some links to will address the concerns that I have. But my concerns circle around the fact that from what I know about this concept, there are

[3:20:26 PM]

efforts in congress to create a national program of a guaranteed minimum income. And I'm supportive of that approach because it means that everybody across the 50 states has access to a similar program. If we in Austin put something in place and Stockton California does something, and towns in Mississippi do something, then it's a patchwork. And not everybody is able to share. Not everybody who has the need is able to share in that uplift. I think of the social security program, and the numerous spinoffs from that, including medicare. Those national efforts made a big difference in the lives of people and were frankly some of the groundbreaking programs that began to lift people out of poverty. And those programs continue today. They are not without challenges. But my point here is that while

[3:21:26 PM]

I applaud the city of Austin's concern and care -- in fact, we are doing something very like this with some of the elements and the wraparound services that we are doing for our homeless residents as far as helping them build community and find access to job training and various resources that they may even not know about or be able to reach, we are helping bridge those gaps. I think a better approach in the end would be to support these efforts at the federal level so that the entire country can benefit from them. So I appreciate, mayor, your bringing the initial \$888,000 to add to -- and then your shift to add it to the \$250,000 that we set aside by the resolution to do the study and the repurposing of those funds. But this is one item that I just

[3:22:31 PM]

can't support today. And for two reasons. One, I don't feel I know nearly enough about it. It's a change in direction that we had pretty unanimously voted on a couple months ago. And because I do think that this is an effort that I'd like to see us direct toward the federal government and support an institution of a national program.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. And I hear you, councilmember pool. My only thing is that if we wait on the federal government the assistance may not come soon enough. That could take a long while. And the fact of the matter is that we have families who do not have more than \$400 in savings or do not have \$400 in savings at all in case of an emergency. So these type of direct assistance programs really go a long way in helping our families in need. And I am comfortable with us not moving forward on waiting on a

[3:23:32 PM]

study, especially given that council has implemented and executed the R.I.S.E. Program, a direct cash assistance type of program. And I think that also offers a great platform for us to build off of. And then also recognizing the impacts of the continued global pandemic that we find ourselves in, I think this type of pilot program would do well in our community. I do support this. Thank you, mayor Adler, for bringing it forward. Just wanted to reiterate my support.

>> Mayor Adler: I appreciate that. Sometimes I think one of the things I'm proud about living in this community is sometimes Austin is at the cutting edge and tries out new ideas. We did that with solar energy and wind energy. Quite frankly, jumped on that at a time when it didn't make economic sense, recognizing that sometimes in order to help something happen at a national level, it takes people trying it. When Stockton did this, two or

[3:24:34 PM]

three years ago, Brian, it got tons of headlines just because it was new and a different idea. Since then, over 20 other cities have jumped in to do it as well. You don't see the same headlines. My hope is if we put our shoulder to this, too, it will make it something that gets additional study and consideration. It's not big. It's only a hundred people, as Mr. Oaks was describing it. It's still very much a pilot program. But it makes us part of that national space. Further discussion on this item? Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I understand that there's a philanthropic organization already hard at work at implementing this in our community, is that correct?

>> Yes. There is a local pilot that's being done by up together right now. And they have about 115 families enrolled into their program.

[3:25:38 PM]

>> Alter: So I would be comfortable with repurposing the \$250,000 towards this, but I think this should be the philanthropic sector or the federal government that should be doing this type of work. I was willing to have it studied and I cosponsored that resolution, but I would prefer that we allow philanthropy to do their pilot and see how it's working here before we jump into our own, since we already have one in the works in Austin. And if that needs to be supplemented, that we need to help them to make sure that their participants are getting access to more resources, we certainly should explore how to supplement that and make that a success. But I'm not sure of the value of doing two separate programs here in Austin at the same time.

>> Part of what this funding in this amendment would allow us to do is actually to help expand

[3:26:39 PM]

the scope of families that we actually study for a guaranteed income program. So for example, the study that is going on right now by up together is limited to a certain set of zip codes for families that are eligible for the program. We would be able to use this funding to be able to expand the number of zip codes of families that we have enrolled into the program. We also believe that this would create an opportunity for us to better connect to wraparound services that the city of Austin provides. So our workforce development contracts and programs, and other services through Austin public health that we could be able to provide those connections for families that we have.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, any further discussion before we take our break? Yes, councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. After listening to you all talk about this I can see that there's great value in this program. And there is intention to help

[3:27:39 PM]

people who obviously have a need. I just don't feel this is the proper function of municipal government. So I can't support it. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I just want to add that the policy direction that I brought forward -- sorry, it's not on this topic.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this topic? All right. Anything else before we take our 3:30 break? When we come back at 3:45 we'll do the errata sheet and have that conversation that councilmember tovo was suggesting. Councilmember Fuentes?

>> Fuentes: The policy direction that I brought forward around the cultural arts funding, our budget staff has recommended that that needs to be a budget amendment, even though it does not have an impact on our general fund. It does make changes within our budget. It was recommended that I bring forward that policy directive as a budget amendment. It's still the same language, it's just the budget amendment.

[3:28:41 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll get to a conversation about all the riders in just a little bit. Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: My microphone disappeared. It shrank into the desk. I think it was maybe from overuse. I wanted to just clarify, did you need to take a break at 3:30? Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not the only one.

>> Tovo: I was going to ask if that hadn't been the case, if we could do the tax rate conversation before just so we could mull it over break, but that's not possible. Okay. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ready to take a break? Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: The three things I wanted to note because you got to the bottom of the sheet on my -- that I handed out that had my name on it I left half a million dollars, which I think then which you mention Maryland mentioned in reserves would be close to a million five or so still in

[3:29:45 PM]

other or for the reserve. I did want to note that the stipend -- the Casar 1 stipend, as people think about this work with their staff, I was planning on asking for \$180,000 additional to have the stipend apply from \$80,000 up to \$90,000 because in conversations with multiple department directors, our nurses who are on at the front line providing the vaccines and tests that we really want to retain, for example, fall within that category. Also, many of the skilled tradespeople on the fixing things during the winter storm, for example, who are exhausted might fall in that category. So if we're going to have a million plus here in this section for -- of onetime then going up to the \$90,000 makes sense. I also wanted to raise that given the increase in recurring costs, if we want to stay at the 14% reserves, based on

[3:30:46 PM]

recurring, then we may very well need that additional reserve money that the mayor has dropped to the bottom line with the change in the vaccine incentive idea. So I would support that going into reserves so we can stay at 14%. The two other quick notes I wanted to leave here, I know I'm open to the idea of looking at travel budgets, just speaking for myself I haven't traveled and I don't plan to travel. The line in my travel budget I use to better pay my staff. And I don't know if that may apply to other departments. But if we are looking at travel budget lines I assume those departments may have travel budgets, may not have traveled, but I don't know if those may be dedicated, for example, for staff retention that many of us are trying to really handle in this tough year. So I just wanted to raise that question for everyone. It's not saying we shouldn't look at that line item, but I use virtually all of that money for that purpose. I don't know if that applies to

[3:31:48 PM]

other departments. Last, before we close this council meeting, item 9 or 10 from earlier in the council meeting, there was a question about whether the collective bargaining agreements bar us from laying

off staff and none of them do. Those collective bargaining agreements just say essentially that the people that get laid off would be the folks that we would offer a job if we opened those jobs back up. And so I know that questions are outstanding, I wanted to leave those notes here.

>> Pool: Mayor, can I offer councilmember Tovo demurred from making comments to respect the 3:30 time cutoff. But then councilmember Casar has given all his thoughts. I think it would only be fair to go back to councilmember Tovo and see if she --

>> Mayor Adler: I will. I started calling people on the dais with respect to that. Let's see if we can do this quickly.

>> Pool: As long as she gets an opportunity.

>> Mayor Adler: I promise you she will. Councilmember Alter.

[3:32:48 PM]

>> Alter: I want to clarify. Our staff gave us the numbers that already factored in the 14% reserve. If we put any money into reserve, it is not to meet our policy, it is to add more.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to give the chair to Mayor Pro Tem. If you would take this. To hear -- staff wanted to say something quickly about reserves. We want to give councilmember Tovo a chance to say what she wants to say. 15 minutes from the time you start, let's come back and we'll have the conversation that councilmember Tovo recommended. Mayor Pro Tem.

>> Interim budget officer, wanted to make clarifications around the changes and how they affect our 14% reserve policy.

>> Harper-Madison: Thank you, manager.

>> As we presented the proposed budget, it was at the 14% reserves. As you make the changes, when it's ongoing increases we have

[3:33:48 PM]

to make adjustments to make sure we remain at that 14% reserve for ongoing increases. And so we are keeping tabs of the increases that are happening as ongoing and look at what the reserve level needs to be changed to to make sure we are in compliance with the reserve policy.

>> Harper-Madison: Thank you. That would have been helpful to know earlier. Thank you.

>> Harper-Madison: Was there anybody else who had their hand? I know Mayor Adler had a queue going. I don't know who was after councilmember Alter. Councilmember Kitchen?

>> Casar: Councilmember tovo.>> Harper-madison: Councilmember tovo and then councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Tovo: I'm okay. I wanted to have the conversation among us before we broke about where we are thinking.

I'm good for now.>> Harper-madison: Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Just quick, that means if we were to -- if we had 3.1 in available ongoing, you would have to take 14% of that

[3:34:50 PM]

and add it to what we have in our reserves right now. Is that correct, Kerry?

>> Correct. When we made -- informed you of the 3.1, staff suggested that we use that as one time in possible, we did not include the 14%. As you make those changes into ongoing we have to increase that 14%.

>> Kitchen: But that's the math, right? 14% times 3.1 or whatever number we use?

>> Whatever number you add as ongoing.

>> Casar: But with the mayor's addition to the reserves because of the vaccine incentive we may have that covered if we did that.

>> Say that one more time?

>> Casar: If we go along with the mayor's amendment of dropping an extra million dollars into reserve because of the vaccine incentive change then we could cover this.

>> Correct.

>> Harper-madison: Are there any other questions from folks that I can't see? If that's not the case, I think

[3:35:51 PM]

we're going to go ahead and recess.

>> Mayor pro tem, I apologize. It's Kathie tovo. I actually do have a quick question about travel budgets. I'm looking back through the information we've exchanged with our staff and I know we have that discretion within our council budgets. It's not clear to me that advantage departments have that same discretion. The travel budget information that is in the answer to one of the questions I submitted in the

budget q&a lists it as educational travel versus city business travel. Do departments have the flexibility of using the money in that category for other purposes, such as staff incentives? Or to increase pay?

>> The short answer is yes. The departments have the flexibility within their appropriation to move those dollars around. So if they choose not to travel in the fiscal year and want to reallocate those funds they have the opportunity to do that.

[3:36:53 PM]

>> Tovo: Can they reallocate it to salary levels?

>> I guess there could be an allocation to salary levels, but we would really want to look at how we would adjust that budget ongoing. Usually those training dollars are used for one-times over each fiscal year. Through the budget we would reallocate their budget to reduce that ongoing.

>> Tovo: Yeah. My colleague, who had made that point is off the dais, but I think that works. My guess is that the departments reflected in the travel budget question are -- operate differently than our council budgets do. We can make a conscious decision to use that to supplement our salaries, but I don't think the departmental budgets can operate that way.

>> No.

>> Tovo: They would have to adjust the following year. Their personnel cost would be

[3:37:54 PM]

reflective of that salary.

>> Correct.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Harper-madison: Anybody I'm not seeing? All right, everybody. So we're going to -- did he say 15 minutes? How long did we say?

>> Yes.

>> Just 15.

>> Harper-madison: I hate to say come back at 53 after, I'll see you all. We're going to recess the Austin city council meeting until 3:55,

[4:01:48 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We reconvene the council meeting here. It is 4:01. I will change the screen view. Which has now happened. We're reconvening, it's 4:00 -- 4:01. There's only six of us here so we'll -- we'll wait for a second to get some more folks down.

>> I also had heard Ann's voice earlier, so I know that she's

[4:02:49 PM]

not on screen, but she might be close.

>> Kitchen: Sorry, I forgot that I wasn't on stream.

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay. All right, I see one, two, three, four, five of us in the chamber. One, two, three, four, five -- everybody here but councilmember Kelly. Who I know that is not too far away. So, Carey, if we were to do the spreadsheet as it is, and you may have asked this question before you took the break, if we

[4:03:50 PM]

were to do the -- the base spread sheet but making the change from 540 330, which changes the other number 350 down to 140, are we okay on that spreadsheet still staying at 4.9%, except for \$168,951 off on ongoing?

>> Give me a second.

>> Mayor Adler: And in a second I'll come back to you, Ann, for

[4:04:53 PM]

your ideas on ways that you thought that we might to that \$168,951 in ongoing. Colleagues, we're all 11 of us are here now. I asked Carey the question if we used the -- the list that councilmember Casar's office prepared that had everything as it was submitted, if we worked off that list but made the change for the in-sourcing contract labor from 340 down to 330, and the other on tovo to 140, and took Adler two and made that zero on one time and zero on other, whether that worked at the 4.9% that gave us the

[4:05:55 PM]

greater tax savings than what had manager had proposed save and except \$168,951 in too much recurring.

>> Mayor, could you clarify, um, what you put in the line for tovo?

>> Mayor Adler: I think that the 540 dropped to 330.

>> Tovo: I believe that my new amendment is posted and I believe that the amount is 336.

>> Mayor Adler: 336?

>> Tovo: I'm just looking for it right now.

>> Mayor Adler: And then the other, I thought that had gone from 350 down to 140. Because I had thought that it was 280, 10 positions at \$28,000

[4:06:55 PM]

each, 280 splitting it and there was 140 on one end and 140 on the other end. But that was just me doing calculations. Kerri, do you have a feel for this?

>> Sir, if I may, my -- my staff have been working with the relevant city staff, and, again, I think that this is about to be posted if it's not already, that the numbers I have are 190 in ongoing for the five F. Templets at the library and 236 in ongoing for building services, and then one-time funding of \$50,000 for equipment costs. So that is a total of I believe -- sorry --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not sure that I follow that --

>> Tovo: Just one sec. I believe it's 426,000 in ongoing and \$50,000 in one time.

[4:07:57 PM]

Possibly those could be Kos but it's not been determined.

>> Mayor Adler: You have 426 in ongoing?

>> Tovo: Correct. And that's based on --

>> Kitchen: I thought that was at 336. Oh, I'm sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, I had the same question. The calculation doesn't seem right to me.

>> Tovo: Okay. So here's -- I'll read you the text of -- of the most recent language based on my staff's conversations with the relevant city staff. Proposal for the 10 security guards is a total of 576, plus

\$50,000 in equipment. The off-setting contractual savings is \$340,000 for an annual cost of 236 which would be 118 from general fund and 118

[4:08:57 PM]

from enterprise fund. So, actually, okay -- so I think that I need to make one change to my amendment sheet because it's got it all as ongoing and some of it -- well, it's listed correctly as ongoing and enterprise of 236 but it's being distributed between the two. So from general fund, it's 190.

>> I think that it's 308.

>> Tovo: 308. So 308 from general fund and 118 from enterprise, and 50 one-time funds for equipment, which may or may not end up being able to be handled with debt.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, that makes more sense to me. Thank you. So, 308 ongoing, tovo nine. 50 one-time, and 118 in "Other."

[4:10:02 PM]

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And, Kerri, are trying to see --

>> So with those changes we're over in the one-time \$146,951 -- excuse me -- in the ongoing.

>> Mayor Adler: \$145,951. Otherwise does the page work, the numbers on the page work?

>> The other items on the page, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, so we have to find them 146,951.

>> Tovo: If we're using this text right, if this is the conversation --

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, yeah, made with all of those assumptions. Councilmember Fuentes, and then councilmember Renteria.

>> Fuentes: With councilmember tovo's amendment number eight, the code department, that would be a reduction by six ftes, would that result in cost savings on the ongoing funding?

[4:11:03 PM]

>> Tovo: No, councilmember. It would just result in a fee decrease for the community fee. Thanks for the questions though.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: I wanted to announce that I did put that on my canopy item as \$60,000 on the one-time spending and I posted on the message board.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor, that one is included in the spreadsheet in front of everyone.

>> Mayor Adler: Where is it in the spreadsheet? Did you have another spread diagnose sheet?

>> No, I think that we may have updated it live on the online one. Sorry, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: It's okay.

>> Tovo: Is that included --

>> Mayor Adler: You have copies of that?

>> We could print a new one. I'm just saying online it's a Google document so it's being added in as we speak.

>> Kitchen: It's a one-time, right?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

[4:12:03 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. Great, thank you, councilmember Renteria, for putting that in.

>> Tovo: I don't see that on the

-- on the online sheet, Greg. Are you talking about tab one, two or three? Oh, wait, there it is. It's there now. Sorry. I see it.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't have it yet.

>> I have the extra stipends in

--

>> I have not done so. It is 130.

>> Mayor, while we're on the topic of the code amendment, we do have staff that just wanted to clarify what councilmember needed by this amendment. I think he is here and he wanted to just ask a few questions.

[4:13:06 PM]

>> Mayor Adle

>> Can I ask a question of the one that I'm seeing, which is the second one that you posted. I don't know when one, that has the vaccine incentive in there?

>> Mayor Adler: Define where I should find this? Should I go to the message board post?

>> So just to be clear, I am not -- we are not having this update with every change that we express here. If I go to the message board post and you go to the first tab, it merely links you to your latest budget amendment as it was made on the message board. So you go to the first tab you will see it. I am not currently asking my staff to -- to change the numbers.

>> Mayor Adler: So let's keep working off the documents we had this morning.

>> That's fine with me. So --

>> Mayor Adler: So I'm working off the document that we had this morning that had the numbers at the bottom. What are the changes that should be made to that? One is them that we're adding a line for Renteria in this, which

[4:14:07 PM]

is the canopy, and that canopy has a one-time expense of how much?

>> Of \$60,000 and you'll see that -

>> Mayor Adler: This is the page I'm looking at. That's 60,000.

>> Alter: Greg,ic we want to work off of --

>> Casar: The top one.

>> Mayor Adler: So tovo 9 is 308,000 in ongoing, 50,000 in one-time and 426,000 in other. Adler 2 is zero and zero.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I'm sorry, I was working on something else so the last thing you said didn't sound quite right in terms of my column. I think it is -- did you say 400 something as other.

[4:15:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: 308 under ongoing. 50,000 under one-time, and 118 under other.

>> Tovo: And that was the amount for the enterprise funds. I'm sorry, I misheard you.

>> Mayor Adler: I may have read it incorrectly. 308, 50 and 118.

>> Pool: And then do we need to change Adler 2.

>> Mayor Adler: To a zero and zero. And then there's also on the one-time stipend the 1,000,124 number becomes what?

>> Casar: You would add 130.

>> Mayor Adler: So that's 2,054,000. Okay. I think those are the changes.

[4:16:11 PM]

Yes, go ahead and do -- Kathie's not here.

>> Stand by.

>> Mayor Adler: Kerri, did I get all the changes to that spreadsheet correctly?

>> Kitchen: Is somebody adding all that up for us correctly.

>> Pool: The total is 59,856,074.

>> Kitchen: Which column?

>> Pool: The total-total.

>> Can we clarify the amount for the addition for councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: It was 130, which gets us -- everyone below 90k.

>> Mayor Adler: Which makes that 2,054,000.

[4:17:14 PM]

2,054,000.

>> Pool: And if you're looking at the online sheet that Greg sent out it already updated on there on the first tab under budget amendments.

>> Casar: I know I said I wasn't asking for us to do it, but she's doing it anyway, so here we are.

>> Mayor Adler: I then have the total ongoing as 3,277,779. Right? And I have the total 1 time of 12,739,076. Is that what is showing?

[4:18:16 PM]

>> Pool: The online sheet shows 1206176. So no, your number and the online sheet are different, mayor. For one time.

>> Alter: I think you need to add the 14% of the ongoing so you can see the total.

>> Mayor Adler: 14% of the ongoing.

>> Casar: Mayor, it interfaces a little bit different than is intuitive. So we should just ask the budget office what their number is.

>> Mayor Adler: What was the ongoing number?

>> 12689076.

>> Mayor Adler: A one-time number of 12,000?

>> Alter: No, the one time number is 1,002,771 nine if we don't want to cut it. That's the ongoing. Sorry, long day already.

>> Pool: Yeah, the one time. I'm reading from Greg's sheet so maybe he can read

[4:19:16 PM]

it, it says 12,689,076.

>> Alter: Right, but I think they said earlier that the reserve portion had to be calculated for the ongoing funding, not the one-time.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm still off because I'm showing a one-time number of 25,428,076.

>> Pool: Wow.

>> Kitchen: 25 million, that's a little off.

>> Pool: He's got 13 million in there too much.

[Laughter]

>> Tovo: I wonder if it makes sense, mayor, just to take another 10 minutes and let our financial staff calculate it? Would that make sense? I know sometimes we've had sort of a running spreadsheet, our staff have

[4:20:18 PM]

maintained and everybody kind of doing math on the dais. It could be avoided maybe.

>> Mayor Adler: The link that you're talking about, if you want to find the link, where do I go?

>> Casar: It's on the second page on the spreadsheet. We've never gone to a second page.

>> Mailbox I think I can take a stab at us getting reconciled. I know Stephanie is out in the ether space somewhere updating her virtual wouldn't. I think where she's off is there should be \$50,000 on that spreadsheet under the one time column for tovo 9 that I didn't see. If she adds \$50,000 to the Google document she would be -- she would have reconciled with what staff has.

>> Pool: That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: What do you show as your total ongoing number.

>> Pool: She has the 50,000 --

>> Mayor Adler: Ed, what are you showing as your ongoing number total?

>> The ongoing number for our number is 4,227,099.

[4:21:21 PM]

That should be \$750,000 higher because of alter 2. Alter 2 is an increase in budget of \$950,000, which will be offset by 950,000 of new revenue, but it is a budgetary increase on the Google documents. You just are showing it as a net zero as expenditure and revenue offset, but it will be a budgetary increase offset by a revenue.

>> Mayor Adler: And that puts us off by the 168,951.

>> It's now 146,151 because of the change to tovo 9.

>> Mayor Adler: And then what's the total -- hang on one second. And what's the total then that you have for one-time expenditures?

>> One time expenditures are 12 missing middle 739,076,000.

-- 12,739,076,000. But because of the increase in ongoing you would need to increase your reserves by 591,000 to maintain the 14%,

[4:22:24 PM]

which would all be done within the 4.9% tax increase that you've set as your goal or sounds like you've set as your goal.

>> Mayor Adler: And how much are we above the 14%? At that level if we do the 14.9%.

>> Let me get back to you on that piece.

>> Mayor Adler: Manager, did you have some questions you wanted to ask?

>> Cronk: Yes, we wanted to make some clarification on tovo 8, the amendment with the [indiscernible] Department and acm Arrellano is here to ask those questions.

>> Tovo: Mayor, may I ask a different question before we move on to a different subject? In some years, most years, we've had actually the ability to see the spreadsheet that the staff are compiling. Is that a capability we have today? And it now is becoming kind

[4:23:24 PM]

of the assumption that we're doing 4.9 and we have skipped over that question and we're talking about the code fee. I want to get clear on what our --

>> Mayor Adler: We'll go back to that base conversation. I'm trying to let people answer questions and I don't know what the clarification is the manager wants to make. He has to make it. I'll let him do that.

>> Tovo: Okay. If there's any way that we could see on he owe Ed, again, I don't know if that capability exists. I know we're usually set up a little differently. But usually we can kind of see your screen up there and whatnot and that's been super helpful. Because I know I couldn't capture all the numbers you were saying and I'm sure our public -- all the people who are fixed to their TVs watching our thrilling budget sessions are probably having a hard time catching up to.

>> We don't have something set up right now to put it up on the screen, but I know in the past we've maybe printed on you a summary sheet so that everybody can see where we're at and in the virtual world we could post that same summary sheet

[4:24:25 PM]

for people to review. I don't think that would take us long to do and then we could all be on the same page.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do that. But before we do that, manager, why don't you ask your questions and then we'll take the break for the staff to do that for us.

>> Cronk: Go ahead, acm Arrellano.

>> Thank you, city manager, and council members, ray rare Arrellano. We heard about some fees that might be a reduction in the clean community fee. It is my understanding that that would not occur. The - four of the six positions are actually temp to permanent conversions of long-standing temporary employees and the other two are new ones. And I'd like to go ahead and call on assistant director Daniel word to provide additional detail on that.

>> Sure. Good afternoon, council, mayor, city manager.

[4:25:27 PM]

Can everybody hear me?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Okay. Yeah, I did want to highlight our budget request. We are requesting six ftes for fiscal year 22. Four of those positions as acm Arrellano mentioned would convert what happened long-standing temporary positions to a permanent position in our department. Two of them would be truly kind of new added capacity. We're looking at capacity in our hr group. We're looking to add capacity to our I.T. Group as well as our inspections, our str processing. We also need to beef up our records management program and then also add an additional staff member to our neighborhood enforcement investigation group to assist with processing legal cases and getting those to our enforcement avenue such

[4:26:29 PM]

as administrative hearings and municipal court.

>> So councilmember tovo, again, that explains the potential implications that, again, would not result in a reduction in the clean community user's fee. We do understand I think some of the amendments that also directs staff to go ahead and go back and do some analysis and provide some reporting back to council. We can certainly do that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I don't know who the appropriate person is to answer this question, but it's my understanding that it does result in some reduction to the clean community fee. I thought it was 35 cents. I am now being told that 35 cents is attributable to cost drivers versus the employee cost. So is it all 50 cents of the increase on every

[4:27:29 PM]

ratepayer's bill that is going to cost drivers and there's no cost associated with hiring six new employees?

>> My understanding is --

>> Tovo: How is that cost being covered?

>> My understanding is if we eliminated the six fte positions, the increase to the clean community fee would be 35 cents accounting for cost drivers. There would be an additional 15-cent increase if we add in the six fte positions.

>> Tovo: So I think I would want to understand, this is -- today was the first I heard that 35 cents of that 50 was attributable to cost drivers. So I don't know whether I have the detail in the two questions I answered to really explain what those cost drivers are. I'll do my best to look, but just to get back to what acm Arrellano said, it's not that none of the clean community fee would be reduced, it's just that it would be reduced only to --

[4:28:29 PM]

it would be reduced, just not fully reduced.

>> The proposed increase would reduce by 15 cents without the ftes added to the fy22 budget.

>> Tovo: And I would like to talk about the temporary employees that these six poxes are to convert temporary employees. It looks like you have nine vacancies as well. So can you help me understand why those temporary employees haven't been tapped to fill any of the vacancies?

>> Sure. So we generally have vacancies throughout the year as employees cycle in and out. Our inspector positions are fortunately a position that do turnover with some frequency. So these aren't -- the positions that are vacant currently are planned to be filled and have roles to fill. The ftes that we're requesting would be in addition to those already

[4:29:30 PM]

existing positions that just happen to currently be vacant.

>> Tovo: So just to be clear also to clarify something, acm Arrellano, I'm suggesting that you come back in a few months in a few months and we postpone discussion of the fee increase. And here's my rationale. As I look at your budget there's \$200,000ish, maybe a little more contemplated for over time. I have as I mixed the other day heard concerns from individuals that for example I appreciate that one of the contemplated positions is to work on short-term rentals. However, it would probably be a good first step to make sure that those inspectors who were working in the short-term rental program are available during the hours where they might be most needed. So we have a short-term rental program where the

[4:30:31 PM]

staff stop at 11:00, but when we hear concerns about short-term rentals that are being used at party houses, those are typically people coming back to their short-term rental after the bars close downtown. So 11:00 is just too early for that program. And these are the kinds of things that have come up again

and again and again through the years and we still have staffing without staggered schedules that really meet the needs in some cases of the inspectors. I appreciate the areas you've identified for focus. I think they're appropriate areas for focus. That being said, I fundamentally think there are some other changes -- there's some other analysis that should happen here and one relates to scheduling. We had one of my colleagues shared some other scheduling challenges. I don't know whether that person feels comfortable speaking up, but -- so that's part of my issue is that I think -- I think we need a closer look at

[4:31:33 PM]

scheduling with regard to one of the positions you described is to prepare cases for handling through the administrative process. You know, having followed several of these cases through the process, I think we need some policy changes or some ordinance changes or the ability to bump it up in terms of our other work. I'm not sure that more staff is going to solve the issues that I'm aware of. So I think this needs a more comprehensive look. That's part of my intention with my amendment is to give us some time for that closer look. I'm happy to pull some of the examples I've got in my files of situations where there was a very clear violations and documented evidence, and it's just really tough. And I appreciate that it's tough for all kinds of reasons, but some of that is I think we need to arm you

[4:32:34 PM]

with some stronger tools. I'm not certain that arming you with more staff is going to solve some of the challenges that I see and that I know some of our constituents are experiencing. So I really appreciate your work. I want to make sure it's as effective as possible. I also know that I've sat in lots of budget cycles where we've added staff hoping that solved some of the challenges that our constituents were experiencing and frankly some of those challenges persist. So we just need a different approach in my opinion. And again, it wasn't a no increase, it was a let's delay consideration of the increase until we have some of that analysis completed.

>> I think one of the broader points we wanted to make is the proposal wasn't going to result in the decrease of the clean community fee that was mentioned in the amendment. So we just wanted to clarify that.

>> Tovo: I appreciate that. I apologize that for error. I did the best with the information I had in the q&a and I'll have to look back

[4:33:35 PM]

and see what lends us to that conclusion that the 50 cents was attributable to the increase in staff. But thanks for the clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Are we ready to take a 10 minute break and let staff come back --

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I had one question as a follow-up?

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead, Ann.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I was a little bit confused. So the reduction of the six ftes, does that -- does that cut any temporary or permanent employees that are in place right now?

>> Council member,

[indiscernible] With the Austin code department. They will not be cut off. We will be able to absorb the cost of those and have them as employees, but we

[4:34:36 PM]

won't convert them to permanent positions.

>> Kitchen: If we vote for this and reduce by six ftes, nobody is out of a job.

>> No.

>> Kitchen: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, anything else before we take a 10-minute break and let staff come back to us,.

>> Casar: There was one clarifying question as we came up with the spreadsheet. For tovo 9 is the 50,000 in KO's or is it one-time funding?

>> Can you tell me what tovo 9 is off the top of your head?

>> Contract end sourcing and these would be for hand-held radios. We would recommend they will be funded through one-time dollars, \$50,000 are I believe for 10 hand-held radios.

>> We'll put it in that way unless there's objection.

>> Tovo: Let me make one other point while the staff are going off to do these. There is an opportunity as I

[4:35:39 PM]

understand, there may be an opportunity to reduce debt for some of the ems quit and some of the dacc vehicles that I've mentioned in my amendments. Maybe staff want to chime in on whether that would be appropriate. And if so those could shift out of the one-time category.

>> Mayor, if I may.

>> Can you give us what's the specific number, tovo --

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, if somebody else could tell me -- >>

>> Alter: It's tovo 6 and I had asked this question of the budget staff and it is in the same email that has our initial email with the lengthy chart. And I believe that 54,000 needs to be one time and 480,000 could be -- I'm not sure if it was KO's or certificates of obligation.

>> Mayor Adler: 54 and what?

>> Alter: I had from that chart you gave me that may have been updated because I

[4:36:40 PM]

know there's been some shifting on how we're doing those calculations. What I had from that email was 54,000 in one time and 480,000 in KO's. It's a lot of vehicles of sru's and other kinds of things. But that's simply from the number you gave us in that same email.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> We'll come back with that.

>> Mayor Adler: And how important is it, Ed, for us in this break to actually find 146,951 in ongoing? I mean, in past years as I recall we got to that kind of level you said it was kind of false accuracy to be solving for that?

>> Less say it's a large budget. What I would recommend on that particular sheet that we just balance that out with vacancy savings. There's a number of positions you would be adding in this budget. They will not be hired day one and you can manage that 156,000 of vacancy savings of negative 146.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. We ready to take the

[4:37:42 PM]

10-minute break? That sound right for you guys, Kerri? All right. It is 4:37. We're going to take a 10-minute break. Let's come back here at just after a quarter to 5:00. Let's say 10 till. 10 till 5:00.

[4:40:30 PM]

[Short break].

[5:06:46 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I don't see there's a box for P.O. And Mckenzie. It looks like Pio and Mckenzie that we're missing.

[5:09:44 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right, I think that we have everybody here except for Pio, is that right? Hmm?

>> [Indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Right. You ready?

[5:11:05 PM]

I think Pio is joining us here in just a second. Let me know if you're ready. Let me go ahead and reconvene the meeting if you guys are set. All right, we're on. So we're going to go ahead and convene, it is 5:11. Kerri, I'm going to let you make a report.

>> Sure, thank you. Can we bring up the spreadsheet, please. So I won't go through every item, since this -- everything ties to the conversation that

[5:12:06 PM]

we've been having throughout the day.

>> Kitchen: Can you make it a little bit bigger? It's hard on the eyes.

>> Mayor Adler: And is there a way to send a link to this? Is this has been printed?

>> It's on a flash drive now so we can get it out.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Okay.

>> So I'm going to just go through some of the --

>> Kitchen: Mayor? Can we make it a little bit bigger? Is that possible?

>> Do you mean the screen or the font?

>> Kitchen: Well, I don't know. I can't see it.

>> It is small. But I see that it's full screen, there's a lot -- I think that the words are just a little small.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, the words are small. Okay, well, never mind. I'll figure it out.

>> Ann, if you go to that full screen view it's a lot easier to see, up in the layout, there's a full screen view.

>> Kitchen: Oh, I got it. Thank you, guys.

[5:13:06 PM]

Thank you. You think that I'd know that by now. I got it. Thanks.

>> So as we look through the changes that have taken place, you will see some of the highlights and they are different colors but it's just identifying the changes that happened. Adler two, we removed the vaccine incentive because of the change recommended by dhd. And Fuentes two, and that change is mentioned in the one time. Going down to Pio one, that includes the canopy, one-time \$60,000. And then the change in Casar one of the additional increase for the stipends. Then you will go down to tovo six, where we moved some of the one-time to debt. You can see that 480, where the

[5:14:06 PM]

debt changed. And in tovo eight, that is the code change that is for the code department and the code funds, so that does not impact the general fund. Tovo nine shows the change in-sourcing that we discussed today. Alter four is -- that was new from the original document that was sent out, so that's why that is notated. And then other items includes the savings that Ed discussed a few minutes ago. So if you continue to go down and you can see that the total ongoing is \$4 million. And you look at the total one-time, \$12.3, and when we look at our balances, that is the negative 6.5.

[5:15:09 PM]

This 571,319 is the reserve requirement for these changes. Total is negative \$7,071,395. If you go down a little bit further, you will see at the five--- the 4.9%, generates \$8.2 million. Which gives about 1.1 additional. If you go to 4.7, and it is just about \$4,000 difference.

>> Mayor, may I ask for one correction? So my amendment number was alter five, I had an alter four that I put up on the message board because of the information I got. I didn't move forward with it. So I don't want there to be any confusion down the line.

>> Okay, we will make that

[5:16:10 PM]

correction.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, can you see mere?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I noticed that heal is not on there. Did you just not show the arpa funds on there?

>> That is right. This just doesn't show the arpa funds.

>> Kitchen: Okay, but when we vote though, that would be part of our voting.

>> Mayor Adler: And the questions that we asked earlier about those other things, we need staff to come back and to take us through what the arpa spend is on all areas so that comes back to the council to be able to confirm and see if there's additional detail. Okay. So as I understand it --

>> Tovo: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes?

>> Tovo: I didn't know if you could see me, I think that I blend in.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Tovo: I just want to make sure that I understood. So at the 5.418, we would have a surplus of \$1.1 million, but if we adopted a .541, we would

[5:17:12 PM]

adopt that 4.7% rate?

>> Correct.

>> Tovo: Okay. I like the sound of that, because I think that we've worked a lot on trying to make sure that everyone is getting their priorities handled. So I do like to see that little wiggle room to come down from 4.9% if all possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, so let's proceed this way. Thank you for this and thank you for giving us this page. I think that we're going to first have a conversation that councilmember tovo suggested earlier to get a feel where people want to be generally. Let's talk about that and see where people are and then we'll make a motion and try to be consistent with that. I want to -- it's been requested and it makes sense to me that if we are going to consider something like that, for example, I want to make sure that the record reflects the individual line items were moved by the person that brought those amendments. So the record should reflect

[5:18:14 PM]

that. And then you can list -- and anybody who -- who really wants to be a second to fund any of those things that are listed just needs to read that into the record and the record will reflect who the second is. That way if we approve the grouping together, the record will very clearly reflect who it was that brought that item forward. And then we can go through the -- the script and adopt. But let's begin with where councilmember Ellis just took us, with respect to where everybody is with respect to kind of tax rate and whether you're comfortable with the page we've worked through. Colleagues, councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm fine with

[5:19:16 PM]

going with that 4.7% rate, understanding that leaves us at 14% reserves. If somebody makes the case that we should add more to the reserve, I was comfortable at 4.9% this morning, but I think that if we're at 14% reserves, still doing that tax bill and I'm good with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, further discussion? Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'm in the same place. I'm comfortable with the 4.7% if people would like to have some more in reserves, then I'm okay with the 4.9%.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, I'm in the same place too. I'm comfortable with the 4.7 and the 4.9 at the reasons that we discussed at the beginning of the meeting. I would probably go to the 4.9% and drop the money down to reserves because I think that given the 3.5% cap, we may be

[5:20:19 PM]

very thankful that we had both that rate as well as those reserves going into kind of an uncertain future. But I'd be okay with 4.7% too if that was the will of the dais. Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: I would be remiss to say that I wasn't concerned about the tax burden on residents whether so many people have been impacted by covid-19 and other economic challenges, but with most things in life I understand that there has to be compromise in order to keep the city afloat. I would -- I would consider 4.7%.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Yes, also I am comfortable with the 4.7%, really thrilled to know that we'll be able to get our priorities funded should that rate go through, but I'm also comfortable going to 4.9% if that means that we have an increase in the reserves.

[5:21:21 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yeah, I'm also comfortable with that. I think that we should go ahead at 4.9% and have some reserve. We don't really know exactly what's going to happen with the pandemic, the third wave that we're getting here in Austin. And I would like to have some reserve in case some emergency comes up. So that we could address those issues. So I'm very comfortable either way, but I would vote for 4.9%.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues? Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I'm going to just echo what all of my colleagues have said. I was very comfortable with 4.9%, and 4.7% is the will of the dais, then I can go there as

[5:22:24 PM]

well.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you say that again, I didn't hear you.

>> Harper-madison: I said that I'm comfortable at 4.9%. I appreciate that we get to 14% either way, in either case if it were the will of the dais, and the balance of the dais was 4.7%, I could go 4.7% also.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, my preference would be to get to 4.7%.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody else? Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: If my choices are between 4.7% and 4.9%, I would prefer 4.7%. I would still like to go lower. I think that there are some cuts that we could make.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I'm in the same place,

[5:23:26 PM]

4.7% is my preference.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I have a couple of questions and I wonder if Ed and Kerri are still around? Director?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, they're ahead. Go ahead.

>> Harper-madison: Does 4.7% maintain that 14% in the reserve?

>> Yes, the 14% will still remain with the 4.7%.

>> Harper-madison: And then what's the difference between -- you know, I think that for the average person, 4.7% and 4.9% doesn't sound like a big difference. Can you talk to us about what the implications are for that .2%? What's the implication for the median taxpayer?

>> Um, it's a little more -- we're just calculating this off

[5:24:28 PM]

the fly so just bear with us for a second but we estimate about \$2.50 a year.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Having heard from everybody, it looks like there's support for 4.7% or 4.9%. It looks like the vin diagram shows that we have a unanimous vote if we were going to do the 4.7%. So I would vote to 4.7%, I think, so that we have the unanimous action on the dais. People comfortable with that? Okay.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Councilmember tovo and I would like to make a joint motion if we could. It's not bad.

[Laughter].

>> Mayor Adler: Say what now?

>> We would like to make a joint motion if we could. I know that is unusual but we were working together and we're

[5:25:31 PM]

able to identify something that would allow us to increase our reserves. I'm sensing that the desire is not to reduce the tax rate so I'm going to let councilmember tovo speak and then I will read the motion but we'd like it to go on the record as joint.

>> Tovo: So, thank you, councilmember alter. I think this is just a really good -- it's a really good example to me of how important our conversations together are, because I sort of started this conversation earlier and then in conversation with councilmember alter, she remembered a piece of information that I didn't remember. So we had talked earlier this morning about the development services -- the development services fund, and what its fund balance was. And in the course of the conversation throughout the day, councilmember alter remembered that the general fund had actually made a transfer from the budget stabilization reserve fund back when development services was transitioning into an enterprise fund.

[5:26:32 PM]

And so the amount that was transferred at that time was \$7.16 million, so, again be, it originated -- not as fees -- but it originated as general fund dollars and was used to seed the development services fund. And so with staff's help we came up with a proposal that is going to be reflected in the amendment that councilmember alter is going to read and, again, reached at half of it so we're doing it as a joint motion, which is unusual, but, you know, workable we think.

>> Alter: So we would like to remove to go \$3.8 million of the first of a two-year plan to repay the reserve fund for the seed funding that it provided in 2019 when dsd transitioned to an enterprise fund. Does anyone need me to read that again? Councilmember kitchen --

>> Kitchen: Again, sorry.

[5:27:32 PM]

>> Alter: We move to reduce the general fund transfer to development services by \$3.8 million as the first of a two-year plan to repay the budget stabilization reserve fund for the seed funding it provided in 2019 when dsd transitioned to an enterprise fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, so let's talk about it for a second. I will make sure that you have the opportunity to make that motion. But there's no base motion yet. But I promise you that you will have the opportunity to be able to do that. But let's talk about it the same way that we've been talking about all of the other things that we've been trying to do with the budget. Okay? So with respect to the -- that idea or motion to take 3.8 to repay the general fund, you want to address it before we start asking questions about it?

>> Tovo: Either way, unless you have a preference, councilmember alter.

[5:28:33 PM]

The point is that we could use this to reduce the rate or we could use it for reserves. Again, our proposal is that we put it into reserves.

>> Mayor Adler: Into reserves and that makes real good sense to me. But I would like to understand the impact of that a little bit more because it's a new concept to me. So, I don't know, manager, or someone in development services, that right now is I guess a reserve for development services? Is there a use for it into development services? What -- what's the opportunity cost, if any, associated with doing this?

>> Sure, mayor and council, Rodney Gonzales, assistant city manager. And we have also conferred with finance about this amendment as well. So as you recall in 2019, after several years of dsd being in the general fund, council at that time adopted the budget of fiscal year 2019, converting dsd to an enterprise fund. And the councilmembers are correct, there was a \$7.6

[5:29:33 PM]

million infusion from general fund balance into dsd as seed funding. And so we've always maintained that and we've always maintained the cost of service. The fund has done very well financially over the years. The fund balance proposed for the end of fiscal year 2022, is approximately \$23 million. And so what is proposed is to repay the general fund for that initial seed funding, and Ed and I have conferred over a two-year time period that's okay. The fund is at cost of service, we know that the council supports cost of service. And we will always update our cost of service studies to ensure that they are the appropriate fees set at that level. And so, mayor and council, it's a proposal that we could that could work.

>> Mayor Adler: And the costs of development services --

>> I didn't hear that part.

>> Mayor Adler: No cost opportunity to development services, manager says no.

>> If I could, so the fund balance is really there as a contingency, just like the general fund balance.

[5:30:34 PM]

So since we could as dsd as an enterprise fund we had a target of getting to 50% fund balance. We're not there, but we're getting there very quickly. And so we will continue, of course, to March towards that 50% target, and the two-year repayment plan will allow us to continue to move towards that target.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. Okay, thank you. Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor. I have a question about the implications of this on dsd's ability to hire the additional staff that they're going to need to keep pace with increased permit applications. Especially, you know, we had the conversation and you agreed that easing the permitting process is

going to be critical moving forward. So I don't want to do anything that will diminish their ability to do that. So I would like somebody to speak to that, please.

>> Thank you, mayor pro tem. I can assure you that this amendment would have no impact in that regard.

[5:31:34 PM]

Our fees as mentioned are set at cost of service, and what we've seen is an increase in the volume, and because of the volume increase, we are able to support those new positions.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I have a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, counselor member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I think that I heard this correctly. Thank you to councilmember tovo and alter for bringing this forward. I really appreciate it. And thank you, acm Gonzales it sounds like working with them to make it work. So that -- am I understanding correctly that that means that the 3.8% really transfers from the dsd reserve to the general fund reserve, is that what's really going on here?

>> Yes, in essence.

>> Kitchen: Okay, all right.

>> With the direction for the remaining to be done in year two.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, in year two, the same thing would happen. So that actually puts our --

[5:32:36 PM]

this is a greater than 14% reserve, which is a good idea. So, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Councilmember alter.

>> I wanted to clarify what we're doing is not transferring a certain amount of money that we would otherwise be transferring to the fund. So we are not actually reducing the balance that we're starting with, we're just reducing the general fund transfer, but the effect is to reimburse ourselves for -- reimburse the budget stabilization reserve fund, and we're not spending that money. So if there were a problem or dsd needed it -- which is not what we're anticipating -- it would still be in the general reserve fund and could be used to help out if we don't spend it.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. I appreciate the creativity on that. All right, so let's do this -- let's start now working through moving forward in adopting where

[5:33:39 PM]

we are. We're going to begin with the base budget being what it was that staff presented to us -- how many days ago was that? Yesterday. All right. And without objection, and so there's not a particular offer on that, I want to just note that collectively we as a group moved that base motion. As amended by staff as presented at the beginning of our session yesterday morning. Because we're doing it collectively we don't need a second for that, so that is our base motion. Now I'll entertain an amendment to that. That is the sheet that Kerri presented to us a moment ago that corresponds to the 4.7% tax rate. In doing that, I want the record to reflect that each of those line items is associated with a

[5:34:39 PM]

sponsor, and the sponsor has moved those individual line items. Okay? And I'm going to now give an opportunity for a second to those, and if you want the record to reflect you as a second on these, I want the clerk to just capture the people that would like to be listed as having seconded it. All right?

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I have to ask a question about the list.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead.

>> Kitchen: I might need to see it again. I can't -- I think that there may have been a problem with how my second amendment was shown, the cares one. I need to see what they put -- what was put on that sheet.

>> Mayor Adler: Kerri, can you pull it up again? Kerri? I'm sorry, can you pull up the spreadsheet again.

[5:35:46 PM]

And can you go to kitchen's three items.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, it's not showing on our screen. Okay, yeah, just go back up.

>> Mayor Adler: Go down to the kitchen there. There they are, okay, they're in the middle of the screen.

>> Kitchen: Okay, then let me see -- the meadows one, what do you have there in the right-hand column? In the far right column?

>> Mayor Adler: Kitchen two.

>> Kitchen: It's cut off. How come it's not in there? The meadows -- the meadows should reflect the costs that are being taken out of vacancy saving, should it not?

>> Councilmember, no, it would

[5:36:47 PM]

not reflect because the ems department will find those funds within their allocation for fiscal year 2022.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So for purposes of voting on it, mayor, I guess that we're voting on our documents later, because the direction that is in my document needs to be voted on.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we'll vote on all of the writers in a moment.

>> Kitchen: Okay, got it, thank you.

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

>> Casar: And we updated the general fund numbers for the one-time stipends, up to \$90,000, but I don't think that we have updated the enterprise numbers. Those enterprise numbers have been sent by H.R. And my assumption -- or whatever motion that we're taking is to do it across city departments, general fund and enterprise.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. Do you need to change the enterprise number on the spreadsheet?

>> Casar: I think that it's being updated now.

>> We're working on it being updated.

>> Mayor Adler: But, yes, the motion includes the updated

[5:37:48 PM]

enterprise numbers to reflect the increase from 80 to 90. Yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I didn't understand that we were putting the Fuentes budget writer of the cultural arts funding into this. And we have not discussed that yet, I still don't understand that. So perhaps we could put that off until after we vote on all of this? Because I don't know how long it's going to take but we didn't agree to that yet, we put off the conversation and I still don't understand.

>> Mayor Adler: Fuentes has just items one and two on this. Can you go up to see Fuentes, can you go up? Line 14. That's not on our spreadsheet.

>> Fuentes: Yes.

>> [Indiscernible].

>> Fuentes: But we haven't discussed it yet and we still have questions.

>> Mayor Adler: So we're not ready to vote yet. Because we haven't discussed Fuentes two.

[5:38:49 PM]

>> Fuentes: Not Fuentes two.

>> Mayor Adler: Is anything else added to that this was not on the spreadsheet that we were working off with, that was posted this morning, other than

-- Fuentes B.R.

>> Fuentes: And the Pio one was add but we agreed to that.

>> Mayor Adler: Pio's one we add. Anything else added?

>> Pio one and Fuentes B.R. Is the only ones added.

>> Mayor Adler: So we'll hold on for a second and talk B.R. Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: All right. So, colleagues, what we have here is a budget -- is an amendment, budget amendment, it came forward as direction to take \$6.7 million from the cultural arts fund and ensure that it is made available as quickly as possible to get these funds out into the community. There is a budget breakdown, I think that we have staff available to answer questions that we have about this, but the

[5:39:52 PM]

budget sheet for cultural arts fund is page 405 in the budget document. And you can see that we have 6.6 in available funds that can be dedicated for this.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Fuentes: Can staff speak to this proposal?

>> Mayor Adler: Can staff -- address this, explain what this is as well? Elaborate.

>> The ede, staff leadership will be moving over to have this conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, can I say something while I'm waiting.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, did I miss this? Was this posted, Bart?

>> At some point during the day, councilmember Fuentes in consultation with finance staff did make the clarification that it wasn't a budget writer, it was more appropriate as an amendment and so it moved to the amendment discussion. But the content didn't change. It was just because we were moving funds, it was -- it needed to be an amendment, not a

[5:40:53 PM]

writer.

>> Mayor Adler: And which -- which -- councilmember Fuentes, which one of your writers was that?

>> Fuentes: This is B.R. -- Yes, it is pd one -- policy direction.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you.

>> Fuentes: And to reiterate our general revenue funds. These are funds that are available. They are in the cultural arts fund as it stands, but we're just asking that we have these made available. I think that y'all have probably received emails from members of our arts community who have -- continue to have significant impact from the pandemic and especially as we are in stage five more and more, venues and artists and festivals have had to cancel. So there's a significant impact in our community. This is also consistent with the resolution that we passed back at the end of may that called for an increased allocation for

[5:41:54 PM]

our arts and music communities. So this is just reiterating that we have the funds and we want to make sure that it gets out to those who need it most.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Hold on one second. Councilmember alter, did you have something else?

>> Alter: I just want to hear from staff because I think that --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, let's see if we have staff that have been brought over. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Yes, and the acting director for the city of Austin economic development department. The staff brought forth a recommendation of requirements of \$3 million. The \$6.6 million that is shown on the

revenue side is an estimate. It is a projection based on activities that could happen. Even where we are over the last two years and where we are currently dealing with the pandemic, we weren't comfortable

[5:42:56 PM]

allocating the full \$6.6 million. In addition the arts commission voted on July 31st to try and start using actuals versus estimates. So that's why we did not budget the full amount. As you remember at the end of this year, it's projected that we will be negative \$3.5 million. In the previous year we were negative \$650,000. So it's our recommendation that we try and pivot and change the process where we are spending actuals versus estimates, given where we are in the current climate dealing with the pandemic. So that is why we put forth only spending \$3 million.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

[5:43:57 PM]

>> Kitchen: I want to thank councilmember Fuentes for bringing this forward. I think it's -- in working with staff as -- it was just explained, this is a good compromise. It's a way to -- to really be helpful to our arts community. So, thank you councilmember Fuentes, for bringing this forward and I do support it.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I'm trying to understand this. We had asked some questions of the cultural art staff as well. And so I think what I want to understand, director, what I'm worried about is that if -- if we are budgeting on the -- as I'm understanding the situation -- and I may be misunderstanding it -- if we're making an -- if we're making an allocation based on the estimate and the estimate is lower, then

[5:44:59 PM]

we're not going to have enough funds to cover those commitments.

>> That -- that could happen. It did in the current year. The current year our budget was approved on the \$10 million estimate. And we are only projected to receive 55% of those funds. And so we had already committed contracts that we committed to uphold, so that is why we find ourselves in a negative balance at the end of this year. Trying to be fiscally responsible because we just don't know what this pandemic will do going forward. And so that is why we were conservative to say let's not spend all of the estimate that we're not certain that will come in.

>> Tovo: So can you remind me -- I remember the -- I remember the challenge that we faced, but I can't remember how we resolved

[5:46:00 PM]

it. How -- how did you make up the gap between the estimated hot funding and the amount of the contracts? Did we make that up with cares funding or with arpa fund something.

>> No. What will happen is that at the end of this year we'll end with a negative balance. But the city manager's proposed budget shows a one-time transfer in from the budget stabilization of 4.8 which will cover that negative and leave a little, and then would use a portion of the estimates to fund future contracts in fy22. So at the end of the year the fund will be negative but the gap will be closed with the transfer in from the budget stabilization fund.

>> Tovo: Which is general fund dollars. So we had to close the gap with general fund dollars?

>> Correct.

>> Tovo: So if we fell behind -- if we make this allocation based

[5:47:02 PM]

on an estimate, rather than actuals, and it falls short, we will, again, be in a position of having to make a choice of reducing contracts or funding through some other means in the general fund?

>> That could happen, yes. And, again, because of the pandemic we just aren't certain. We're hopeful that we do collect the 6.6, but we're just not sure with all of the bearings that is dependent on.

>> Tovo: So is there any way to

-- to honor the intent of trying to get the money out sooner? Could we do this -- um, could we have a check in sooner? I guess what I'm wondering, manager, is there a way or director holtrab, could we -- could we do -- could we do this

[5:48:02 PM]

as a six-month check in?

>> As you may recall, we have been working to reimagine how we were using our hotel occupancy tax funds across all the divisions. And so we are pivoting to a new program model. So we have moved our launch date. We're still collecting feedback from the community, and the hope is to launch -- to bring back program guidelines and to launch the new programs leading with equity in 24 of this year.

>> Tovo: So I guess that I'm not entirely understanding how that -- I'm trying to look for a solution that would allow us to honor the council's interest in getting the money out the door without putting us in a position where we're paying out more --

[5:49:02 PM]

or contracting more than we're going to take in. So I don't know exactly what that solution looks like or how it connects with the changes that you're discussing. So maybe --

>> Depending on how receipts come in over the next six months, perhaps we could come back at that time to release thrive. And I have my program manager, Megan wells, on the call to also assist. But, again, we're dealing -- we just don't know. And, again, I'm hopeful that all of the activities that are planned will happen and we will actually receive more, but given where we are in the current year, and given where we were last year, we thought that this year would be better. And it did not pan out that way. Again, 55%. And so I just don't have a crystal ball into the future which is why we were being conservative.

>> Tovo: So this was the

[5:50:03 PM]

recommendation of the arts commission, but I assume that it was also the recommendation of our staff?

>> Correct. The arts commission voted July 31st to try and to start use the actuals versus estimates, so we're not finding ourselves in the same position next year.

>> Tovo: All right, thank you for the additional info.

>> No problem.

>> Mayor Adler: So I understand and try to ask the questions -- is the -- is the money that we're appropriating here actually money that is already in? Or is this all anticipated? We talk about the current fund balance at this point, is how much?

>> It will be a negative \$3.5 by September 30th. And so when --

>> Mayor Adler: All right, that

-- but that negative 3.5 is something that we're covering on the manager's budget that's in front of us with a transfer from budget stabilization?

[5:51:04 PM]

So that's covering that 3.5. So the money that is being designated here is the money that's anticipated to come in, but not in yet?

>> From my understanding we have 4.2 that is available today, but perhaps our budget officer could speak to it. But, yes, it would be a total of 6.6 when you count the projected.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, I was confused because I had seen something that describes a current fund balance, and I'm not sure that there's a current fund balance.

>> So it -- if I could just walk through the funds. Kerri, could you pull up the chart that I sent over?

>> Tovo: As we pull that up I want to mention that I understand that there's a desire to move to an accrual method

[5:52:05 PM]

versus a projected method when it comes to our contracts, but with the feedback that I've been hearing from the community is that these dollars are needed now. And part of the questions that I also have is that we had dedicated at least \$3 million as part of the American rescue act plan dollars. And those dollars have not gone out. So even though we had these funds and we said, hey, we really want to make sure that these get out as quickly as possible, those funds have not been activated yet. The thrive program will come online I believe later this month. Councilmember alter, your program was able to successfully get out, but -- so we've been committing to the community, hey, we're with you, we're going to get these dollars out, but we're just not seeing the movement that we need. So this is why we're bringing this forward as a direction to say this is important, that we really need to get these dollars out as quickly as possible.

[5:53:05 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: So I understand this. In the past we have been making grants to organizations based on what we anticipate earning in that year. They then get that grant and they plan and spend accordingly. If we don't raise that money and we come to them and say, hey, guys, the money didn't come in, so I know that we said that we were giving to give you \$50,000, but actually we can only give you \$20,000, they look at us and they say, wait a second, you told me that you were going to give me \$50,000 and I planned on having \$50,000 and I programmed having \$50,000 and you can't come to me and say I'm not getting it. But we're there saying in good faith we told you what we thought that we'd get, but we haven't. For that reason the arts commission is saying let's not do that anymore. Let's actually give out next year what we earn this year and that way we know exactly what it is when we start. What you're saying is that it may be a good idea to go to that, just not now. Because now is not the time to do that. We ought to continue on with the

[5:54:06 PM]

practice that we had before, recognizing that we may be telling people that we have money that we don't have. Putting us -- ultimately being in a position where as a council we'll either cut people from what we told them that we'd give them or we have to find general fund money at that point to be able to make that up, right? And what Kathie was asking for I think is that there's some kind of hybrid thing that takes into account the fact that we really do want to get to a place where we're giving out next year what we earned this year, so we know exactly what that number is, because that's a better place for us to be and organizations then would be able to rely on it without going through the scare. Is there -- is there some kind of transition to that that we could make that we in essence share risks with the recipients of the cultural arts fund, which I guess that would be. And what Kathie is asking, is there a way for us to do maybe half of the funding so that if

[5:55:07 PM]

we -- if we miss by a lot, that delta comes back and we end up not traveling, or those kinds of things, we're not -- we haven't represented to the organizations that there is actually money there when there really is no money there yet. So the question that I would ask would be the same one that I think that councilmember tovo asked is -- is there kind of a hybrid risk sharing thing that we could do with these organizations? And then get a report constantly over the course of the year as to how we're tracking so that we're not finding out next spring that there's an issue and we're scrambling, but maybe we could kind of keep track now and as we're going forward so that if there's a problem we can start ining out now what that means. Would something like that --

>> Kitchen: Mayor, could I speak? Mayor, I don't know if you have seen me but I had my hand up for a while.

>> Mayor Adler: And let me hear

[5:56:07 PM]

from staff as whether there's a hybrid and then this I'll get to you.

>> Kitchen: I was going to say that this proposal is a hybrid and if I had a minute to speak I could explain that.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll get to you in a second. Let me hear from Rodney.

>> Hi, mayor, Rodney Gonzales, assistant city manager. What is before you is a hybrid because we are allocating half of what we are estimating. It is roughly about half, so certainly as we go through the new fiscal year and we see what collections are, we can certainly come back with a budget amendment to allocate the remaining portion based on collections at that point. And what we're talking about really is managing expectations, because at the onset, we establish a contract with our cultural arts vendors. We want to ensure that they're not overly relying on us for that full amount, where we have to come back to them at some point in the future and say, sorry, but we didn't collect enough and we either have to cut

[5:57:08 PM]

the contract, or we have to find general fund money to replace it. So in front of you actually is a hybrid, because we're not allocating all of what we are estimating, the 3.6 is an estimate. And what we could do is mid-year based on collections we could then allocate the remaining of it.

>> May I ask, to clarify, when you say in front of us as the staff proposal or the amendment?

>> From the staff proposal.

>> Mayor Adler: So the staff made a proposal --

>> Kitchen: Mayor --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm just asking my question, Ann. Let me finish here, just a second, I promise to get to you. If -- if the staff made a proposal, and now -- is the staff comfortable with this proposal coming from councilmember Fuentes as being reasonable under the circumstances?

>> So as interim director, it was stated that the piece for us that is causing us some concern is managing expectations.

[5:58:08 PM]

Because on October 1st we will initiate new contracts and if we initiate those contracts allocating the full amount, and we get into the year with actual collections and they're lower than anticipated, then we'll run into an issue. Our contractors have relied on us, based upon the contract, that they will receive the full amount. So at that point we have to either then cut those amounts or find general fund dollars. So that's a concern is managing expectations.

>> Mayor Adler: So explain to me how then what councilmember Fuentes is proposing relates to that those expectations? Those expectations, and if we did what councilmember Fuentes is proposing.

>> So the way that we read the direction is to allocate not just the \$3.6 million but the entire estimated collection which is over \$6 million. We would allocate that to the contractors. That's the way that we're interpreting it.

>> Mayor Adler: So when you said a second ago that what we had in front of us was already the hybrid, you're not talking about

-- hybrid, you're not talking about what councilmember Fuentes

[5:59:10 PM]

did, you're talking about what is in the base budget is already the hybrid?

>> Yes, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Now I understand the question -- I understand the issue. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Well, I'll just -- you know, I was trying -- let me just say that my understanding from what councilmember Fuentes is doing, and really this is for her to speak to, is that she has reached -- she has reached a balance. As she said at the beginning, she is not asking to allocate the entire amount of the estimated dollars which goes to what councilmember tovo was asking, which is that we don't want to, you know, what if we're wrong about the estimate. But I think that councilmember Fuentes has already accounted for that, and director holt-rab said that earlier. Her amendment relates to only half of what is estimated. So I'll let her speak to it. You know, it's her amendment and I'll let her speak to it. But I hear the concerns that you're raising and that you are

[6:00:11 PM]

also raising councilmember tovo, but I think that councilmember Fuentes accounted for that in reaching -- in reaching a balance. She's not asking to -- to transfer all of it.

>> Mayor Adler: So -- so I -- I hear you. I share the concern that councilmember Fuentes has, because we have some organizations I think that making it impossible to figure it is how they go. But my understanding, councilmember kitchen, is that the staff had proposed to the base budget of doing half of it and councilmember Fuentes is proposing to go and to give the rest of it. So between -- so what the staff proposed and the other half that councilmember Fuentes is for the 10% just reserve that we constantly try to keep. So this does go the whole way, do I understand that correctly, councilmember Fuentes?

>> Fuentes: And there's a big piece here.

[6:01:11 PM]

The issue is the \$3.6 million, which is the programs that are about to be rolled out, and the thrive and I can't remember what the second program's name is. But those programs only cover a certain amount of contractors, my understanding 25 to 45 contracts would be awarded. So that is a significant gap from what it has been traditionally awarded. So we have several artists and organizations coming forward who are raising concerns with the process and how things are being moved out. And there's legitimate concerns that they may not get anything, and some of these organizations are organizations that are in our community. So it's built with an eye towards equity that I support, to ensure that we're dedicating more dollars into these programs so that more of our organizations and artists are covered. You're right, mayor, that the amendment is for the rest of the fund there. But, you know, I'm open if the

[6:02:13 PM]

staff wants to do a hybrid approach where we have half of that amount and then perhaps in six months we come back and talk about it to see how it's going. But my concern remains is that we had allocated \$3 million in the arpa funds, that \$3 million still has not gone out to our community. So we're here, you know, during budget time trying to figure out how we get more out.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: So I'm really concerned about us going down to the point where we only have about 10% set aside. The hotel taxes are also on -- how many months delay that we get them?

>> Typically it's one month but it depends on the hotel itself. They're either filing monthly or quarterly.

>> Alter: So the estimates for the end of this year or the start of next year assume an opening of the economy that may be questionable right now. And so I just think it's

[6:03:13 PM]

premature to make this move. I think what the staff put forward is already a hybrid. What I might suggest if we wanted to put language to check back in, you know, to provide us an update in December when you have a better idea of some of the receipts. Maybe we'll be lucky and the hot taxes may have gone up extremely high, like the sales tax did, but then we have to be able to check what happens in September and October when they might not be so high. So I think that you need to do that, you know, maybe in December. And then we can revisit and we can also ask the arts commission to weigh in on what they think would be the most appropriate. There's a long-standing debate that's been going on as we try to shift our hot tax funding so that it can be more diverse. And simply as you add more and more organizations there's simply not enough money. On top of that we have a drop in receipts. So it's really important that the actors who are involved are able to have the open

[6:04:15 PM]

conversations and be able to be part of that. I think that there's, you know, if the arts commission voted for essentially moving forward with the staff plan, then we change it now. I'm just really -- I'm uncomfortable with the risk this represents while at the same time I really do want us to deliver -- deliver aid to our arts organizations. I think perhaps we also need to add direction to get the money that's in arpa out quickly, which is there and ready to go as of October 1st, if it was in the second trunch and if there's money in the reserve that could be expedited if they have a program to get it out of the door. I don't know what is holding that up.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Ellis and then councilmember pool.

>> Ellis: Thank you. I just wanted to voice that I'm supportive of the hybrid option that the staff already worked on. I do think that it is important that we take care of our arts communities, but it does sound

[6:05:17 PM]

there's a bit of reservation in allotting money at this time that is not going out and I want to make sure that the programs are well developed and staff knows if they need to come back to us to move money around, we're more than happy to do that as we always have been. I'm supportive on leaning on staff's recommendation for this particular one.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: So, part of the problem that is a chronic problem for our arts community is that we're relying on a fund that is hard to predict. In this case, it dropped well below what anybody had seen for a long time. And it feels to me like the city had contractual obligations and promises to the arts community that we have not been able to fulfill. So I feel like if the hot moneys aren't available, we need to shore them up somehow and I -- I think that we just found the

[6:06:18 PM]

transfer to the general fund reserves from the dsd reserves, for example, could be used to forward fund to fill this gap and help the arts community. Is that something that we could do?

>> I think that you could do it, councilmember. At the end of the day these are all general fund dollars so you would have that flexibility.

>> Ellis: I think that may well be a solution that we should consider seriously here today and then the larger issue is the instability with the fund and the allocations in the arts contracting program that is

long-standing. It's not new. It was an issue back when I was on the arts commission, and I -- we've been struggling to try to

[6:07:19 PM]

figure out how best to shore up that program. For today, for this here, I do think that we have a potential solution right in front of us. So, mayor I would like to make that recommendation that the moneys that are in the hybrid program that councilmember Fuentes has offered up here in her budget writer that is now part of our amendments, that we use some of the moneys that we have identified thanks to councilmember alter and councilmember tovo from the general fund reserves and the dsd fund reserves.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's continue to discuss this issue. Councilmember -- I'm sorry?

>> [Indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Staff?

>> Yes, yes. I want to clear up one item. We have not clawed back on any of the cultural contracts. All the contracts have been --

[6:08:19 PM]

will be fulfilled. So we've never done that. In addition we are working hard on trying to deport the arpa funds. We deployed 13 new programs last year. So we're tapping the same staff that are engaged in their regular work, on top of the arpa funding. So we are trying our best to get the new programs out, but recognizing that it is the same staff that we are continually tapping, and I just wanted to recognize staff for all of their hard work.

>> Pool: I should tell you how appreciative I am and I'm sure that the entire dais is. It's been a heavy burden for everybody and the arts community does feel like they have not been able to get to the front of the line with the arpa monies has -- it is one aspect that has been animating what councilmember Fuentes and kitchen have been working on and I have been trying to assist them as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[6:09:21 PM]

Councilmember Casar?

>> Casar: Can I understand in a scenario that is worse than what we anticipate what the potential gap would be? So if we were to adopt this budget writer and things were to get worse than we anticipate, what's the amount of gap that we might be facing?

>> It would depend on travel. If it's consistent with this year, and you approve an estimate of 6.6 and we only bring in 50% and then we turn around and issue contracts of \$6 million, you could still find yourself in a negative position at the end of the year. And I don't know if that was for me or Ed or Kerri.

>> Casar: That works just fine, thank you, director. So if travel was -- is as low this coming year as it was last year -- and we obviously all hope that it does not -- then

[6:10:23 PM]

the amount that we to make up is about equal to the additional reserves that we just put in balance?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Mayor, I have a concern about, you know, stabilizing funds into -- I mean, I rather would have a hybrid system that the staff is recommending. I do believe that if the economy does pick up that we can address that issue halfway from now. But I just don't feel comfortable making a commitment to fund these, and then have these artists that plan way ahead of time when they're having an event and do not have any kind of funds at all because we just didn't receive it. So I feel more comfortable paying out as we receive the funds.

>> Mayor Adler: If the arpa funds were to get out quickly,

[6:11:24 PM]

does that meet the same need, is that an effective substitute?

>> Fuentes: I think so. I think that there's definitely a middle ground here. You know, the intention was to at least dedicate \$6.6 million as quickly as possible, and if it ends up going into the programs that have been stood up, I'm fine with that too, and similar to the issue that was raised with the arts non-profit program that we're considering. So if we top it out it's \$3 million if it's from arpa or saying that we'll take more of the projected amount, which from my understanding in previous budget cycles it usually is about half of the projected amount that gets into the program funding. Which is not the case in what is presented by staff at the moment. I think that would be a good middle ground. I'm certainly very open to it.

>> Mayor Adler: so here's my question and, Kerri, there might be a question for you. If we adopted this at the full \$6 million, or we put in the

[6:12:24 PM]

other half from the work that we're doing here, and the arpa funds then went to backfill this, would that get us in essence back to the hybrid situation? In other words, I'm just trying to figure out, we have arpa funds at 3.5, and a 3.5 gap because of the hybrid. Can we either get more support or staff to the directors office so she can get the arpa funds out more quickly? Or can we adopt this with the understanding that those arpa funds will backfill this so that we're not facing that risk? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I had another suggestion. I wondered if we could approve this contingent on a check in at December? I appreciate what you're doing, it's in essence the same thing,

[6:13:26 PM]

basically.

>> Mayor Adler: I didn't know if they had to enter the contracts before December and when they enter into those contracts those recipients are going to want to have a full year. They want to know what they can do for the year.

>> Tovo: I see.

>> Mayor Adler: So we'll commit potentially to the \$6 million in contracts in september/october time frame.

>> Tovo: With half of it coming from arpa?

>> Mayor Adler: That's what I was saying. Let's just say the arpa fund will backfill that. And if the money comes in on hot as we hope they might, let's say it comes in at six and not 3.5, then we'll just have an additional \$3 million that in essence will backfill the arpa money that then is available for arts consistent with the program that was the arpa spend.

>> Tovo:if that works logistically, I think that is something that I could support. Because I am concerned about, you know, all of the issues that we talked about and I do not --

[6:14:28 PM]

yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me ask that question.

>> Tovo: I think that accomplishes, councilmember Fuentes, what you were trying to do and does so in a way to minimize risk.

>> Mayor Adler: So does that work -- Kerri, does that work?

>> I'm going to defer some, because I believe that the arpa funds allocated in the spending plan have already been addressed in their planning. Is that correct?

>> Not 100%. What we recognized about arpa is it is more flexible than our hotel occupancy tax. And so arts commission had some thoughts around how it could pivot arpa to be more flexible than the hotel occupancy tax. So it's on our agenda for this Monday to talk with the arts commission about the arpa funds.

[6:15:29 PM]

And so we could do it, but I don't really -- I would need to think about that.

>> Mayor Adler: Does it make sense for us to table this item so that the commissions can meet on it and then come back to us at the meeting at the end of August or the first meeting in September? And work with the arts and music commission, look at the arpa dollars that are available, see if we can do that kind of switch? Or if the art commission is saying actually the art community would rather us not do that because of the flexibility involved in those dollars, they could propose something back. But I join with councilmember Fuentes in saying that we need to get relief out quickly for these organizations. I just am not quite sure as I sit here today what's the right way to do it, and I'm not convinced that we're going to be able to come up with it on the dais, but I don't know any reason that we could not do this, but do this at the last meeting in August or the first meeting in September.

[6:16:30 PM]

Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: So I -- I like that direction, mayor, because I think that if we're not deeply immersed in the conversation that's going on in the arts community, we missed the fact that they're trying to solve multiple problems. The arpa funding was put forward as a way to provide some emergency relief for the ecosystem and to do things that you can't do with the hot funding. I don't know that the cultural arts fund would be the first choice if we were going to put in \$3 million in additionally into the arts, music ecosystem. So I really think that -- that is about performances, etc. And if we have delta and they can't do performances and we're intermingling it with hot tax funding that has to have all of these things, I think that is challenging. I would like to ask for the arts commission to be working -- and

[6:17:32 PM]

I don't know how much -- the music commission to work on this. And they have a lot of really creative ideas. Councilmember tovo and I had a conversation about do we just put this in arts? So I don't have a problem with us as council deciding that we want to put a couple million dollars into that, but I think it really deserves the thought and the care. I think that we also need to make sure that arpa money is getting out the door. We're just putting in if we pass this another million dollars into the non-profit creative arts which will help many of these same organizations if we wanted to cut elsewhere. There are, you know, a hundred organizations that applied that are eligible, you know, for this \$20,000 grant, and, you know, we could add more money in that and reach more organizations and, again, that money could be out the door tomorrow, or whenever the manager is comfortable with the fiscal year. Way, if we wanted to cut something else that we could,

[6:18:34 PM]

you know, think about doing that. But I feel pretty strongly that the arts commission and our EdD department have been working really, really hard to make some pivots so that our art support is more diverse, and is really helping to support the ecosystem, and if we're not going to be using hot dollars, then we have opportunities that the hot dollars don't allow us to do. And I think that we're also playing with fire with the hot dollars right now.

>> Mayor adler:councilmember Fuentes, what do you think?

>> Fuentes: Yes, I'm happy, you know, to withdrawal this writer for now with the thought of having a more robust conversation that includes our arts commission and the arts community, you know, inviting everyone to come share their thoughts on how things are going. And also -- and thank you all for bearing with us as we had this conversation. It was certainly timely and needed. And I know that everyone here is receiving emails and getting

[6:19:34 PM]

meeting requests from artists and creatives within their districts. So this is a very important conversation that we need to be having as a community. And, of course, I welcome it. And the need still remains, you know, and so certainly I'll be working with my co-sponsors, councilmember kitchen and councilmember pool, to look at bringing forward an ifc at our next council meeting. And convening those appropriate conversations. As y'all know, EdD did send us a memoup the day on just a few days ago so there's a lot of good information in this memo that has helped to provide even more clarity and context to the state of the creative sector as it stands with the fundings that we have allocated. But, also, it raises more questions. And so I realize that it's definitely worth a larger conversation. And I want us to have it for the community. So I think that I'll come back.

[6:20:39 PM]

I'll withdraw the writer and, of course, I welcome any of our arts community that are watching this right now, please, do not hesitate to reach out to us and to let us know your thoughts and any suggestions that you have as we move forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes, I really appreciate your leadership on this and keeping this issue front and center and I join you in everything that you just said, as well as the urgency associated with this, because people are doing their next fiscal year and they need to know what it is that they have or not have. So if there's a way for to us go greater than the \$3.5 million that is the hybrid that staff is doing, doing any one of these options, the sooner that we find that out, the better those organizations can plan their year. So it would be great if we could come back in the end of August, the first meeting in September if possible to talk about whether we're ready to propose something or not. Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I had a question for miss Robb. With the non-profit relief

[6:21:39 PM]

grant, I know that there's 100 plus organizations that are waiting and with this proposal we would be able to fund another 50. Do you think that, you know, the groups that are in the 150 to 175 range, you know, merit that funding from what you know about it at this point?

>> To my knowledge, all of them are eligible, and so, yes, they meet the spirit of the program.

>> Alter: So maybe I might make an amendment to our proposal since we're putting \$3.6 million into reserves that we could take the \$500,000 of reserves and add that to the non-profit grant which would get another \$500,000 out the door to the creative organizations, because we don't need to have both, and that might be another hybrid piece.

>> Mayor Adler: So that would in essence then on alter five,

[6:22:40 PM]

increase it from 1 to 1.5, and it would tap into 500 of the reserve eliminate that's just about to happen from dsd? Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I'm supportive of that. I just want to say -- I would be repolice to not point out that there are organizations and non-profits and artists who are not covered with the non-profit grant. From my understanding they're not eligible for a number of reasons. So I just want to point out that there still is a great need and there's a gap of individuals who are very concerned about the type of funding they're going to receive. And so I just wanted to point that out.

>> Mayor Adler: The other alternative is to take that 500 and put it in the cultural arts, and go from 3.5 to 4. And move it directly into that

[6:23:40 PM]

account as well.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Is that doable for staff?

>> I believe that they confirmed that is a possible as well. And councilmember Fuentes, I wanted to say thank you, we appreciate your understanding and we certainly have heard the council's comments because the arpa funding and I can tell you that staff is working diligently with the arts and music commissions on this so we can get it out as soon as possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes, I would support -- I would support -- I think that you just mentioned, mayor -- it's hard with you all talking with each other for us to participate in the conversation. But I think that I would suggest that if we -- if \$500,000 is appropriate to take out of the 3.8 that we put it towards what councilmember Fuentes was trying to do, which is to put it towards that bucket of funding. I think that's what you just

[6:24:41 PM]

suggested there. I wasn't quite clear on what you were suggesting. And that goes to what councilmember pool suggested a while back, which is that we could use some of that amount of the 3.8 to be helpful here.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: So, again, the cultural arts fund is used to fund folks to put on performances, which in the short run is not going to happen, and folks need this money to survive as an organization. So I might suggest that what we do is we say that that \$500,000, which is not from the 3.8, but the 3.8 allows us to have our reserves requirement, what is in the proposal that we have before us, that we earmark that to the arts commission to determine whether it should go in the cultural arts fund or add it to the non-profit relief because they have a sense of what's going to -- you know, work with EdD staff to determine that.

[6:25:41 PM]

The cultural arts funding, as I understand, is still going through a process. It's going to be months and months before it comes out. I mean, there may be reasons to do either, I don't know that we'll resolve them today. My concern, I think that this is the concern that motivated the writer in the first place, is one that councilmember Fuentes and I share, which is to get the money out to the creative sector, you know, as soon as possible. And, yes, that doesn't -- but a lot of those people aren't eligible for the cultural arts funding who need the support either. You know, so I think that we don't -- I don't know that we have to make a decision between which pot today. I think that we could delegate that to EdD and the arts commission and have them do it in all haste, but I don't think that we should just put it in performances, that may not happen.

>> Mayor Adler: Can we go back a second if they do that in the last week of August or the first week of September, that is still

[6:26:42 PM]

timely. And one of the things that we should ask them to look at is the 3.8 that is here and take a look at the arpa funding and take a look at how the different funds can be used. Some more flexibly than others and different programs, and then come back to us with the recommendation, rather than us trying to decide it while we're on the dais, because I'm concerned about doing it without the input. I would like to hear what my arts commission and my music commissioners would tell us. Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I'm getting input from my arts commission as we're having this discussion, and that individual is suggesting that it would be helpful if they had an opportunity to weigh in. You know, they did weigh in on this subject, there are differences as many of you have mentioned in how in the flexibility of hot versus arpa, and they are serving different purposes. So I would suggest that we -- we allow our commissioners to weigh in on the proposal and help guide it in the direction that

[6:27:43 PM]

seems to fit everybody's goals.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, so councilmember Fuentes, you okay with withdrawing this but asking the staff to come back in the end of August or the first week in September on their proposal on how to work this out?

>> Fuentes: Yes. And to add in, definitely want to hear from our arts commission and from anyone in the creative sector, please, send us your thoughts and emails. I think that their input should be considered as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I'm not going to be able to be here on the September 2nd meeting. So I'd like to be present. Taking my daughter to college. So I would appreciate it if you could schedule that for a meeting that I would be at and to do it as quickly as possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. So that line item is coming out of that spreadsheet. Collectively we moved that spreadsheet but the record reflected who the maker was. If the record would reflect that

[6:28:44 PM]

the seconds to each of those are the people that were the co-sponsors on each of those items and just list them as the seconds of those items. Okay? And so there's an amendment to the base motion that is the page that Ed showed us, except that Fuentes thing comes off, and everything else stays the same. Set at the 4.7% option. Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: I know that there are a couple of councilmember tovo's that I was trying to co-sponsor but didn't get on so she has a bunch that don't have co-sponsors and I'd be happy to be the second for those.

>> Mayor Adler: Please, please show that. Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Yes, thank you. I'm not sure that I had any co-sponsors, but, thank you. I know that some of you had indicated an interest in doing that and councilmember alter, thank you for doing that. I had new language to read in for one of the amendments related to the family resource

[6:29:45 PM]

centers that I'd like to become part of this. And I believe that I also understand the ems item is off .

>> I'm going to go back in my communications and figure out well let me read the language first.

>> Mayor Adler: We will take a dinner break when we have the writers added, we will be able to adopt the budget there will be more time council member tovo if you needed to be able to--

>> Councilmember tovo: Sort out the ems I will with the staff on the break. If I could just change my amendment and this is the amendment related to the family resource centers. My direction is going to be to allocate that money to--

[6:30:46 PM]

>> >> Mayor Adler: Which number is this?

>> Councilmember tovo: We will do the writers first and circle back around.

>> Mayor Adler: Sorry.

>> Councilmember tovo: I'm working towards the issues you raised but we can do it later with the writers .

>> Mayor Adler: All right so.

>> Councilmemer kitchen: Mayor I have a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmemer kitchen?

>> Councilmemer kitchen: The staff can email us the spreadsheet we can look at it over dinner break I'm confused about arpa and council member tovo had several out of arpa and so did I. Is that included in the spreadsheet we're working on now. Or do we vote on those as part of the writers? I think council member tovo had the dac and health care for the homeless and lms, the licensed mental professionals out of arpa and I

[6:31:48 PM]

had heal.

>> >> Mayor Adler: Is Dianna here? To talk about those items?

>> Councilmemer kitchen: My question mayor is whether they're on this list that was put up and--if Diana says it's all covered in heal then it's going to be easy for us. If all of those elements are cover inside arpa it's easy for us if there is an issue they will identify that and that may be the quickest way to resolve your question.

>> Councilmemer kitchen: My question is what piece of paper does it show on that we vote on that's what my shows on my piece of paper Diane yeah answered the question related to heal I wanted to know the piece of paper that the staff put up that we just moved didn't show heal on it. So, that's why I'm wanting to know just what piece of paper I would be looking at. That is all.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do that as a writer element so it's

[6:32:48 PM]

recorded as part of the budget motion we approve.

>> Or just separate amendments they are not writers they are allocations.

>> Mayor Adler: They are not allocations of the general fund budget we haven't brought the arpa fund into this. That's why I was thinking as a direction it has the same force of reaction of the council it doesn't relate to the budget that's in front of us.

>> Councilmember tovo: As councilmember kitchen said thank you for bringing that up I need to do that then with the ones I'm proposing as well some are on the list as 0.

>> Mayor Adler: We have Dianna here to speak to them if there are any issues F there are any issues that gives us dinner to work through those issues go ahead. Ed.

>> For the arpa funding there is a framework and did approve the appropriations that is why it's not on the spreadsheet the funds have been appropriated

[6:33:48 PM]

and budget direction how you want us to use those appropriated funds would be the way to go.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Mrs. Grey are you with us?

>> I am.

>> Mayor Adler: Can we address again there are some dollars related to homelessness and we want to know whether in your opinion, they are part--they are appropriate in effort and scale and all that stuff as part of this other plan that comes out of the arpa homelessness dollars designated.

>> Yes sir. So the--all of the various factions that have been presented are I would say generally consistent with the city's strategies around homelessness and generally with the strategies that were outlined in the summit plans and goals something I have discussed with many of the councilmembers over the course

[6:34:48 PM]

of the past week is that council has asked us to come back not only with the broad investment plan for the 515 million but then of that of course, we need to determine comprehensive standpoint how we're programming the 106 million total that council has set aside for the purposes of meeting the summit goals and addressing the challenge of homelessness in our community. My recommendation has been that, um...I would prefer that we do that all at once for the fiscal year 22 funds rather than piecemeal. Simply so that we're able to share with council what that sort of strategic portfolio of investments looks like and likely then subsequently go through either an allocation process, um...and/or a

[6:35:51 PM]

solicitation in many cases because we do as part of the summit want to be having community conversations not only with our providers but with our other funding partners and bringing new service providers in particular into the fold in particular around increasing equity. And so my answer is twofold. Yes they are consistent but also I think it might be more coherent and more impactful for us to have all of those writers occur at once as we look at the remainder of the 106 million that is appropriated for fiscal year 2022.

>> Mayor Adler: I want today divide the question in half. The first question is are we comfortable these elements will be paid off out of the arpa homelessness dollars? Because

[6:36:51 PM]

if we're not comfortable saying that, then we need during this budget process to find a different source for those funds. A separate question we're going to be dealing with on writer is the question you just raised which relate to how do we direct those funds be spent with respect to vendors or those kinds of questions. All right. So, I want to deal with the first one of those questions first. Not yet with the second one of those questions. And as I look at the chart we have, kitchen three which is \$6 million that is heal phase two and tovo3 and 4 seem to be things that have dollars that are not coming out of on going 1-time. So, they would be coming out of the arpa funds and I want to know if those three things and I think those are the three things. Is

[6:37:53 PM]

there another one?

>> Tovo5.

>> Mayor Adler: I think tovo5 has been shown coming out of 1-time dollars. It's the same thing but it's budgeted there and the total is up on the thing. So, it's kitchen three, tovo5 and 4 has been covered in the roll up it's shown us. Are you comfortable with kitchen three, tovo3 and 4 as being appropriate expenditures out of the arpa homelessness fund?

>> The types of expenditure described in those amendments or writers are all consistent. However it's different to separate the two questions you have posed. Kitchen three does not define the final recipient of the funds. If I'm not mistaken, um...tovo 3 allocates

[6:38:53 PM]

funding to a city department, to downtown Austin community court and number four represents funding to integral care. So, they are named within those documents.

>> And I understand [multiple speakers].

>> Mayor Adler: There's a writer we're going to be considering later that says the designation notwithstanding, staff has the discretion to make sure it goes to the right person or the right entity or the right system. The council may or may not pass that. But we're not dealing with that now. What we are dealing with now is are we comfortable with this amount of money for these functions, these purposes, be allocated out of the arpa dollars?

>> As I stated earlier, wholly comfortable on health and the rapid rehousing because of its prominence within the summit plan. 3 and 4 I would say

[6:39:54 PM]

generally yes but they are more specific investments that were not described in the plan. It does not cause me any particular concern that we are diverging from that purpose.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay what I would propose is we have a writer that we agree to that says that kitchen three, two is 3 and 4 shall be funded out of the arpa \$100 million when you bring that money by writers being directed for the purposes described in those things recognizing they are still writer which we may or may not cover later that deals with who it is that actually gets the dollars.

>> Yes sir.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie does that work for you?

>> Councilmember two: It does not. Let me explain why. So, several of these I don't mind having the discussion, just

[6:40:54 PM]

understanding we're going to need to circle back because if--there's a broader context I don't think all of my colleagues have been a part of that I will just share or we can share after the break but you know the situation is in last year's budget we asked the downtown Austin community court to please identify their unmet needs and report back to us on what those are. They have done so. In April. They provided us with a memo that outlined their needs and that outlined my amendments the underlying point of this conversation is that now because they're being funded because my proposal is to fund them out of arpa there is a suggestion perhaps while the service can be delivered, these would be, um...open to other vendors. And I just I think there is an absolutely

[6:41:55 PM]

fundamental difference between seeking out a third party to provide some services and funding our city departments and so I really, um...have to I'm going to have to have a very serious significant thorough conversation with all of you if the money we allocated for homelessness through American rescue plan dollars if our downtown Austin community court which is our front line diversion center for individuals primarily not exclusively primarily dealt with homelessness and now tasked working with all of the individuals who come through through prop B enforcement they don't have the resources around tools they need to work with those individuals and connect them with housing I think we're going to have to go back and

[6:42:55 PM]

consider how we allocated our arpa dollars, we have to be able to fund our city department on the front lines along with the other folks on the front lines including the homeless strategy office obviously. I'm super concerned if we're going to make the dac compete with other third party vendors we need to function what the function and the role is of the dac as we move forward in continuing to prioritize individuals experiencing homelessness, and continue to experience homelessness in Austin. I have concerned about the writers you expressed I need to during the break figure out some of the funding is here, some of the funding is here and some of the funding is in arpa1 I think that you may have skipped over is three because the one time costs are vehicles for those case managers that I have

[6:43:56 PM]

proposed to be funded out of arpa.

>> Mayor Adler: Which one?

>> Councilmember tovo: I think it's three. I need a break just to regroup but another one is health care for the Holmes health and wellness center which is a proposal that downtown Austin alliance came to us and asked us to participate in. The dac had extra funding they were able to put toward it. That extra funding but for if we don't make this allocation, that is additional funding won't be at max the downtown Austin alliance has put it in their budget where this is an allocation I hope to make because it's our piece of that match. We know we have several hundred people on the wait list to have expressed an interest and have been identified as having a need for mental health resources among the population of individuals experiencing homelessness in the area of the dac these are

[6:44:59 PM]

not services I want to--I want to fund them at the capacity.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand that. Let's work over and Diana grey if you could I could consider looking at the tovo four as almost as a grant offer that requires a match to a certain place. So, you know that's a little bit different because we're using those dollars to leverage but it's tied to a specific user it may be it's appropriate in those instances for the council to approve something that identifies a specific vendor because it's about receiving a grant that is tied to a vendor.

>> Councilmember tovo: Let's be clear the vendor in many of these cases is the city department.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand that. And you and I disagree philosophy I'm trying to find a way our Venn diagrams overlap I will work with you over dinner to see if there's a way to do

[6:46:00 PM]

that. I was just trying to present one that might enable us to get done tonight in a way that gives you what you want out of this but is also me being able to stay true to concerns I have expressed the last six years identifying vendors I'm trying to find that place. I understand--

>> Councilmember tovo: We do have a fundamental disagreement whether a city department should be treated or regarded

[multiple speakers].

>> Mayor Adler: You and I might not be able to resolve that you might not convince me I might not convince you I want to find a place that moves forward tonight that is true to what we think. That's what I'm searching for here. If it's possible over dinner, Mrs. Grey I would like to talk to you about that issue and I would like to talk then the tovo three as well. But in any event

[6:47:00 PM]

I think we're all okay with these dollars going to this place, we can have the conversation if needed later about whether we're doing--making any changing to the budget amendment through a writer. Yes.

>> I want to be familiar are you questioning it's going to particular vendor or questioning whether it's coming out of arpa money.

>> Mayor Adler: The particular vendor.

>> Councilmember alter: You are fine with this coming out of arpa money.

>> Mayor Adler: I understood her answer to say yes.

>> Councilmember alter: All we're trying to find the city with arpa money that allows you not--

>> Mayor Adler: Potentially.

[Multiple speakers].

>> Councilmember alter: I want today make sure the question wasn't--I was glad I was miss interpreting I thought you were questioning the arpa use. We can put the positions under

[6:48:01 PM]

Mrs. Grey's office and switch them around that is the problem.

>> Mayor Adler: No. That's why I break it into two questions and we asked that question.

[Multiple speakers].

>> The wording .

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Councilmemer kitchen: Is that vendor the issue piece to resolve tonight. I would like to get through the budget if this is an issue and you and council member tovo have to hash out more intensively but doesn't effect the fact it's arpa and we can get the budget piece done tonight can we table that piece and you guys work on it? Outside of--

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think we need to. I'm not sure we're going to be able to get past that. What you are saying is exactly what I have been trying to say here the last 20 minutes there is potentially a way for us to do that. I think maybe there is a way for us to work that out over dinner that allows our writer to get past in a way dresses it in other

[6:49:04 PM]

situations but be able to proceed in a way that council member tovo is comfortable.

[Multiple speakers] It's not something we can work out on the dais as we're sitting here now.

>> Councilmember tovo: I agree. I want to explain to councilmember pool why it's relevant F there is not an agreement that the dac would be the recipient of the funding we need to look for the funding within the budget we're about to pass.

>> Councilmember pool: I understand. And loose ends like that can be addressed. I think there's a collective will to finish tonight and not too late is really what's--[multiple speakers].

>> Mayor Adler: I think we are unanimous on that. We have this in front of us all the changes the amendments to it that is now in the base motion. Council member tovo and councilmember alter move to add to this the--

>> Mayor before you add to it,

[6:50:04 PM]

can we get a second for the base motion?

>> Mayor Adler: It's everybody.

>> Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: The second to the page. Each of the lines were individually made by the person who moved those lines and a second to each of those lines are the people that showed as cosponsors with the addition that those of council member tovo that didn't have any sponsors shown the second is councilmember alter.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: That collective group of amendments without objection is now made part of the base motion [multiple speakers].

>> Correct. We didn't have a second for the original base motion with staff amendments .

>> Mayor Adler: It was everybody. Everybody made the motion. Since everybody made the motion we don't need a

[6:51:05 PM]

second if anybody want today know who seconded it it's everybody, too. Okay? Sorry. All right. So, the last piece we're going to add to this is the transfer from the reserve from dsd to the general fund reserve. Councilmember alter?

>> Councilmember alter: So council member tovo and myself move to reduce the general fund transfer to development services 3.8 million as first of two year plan for the stabilization fund for the seed provided in 2019 when dsd transition to enterprise fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Cool. All right. We have two people that make that motion is there a second to that motion?

>> I second that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool and [inaudible] And councilmember Ellis seconds that, too.

>> Add me to that motion so happy to sign up.

>> Mayor Adler: I like to be

[6:52:06 PM]

shown as a second too also on the cap pea question. Council member tovo.

>> Councilmember tovo: I think you brought yours forward without a cosponsor.

>> I cosponsored one of his.

>> Mayor Adler: Do the degree they need a second will someone second mine? Mayor pro tem seconds mine if there is a second listed. All right. I think we have everything done here, we can get back to our script other than the budget writers we're going to take a look at over dinner then we can blow through the rest of this. Right? We have dinner to be able to work on that. And you were going to get that out to everybody you may have already emailed it out to everybody that would be great. It is 6:52 right now. Eight minutes to seven. Do we want to come back at 7:45? 7:30? Can you all do

[6:53:06 PM]

7:30. All right. We will come back at 7:30. We will handle the writers then we should be on track to finish tonight. We are recessed.

(Meeting in recess).

[7:50:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem I think we're set to start. All right. It is 7:49. We're going to go ahead and convene. We had the base motion in front of us. I'm going to make some change to the my budget writer. Kathie I think you were going to make a language change to one that concerned aid can you read that into the record? This is a budget amendment.

[7:51:10 PM]

>> Okay while I continue to look for it. Make I make a different comment, the number on the spreadsheet is off by 4,000 in the ems amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. This is the ems equipment for downtown?

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: What do you think the correct number?

>> Um... Plus 4,000. Okay. So here's the language I'm going to add to clarify my amendment this is the aye tempt that had been expressed as Austin voices and this language is as follows the city manager is directed to allocate \$520,000 dedicated to the Austin independent school district family source center to connect community partners parents campuses grassroots organization together with 8aisd family source center.

[7:52:11 PM]

[Reading] Hubs as well as to provide regular opportunities for family members for campus and campus community improvements.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you very much for doing that. It's a great organization I think if we were up here picking vendors or providers that is probably the one we would all pick I appreciate you saying let's give it to aid and go through whatever process just as we would. I appreciate that.

>> Councilmember tovo: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have an objection to the item? Hearing none, that amendment is made. Conversations with respect to budget writers on my budget writer that deals with standard solicitation. This is just the writer ewes used to be a day when city council was approached by friends and others in the community trusted partners in the community and

[7:53:11 PM]

get lobbied on specific contracts over the years we have try today move past that and say we're not going to approve particular vendors from the dais, we will let the staff do that with whatever it's process is. The budget writer merely says follow standard solicitation process considering srpbder selection that doesn't mean any particular formal kind. Do whatever is standard even if one is called out I will aepbd many this is an except for 3, 4, 5 I will explain why the tovo's 3, 4, 5 with respect to number three, that's dac that is city department. Just like giving money to pard. I think it is rapid rehousing there are other rapid rehousing providers in the city so I would like to part doesn't have a competitor this does except we support Parde and support dac doing a

[7:54:12 PM]

phenomenal job and want to encourage it but because my main goal is just to say we shouldn't be in the provider selection place. In this instance, I don't think three falls within that appropriate per view in case there is any doubt I'm excluding three. I'm also excluding number four. In essence is a grant proposal it's coming to uses half of it's paid to somebody else it's tied to a vendor in that instance I think there's a different situation that's associated with that. And accepting number five the host team that does have a specific third party providers associated with that care. Staff recommended that we increase money for host money and we kind of considered that as a, um...kind of a tool. So, I think that's different as well. So, the description that is contained in the budget

[7:55:14 PM]

writer I'm just going to strike just leave the budget direction that says to the degree they just use whatever the appropriate solicitation process is. Anybody--yes?

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> You and I had talked about excluding the one that relates to Austin cares and that would be kitchen two. That is an extension of a contract [audio cutting out] In it's existing contract.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes I think that is right. Also kitchen two. That is adding two months to the back of that contract.

>> Councilmember kitchen: It's three months.

>> Mayor Adler: Three months. Okay. Councilmember pool.

>> Councilmember pool: So the same with pool amendment number two which is expansion of the existing contract with the other ones foundation for the clean up of our in this case, specifically, watershed

[7:56:16 PM]

protection lands.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, we don't get into discussion I am going to exclude pool but that's a contract of the type I think a lot of providers the two is great work program is great. This is the kind of thing that gets sent out for bid for providers of the community to be able to participate in and to--it could easily be this is the organization that would be chosen to do this work. Certainly when we bid it out before they were the ones selected to do the work.

>> Councilmember pool: As far as I remember I could be wrong, my memory is no one else bid on it at the time I think if you are going to change these rules, we need to give people a longer--councilmember

kitchen you might want to mute--a longer run way to prepare for this because we have been in pretty clear communication with these folks that this was on

[7:57:18 PM]

the budget line up I would ask for a little bit more time on the run way. And also would point out that tooth was the only entity when this first began and they do have a particular program that

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: I think that I might be able to square this, what you raised, councilmember pool. I don't read your writer saying that all of these must be put out to solicitation, even though it has the word "Solicitation "In the title, it doesn't indicate that there must be a solicitation process for each. What you're saying is that we're giving the money to the staff to allocate to the appropriate group by whatever method is the best method to get the best work done. So if that is a solicitation process, then it should be that. But if, in fact, the staff says, look, there actually aren't other group doing this and we want to expand an existing contract, you wouldn't oppose the staff doing that either, you just want it to go through the

[7:58:19 PM]

process as you wrote that staff would use to get you justice, efficiency, etc. And so the staff may say that we should not go to bed and in some cases staff might go to bed.

>> Mayor Adler: That's very true. And that's what I meant by saying that you use whatever process staff wants to use. In this case, the budget amendment itself doesn't list any particular provider, it just lists a program. And we bid out for the providers to do that program. The description --

>> Can I make --

>> Mayor Adler: Let me finish -- let me finish before you talk, hang on. In this particular case, the description of this contains a description of this. And I would take that as a direction to hire. I'm going to also exclude pool number -- which number is this, Leslie?

>> Two.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to --

>> [Indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Exclude pool number 2 from this as well for the relationships that Leslie

[7:59:20 PM]

just gave that perhaps there was a notice, but I would say that as we work from mid-dais, and I will state out really loud and clear for everybody so that there's notice -- to the degree that the dais has identified a particular provider for something, I don't think that's our place. And I think that the community needs to know that they want to get the contract, they can't come to the councilmember to try to get money for their particular program, or, you know, no matter how good they are and even if they're the only one thing -- they should advocate for the need. We should approve the need. And then the staff should pair the need to whoever it wants to. I will exclude it here if there's a measure of ambiguity so we can move on and get done tonight, but I'll just state really loudly I think that is the right thing to do. And I'll try to hold to that in the future. Councilmember Kelly. And then councilmember alter.

>> Kelly: I want to say -- excuse me -- thank you for

[8:00:20 PM]

pointing that out and it's important to go through a competitive bid process to help not just the city but the taxpayers, because at the end of the day we have to be good stewards of taxpayer money. And I appreciate this coming to light. Thank you.

>> Mayor adler:councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I agree with the sentiment of what you're talking about and I would like to understand what in alter one, which is the resilience falls in this category, the two types of training are the training that the departments have --

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think that there's anything in alter number one to do that, which is why I'm saying that I am striking through all of the description. So the only thing that continues is the budget --

>> Alter: I missed that. Sorry, I missed that.

>> Mayor Adler: No, no problem. All right, anybody object to that amendment? To the amendment? Hearing none, that change is made. All right, that gets us to the riders. Does anybody else want to pool and to discuss any of the other riders that are in front of us.

[8:01:21 PM]

Fuentes B.R. One, and two, and three and four and five. It is Casar, B.R. One. And it is kitchen B.R. One, two and three and four. It is Kelly B.R. One. And it is tovo B.R. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. And it is alter B.R. One, two, three. And it is Adler, b.r.1 and two. Anyone want to discuss any of those? Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: I don't need to pull this one. I wanted to sign on to Fuentes five. And I want to speak to Kelly one and kitchen one. And I want to pull kitchen three and I want to sign on to tovo resilience hubs.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, will the record reflect that councilmember alter is signing on to the two that she wanted to

[8:02:21 PM]

sign on to. Let's -- let's raise the one that you might have questions about. Which one -- there was one that I think that you -- you had questions about the other that you wanted to speak to?

>> Alter: I want to speak to kitchen -- the two academy ones that I wanted to speak to, Kelly and kitchen. And then I had a question about kitchen three.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, why don't you raise that kitchen three.

>> Alter: So kitchen three has -- is the part about parental leave. And I wanted to see if she would accept a friendly amendment. Normally these kinds of benefits are done in a contracting process when you have staff. So I wanted to add at the end of the rider that this process should also include which options might be eligible for inclusion in the contract renegotiation process.

[8:03:21 PM]

>> Kitchen: May I accept that? I think that's -- the point of it -- and that is kitchen four, by the way.

>> Alter: Sorry, you're right.

>> Kitchen: The point was to bring us back options, and I certainly agree that that was the intent. And so if you'd like to add that language, that's no problem.

>> Alter: Thank you. And I will send it to you and the clerk.

>> Mayor Adler: What was the language, just reading it again, please.

>> The process should also include which options might be eligible for inclusion in the contract renegotiation process. Because they -- we're going -- normally those kinds of things would be part of the contract. There may be reasons with this particular type of benefit that we don't want to do it through the contract, but I think that should be transparent through the process that the city manager comes back with.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that amendment being added? Thank you for doing that. I agree with that too.

[8:04:22 PM]

As the concerns of the groups that we have with contracts like, that I think that it's important that these kinds of things are negotiated as part of those contracts.

>> Kitchen: And mayor, if I may speak to that. The attempt was simply to bring the options back to the council as a whole to talk about. So without making, you know, a decision right now about what the appropriate avenue was, so I think that having an option that comes back that makes them part of the contract is great. Some of us may not feel that it needs to be part of the contracting process, but we can have that discussion later when the option comes back to us.

>> Alter: Did you want me to speak to the other ones?

>> Mayor Adler: Are you pulling them because you want to question them?

>> Alter: Well, other people may have questions after I speak, but if other people want to go next, that's fine too.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right, what I'm trying to do is to find outcome one of these

[8:05:22 PM]

we might have to vote on individually, as opposed to voting on them collectively. Almost like pulling it off the consent agenda. I'm treating this as if it were a consent agenda at this point as people make changes. So I don't know the nature of what you were going to say.

>> Alter: Why don't we pull it and we will vote after you have done the other ones.

>> Mayor Adler: Which is the other one that you pulled?

>> Alter: The Kelly one on academy and the kitchen one on the academy. Moip okay. So kitchen B.R. Two is pulled and Kelly B.R. One is pulled. And I'm pulling kitchen B.R. Three. Other ones to pull? Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I just wanted to say that is why my hand was raised. I wanted to pull kitchen three.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes?

>> Staff just want to note that

[8:06:23 PM]

it's for tovo B.R. Two on the downturn community court. Just some of the times and T time frames. We would ask for grace. We have a memo that we'll update the council imminently so that will be going out soon, but we just want to make sure that we are hearing the direction that is provided in the budget rider but knowing that some of the time frames may need to be adjusted based on new information that we get at the time. So we'll continue to update council with the information as we receive it, but then specifically with some of the site remediation and when construction could start, those time frames may have to change.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, do we want to change any days in the rider?

>> The time frame is aggressive and my main intent to make sure that there's an agreed upon time frame and we start at that point.

[8:07:24 PM]

And if -- you know, if construction can't begin in January 2022, then I would at least -- I would expect there to be a real plan. And so that's the intent here if we're off by some months, you know, obviously it has to be a realistic plan, but it has to be -- there has to be a plan and that's my -- that's my ask. So if what you're saying is, like, you know, you may not be able to get -- which I understand because it may -- it was a pretty aggressive time frame.

[Laughter] You know, if you can't get back what the permanent location is by September 15th, I understand that. But we need to be able to tell people what the permanent location is and then how quickly we're going to move on with one Texas center. I don't want these to be sort of pending questions and then one Texas center becomes the permanent option by default.

>> I think in future updates if we need to make adjustment to this direction with your

[8:08:26 PM]

concurrence and we'll continue to move forward. As you said it's an aggressive timeline and I want to meet your expectations but I'm putting it out there that this may need to be adjusted based on what information we get.

>> That's understandable.

>> Is this B.R. Eight, which one is this?

>> Two.

>> Mayor Adler: Tovo two? Can we add to this -- to the rider that in the event that the manager can't make those deadlines, he'll report to council.

>> That's what happens anyway. I mean, we very frequently pass resolutions and we just government one today, this morning I think. I forget what memo that was, it just says that we can't meet the deadline and we're informing you of an extension. I think that is the default. And just, you know, I mentioned this the other day that I likely will follow up with the ISD which I already drafted. There were elements in the draft that I didn't put in the direction, but, you know, we definitely need storage in multiple parts of the city. And I know that's been in

[8:09:27 PM]

various resolutions before, but I think that it becomes even more essential during this phase of prop B that if people are being brought to the dak for adjudication we have a real plan for how to get them back to their parts of the city where they reside, and a real plan for where they can store their belongings. And we don't have any of those -- we don't have all of those details nailed down. And so likely, manager, I'll follow up with an ISD to capture some of those pieces unless they're in your plan, which they may be.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, any other ones to pull? All right. So the consent of this is -- the ones that we have pulled that we'll discuss here are kitchen B.R. Two, and B.R. Three, and Kelly one. And Fuentes was withdrawn. So anymore to pull? Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: I need to make a correction to one of mine.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: Under the Austin -- I'm sorry -- under the right to return, right to stay preference

[8:10:29 PM]

policy, the direction was to return the memorandum by spring 2021. That was just a typo. It should be 2022.

>> Mayor Adler: That is B.R. Seven? Tovo seven?

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, I didn't number mine, so I don't know.

>> Mayor Adler: It's tovo B.R. Seven.

>> Tovo: And that is it. I would like to at the appropriate time move approval of the items related to the dak that I put forward as amendments that are arpa funded.

>> Mayor Adler: All right, so there should be another rider that talks about the arpa funding and saying out of the already appropriated arpa homelessness dollars is the council intention that the items that were shown as kitchen three, which was heal, and tovo three and four, that case managers and healthcare for the

[8:11:29 PM]

homeless, are further descriptions of the already appropriated dollars for homelessness out of arpa. Is everybody okay with that direction? Did I catch that?

>> Mayor --

>> Tovo: I have a few comments to make at it at a appropriate time and a further direction to staff.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Yes, the language that I have in my budget rider one related to heal, I would like to pass all of that language. Not what you just named instead of it.

>> Mayor Adler: No, it's in addition to it.

>> Kitchen: Okay. In addition to is fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. All right, so we're pulling kitchen two, kitchen B.R. Three and Kelly B.R. One. Should we discuss these now? Let's do that. Let's talk about kitchen B.R. Two. I think that you pulled this, councilmember alter?

>> Alter: Yeah, I think that it would make sense to do Kelly

[8:12:30 PM]

B.R. One at the same time, because it relates to both of them.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: So before we passed kitchennies rider on academy and Kelly is on the modified academy which we spoke about at length, I think we need to proceed with our eyes open as to the challenges and the opportunities ahead. Over the last few weeks I and my staff member April brown have had several conversations with APD leadership, and I see chief chicone here in the room and city staff and advocates to really better understand how the cadet reimagining process is going. And we've learned that there are still many sincere concerns about the academy and about the reform process. As a council, we set out clear expectations and metrics. We voted unanimously in the spring to fully implement the short and long-term recommendations from crol and to evaluate the pilot class and make necessary changes ahead of

[8:13:32 PM]

additional classes. Before we vote on these riders, I need to express that I have deep reservations about our ability to get all of this done. In a short few months. I have additional concerns about our ability to overlap classes, especially three classes, from a physical space perspective, as well as with respect to our ability to meet our goals for cadet learning, experience and outcomes. I want to make sure that the city manager and the chief understand that in order for me ultimately to get to a place where I'm comfortable authorizing new classes, I really am going to need to see that APD has made significant process and that the benchmarks we set out since starting this process over a year and a half ago, and that there's a clear plan in place to run the cadet classes from a space and teaching standpoint. The first part is in these riders but there is a real question about the resources for the space and the teaching so

[8:14:33 PM]

that the cadets are learning in an environment where they can learn, and that our instructors have the ability to instruct them at the level that we expect. I want to be clear that as I say this, it comes from an understanding and a belief that we do need new officers. I recognize that, and I agree. I want us to have new officers. But I want them to be trained to be the kind of officers that our community is asking for. They need to understand and to be committed to this community and to their roles as community guardians. They need to appreciate our diversity and develop empathy for the historical experiences of community members. I think that it is also clear that the academy reimagining process must continue beyond the 144th class. These are major efforts our community and city are undertaking, and we must continue to honor this process. I firmly believe that we as a city can lead the nation in these kinds much processes and

[8:15:34 PM]

training and to be a model for others. With these concerns raised, I also want to say that I've also heard continued hope from the community that this process can work if we build trust, work openly and earnestly and commit to a true reimagining of our academy and our police force. We still have a lot of work to do. And I'm thankful to the doctor and the community and the staff members working on curriculum review and academy reform. And I also want to say that I appreciate chief chcone's commitment to this process. I am hopeful that the work will continue and that we'll continue to work together to lead the nation in community-oriented public safety. And I appreciate the guardrails that these budget riders provide as we move into this process. I think that it's imperative that we are very clear about our expectations and that we approach this process with open eyes and clarity, so that expectations can be very clear moving forward.

[8:16:34 PM]

Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Yes?

>> Thank you very much. To speak to my budget rider one, first, I would like to thank you councilmember alter. When we first had this idea you came to me and we talked about it, so I do feel that you have concerns and those are things that need to be answered, and those are things that I tried to implement as safeguards in the budget rider. And as we continue to learn more I think that we'll be able to adapt and overcome and create one of the best academies that the city of Austin has ever had. That's my hope. I want to be back to the shining light of what we used to be as a department, where people from all over the country wanted to come here to be part of this city. But factually, we still have vacancies. And we still have attrition that's very high. And so where this budget rider did not have a cost to the city, it provides the opportunity for our police department to be able to provide an alternative if

[8:17:35 PM]

they have the costs available to do so. It would provide the ability to have officers who have experience on our streets. Officers who could come in and help with the culture of the department. And I was wondering actually if we might be able to bring chief chicone up to explain more about the modified and talk to us about that.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, while you're doing that could I speak --

>> Mayor Adler: The chief is right here.

>> Good evening, mayor and council. Interim chief police chief. And thank you councilmembers alter and Kelly for addressing this critical issue that since I took over as interim chief of police has been my focus to make sure that we are moving the academy forward in the reimagine process. That we are kind of laser focused to make sure that we are doing all of the things that need to be done to meet the expectations that were outlined upon the approval of the class

[8:18:36 PM]

starting. And to your question, councilmember Kelly, with regard to a modified class. So just for clarity, when we refer to a modified academy, those are officers that are already peace officers, either in the state of Texas or in another state, that can be brought in to be licensed here in Texas. They go through a shortened academy because many of the things that we would teach in a regular cadet academy, they have already been through that training. They still have to meet all of our same entrance standards for a regular cadet class. Go through a background, psychological, all of the testing and everything that all of the rest of our normal cadets have to go through. But they have the ability to come in at a slightly higher rate of pay than a normal cadet to offset their experience, as well as to go through a shortened academy that gets them out on the streets more quickly.

>> Thank you.

[8:19:37 PM]

Could you please verify how many police vacancies we still have?

>> I didn't hear.

>> Can you tell us how many vacancies you have?

>> We're sitting below 1,650 and that number fluctuates day to day.

>> And how long a typical academy lasts, not modified?

>> The modified academy is around four months, 16 weeks. But we have, you know, I would like to see our modified academy go through the same process of putting our regular academy as far as curriculum review so it may decrease or increase a little bit but we want it generally half as time as normal.

>> So the normal academy is double the amount of time as modified?

>> Correct.

>> Awesome. What is your current attrition rate at the department?

>> We are losing anywhere from 15 -- sometimes a little bit more or less -- but we're

[8:20:38 PM]

averaging about 15 per month.

>> And that affects the response rates, correct?

>> Say that again?

>> That affects response rates to incidents across the city?

>> What is important to understand about attrition, it doesn't matter whether it's a resignation or a retirement, at what rate that occurs, because when we make promotions based on that vacancy, all of those vacancies come back down to the officer rank. And most of our officers are on patrol. So that's why all of the people leaving, even though many of them are not on patrol, they might be seasoned officers that have rank that are working in specialized units or are leadership for the department. Their vacancy will be carried at the office of rank because we'll promote up. That is what is hurting our patrol staffing and our response times.

>> Thank you. And one more question, to piggyback on some of the concerns that you have had -- what are some things that have

[8:21:39 PM]

been done at the academy that have been recognized and credited in a positive -- corrected in a positive way moving forward for future academies? Could you give me a couple of examples?

>> Actually, I have our director of training, Dr. Ann Krenion is on the line and I don't know if she could be moved over. If she is not available, I can surge address it but she is certainly the expert and would be able to provide very good examples. Is she with us?

>> While we're waiting, sorry, one last question. Could you tell us how many officers near the academy currently, based on the fact that we had a hundred start?

>> We are sitting at 88 out of the original 100 that started.

>> Mayor Adler: While we're waiting for the doctor to come over as well, chief, in talking to our mayors in dozens of other

[8:22:42 PM]

cities around the country, it seems as if everybody is having attrition issues and recruitment issues in law enforcement. Is that true?

>> I think that's very accurate. Right now folks are trying very hard to recruit and very hard to retain officers. It's a tough time for the profession.

>> Mayor Adler: Why is that, that it's happening virtually everywhere?

>> I would agree with that.

>> Mayor Adler: But, no, why, do you know?

>> I think that it is kind of a culmination of things. I can't speak to other places but certainly here in Austin, with, you know, some of the narrative that has been around policing recently, as well as one of the things that I have explained is that, you know, when I came on to the department in 1997, that was right when the department had signed its very first contract, pay for police officers jumped significantly and there was a very strong hiring push at that

[8:23:44 PM]

time. So there was a large number of officers that came on that are now eligible to retire. And so we have a number of people that are retiring that are eligible to retire. As well as some that are leaving the profession all together and go to pursue a different profession.

>> Mayor Adler: If you visit and you speak with other chiefs and other police departments around the country, and they're all dealing with the same kind of challenge, did you get any feel for what might be those common elements impacting all police forces around the country, I'd be interested in getting your assessment of that. You don't have to do that now. I see that the doctor is back.

>> I believe that councilmember kitchen wanted to speak.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll let her do that, but in answer to your question, I want to let that happen. You want to reask your question about the academy?

[8:24:46 PM]

>> Hi, Dr. Kreig. I was wondering if you could give us some examples of changes that you have made to the academy thus far through your process that have been positive based on the feedback that you've gotten?

>> Sure, absolutely. There's several things. Hi, welcome, council. One of the things that we have done is that we made sure to prioritize things like deescalation and we have actually written a grant that we're hoping that will be funded, a \$200,000 grant for deescalation for the cops office. But we're also working on a robust process of going through the curriculum. We went through and I reviewed everything, but we're also making sure that it's being reviewed at every single rank. So we're revamping the process to make sure that we have multiple reviews across all ranks to ensure that the curriculum is up-to-date. To check all of our sourcing at multiple levels and to address the concerns that we have heard from the community.

[8:25:46 PM]

And so we've also changed I think the culture of the academy. Commander Johnson and I have spoken in depth about how one of the things that we want to change is the way that we interact with our officers across rank. And I know that the leadership team is really committed that we can't have officers training cadets who don't feel safe being able to talk about what their concerns are, and so we have a really open culture that I think we've worked really hard on in last few months to say if we're having people train cadets, do they feel safe discussing the things that they want to happen out of the academy and things that are concerns on their end? And then I would say that the other aspect is, well, while we've been working with committees and there's been challenges, I think that we have embraced a culture of owning when we don't meet the community expectations. And making sure that we have processes in place, right? So I know that there's been a

[8:26:47 PM]

lot of concern this particular week as we've taken a little bit of a step back. And I would actually say that is abnormal for policing culture, right? So that decision to take a step back was difficult, and it was one that I needed to be able to think about what the community concerns were, what was the feedback that I was getting from the officers, what were the processes that were failing, and how to actually reimagine those processes. Instead of doing the same things. You know, so I don't want to paint a three golden amazing things like it's as if work is over, because we know that it's not. We know that we're continuously revising processes, and I think that one of the things that is really wonderful about the academy is that we're willing to say when we don't meet community expectation and to work on actually doing so. So I hope that answers your question and I'm open to any others as well.

>> That definitely answers my question and I don't know if

[8:27:48 PM]

councilmember alter had any follow-up questions or anybody else here. But I would say that I did not know until I had spoken with councilmember alter that the review commission or committee had taken a break. And I think that that was shocking for some of us here. I can't speak to everyone, but because the academy is under such scrutiny right now, I would like to ask that if we were to have something like that happen again, that the council gets an update ahead of time, if that could maybe happen, that would be helpful for me. I know that it would.

>> Certainly, councilmember, I'll make that commitment to you that we will keep you and the city manager office apprised if we have to do it again. I think that you heard Dr. Kringen kind of speak to that. This is a process really that nobody has undertaken before. And we are trying truly to reimagine the way that we are training our cadets to do it in a way that is going to meet community expectations.

[8:28:48 PM]

When there is a question about whether or not we're doing it the most efficient way that we're being respectful of our community members that are participating essentially as volunteers in this process to help us to all be successful, that we are, you know, we're not overburdening them, but at the same time we want to be efficient so we're not wasting their time either. So as all of that kind of came to light in these two committees, as well as outlining very strong goals in the mission of both committees, that's why the break was taken. Essentially they're going to miss one meeting and then we're right back on track again, outlining a framework of how that's going to work and bringing it back to the committee

members so that they have input into that, and, certainly, can help to craft it. And then we continue to move forward hopefully and then in an even more efficient manner.

>> Thank you very much.

[8:29:49 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have questions for the chief or Dr. Kringen while they're up here?

>> Kitchen: Yes, I want to speak to my budget rider which is on the curriculum review process. And I appreciate -- I also signed on to councilmember Kelly's. I appreciate what you put forward, councilmember Kelly, in terms of the potential for a third class that involves officers that have experience. And thank you for -- thank you for explaining that process. And I want to back up and explain what is in my budget rider with regard to the curriculum and then I'll have a question for Dr. Kringen. First it acknowledges the resolution that we all passed earlier in this year that set forth requirements for the

[8:30:51 PM]

curriculum. And it just acknowledges that as we go into this process of additional connect classes, that we will continue to follow those requirements. My rider also acknowledges that we would commence the 145th cadet class after recommendations from the evaluation and the review of the 144th cadet class had been incorporated and we've made substantial process on the crol report. And then also that there will be a progress report back to the council. And that, finally, authorization will come back to us when, you know, we are moving forward with two cadet classes and that APD will come back to us with requests authorize with the commencement of the 145th. So I just want to say,

[8:31:52 PM]

Dr. Kringen, that I really appreciate the work that you've been doing and thank you for the explanations of the changes that you all have been able to make with the academy. I have gotten good feedback. I have been talking with the curriculum review committee, and although they have mentioned and talked about the fact that it's very important that we continue to make these changes, I've also heard from them that they are hopeful about this process and appreciate this process. So I really appreciate the work that you have been doing. This is not easy, as others -- you know, the conversation that we just had. And, chief, I'd like to thank you also. This is not easy, but it is critical that we make these changes. And as we do that, and as we do that with the public, I am very pleased and hopeful that we're going to come out of this with a best practice, a national best practice, that can be recognized. And so I appreciate the work that you are all doing and I appreciate the explanation,

[8:32:52 PM]

chief, that you just gave us with regard to the reasoning behind the pause, the one-week pause in the curriculum review process, and the fact that is coming back in a way that will work better, as you have explained. And, again, all these things are very important. And I trust that we will proceed with them. So, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody else have any questions for the chief or Dr. Kringem? Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: Again, I do have -- well, I have lots of questions, but, y'all, it's 8:33 and we said that we'd finish tonight. So the one quick question that I would ask, whose idea was it to pause the community group, the group looking into oversight -- I'm sorry, the volunteer group's name is missing right now -- the

[8:33:53 PM]

committee. When councilmember Kelly said that she was surprised that the committee took a break, it implied that the committee opted to take that break. Was that the case?

>> So, mayor pro tem, I met with members of the training academy staff, including Dr. Kringen and commander Johnson and ultimately it was my decision to delay the committee by one meeting, to skip the one meeting, so that we would have an opportunity to work on the items that I was talking about, bring it back to the committee at our next scheduled date, and then pick the work right back up. That was my decision.

>> Harper-madison: I appreciate that clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: Any other questions for the chief and Dr. Kringen? Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have further comments on kitchen B.R. Two and Kelly B.R. One? Is everybody okay with kitchen

[8:34:53 PM]

B.R. Two and Kelly B.R. One? We need a vote on that, counselor alter?

>> Alter: I wanted that the city manager wanted to say something.

>> I was going to acknowledge and appreciate the important work that is being undertaken through this review process, the commitment that we have from the interim chief and from Dr. Kringem and from chief of staff Guay who is here as well. And this is an all hands on deck effort. We know that it's an a process that we learn as we move forward, and we will continue to give all of our efforts to make sure

that we have a reimagined academy that meets the expectations of our community and this council.
Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right, Patrick, thank you for that. And the chance to hopefully meet some of the cadets in the new class, chief, and a real impressive group and they'll fit in great with our force.
Councilmember Casar?

[8:35:53 PM]

>> Casar: I didn't want to ask the question because I wanted to save time. But I talked to Mr. Guay, and I wasn't aware that I didn't fully connect the dots until the chief mentioned that if we have a more senior officer retire, that may not be on patrol, with the state law issues that actually hits on the patrol level, and that seems like a challenge within the state law or something that we could handle within the contract, because that is unfortunate chain of events that if you have a more senior officer who is out for retirement that we don't have the discretion necessary to be able to reorganize our own resources accordingly.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right, let's go on then to the next item, which is kitchen B.R. Three. Mayor pro tem, you pulled this. You want to address it first, raise your issue?

>> Harper-madison: We both will. Yeah, I'm happy to raise my issue but my issue is requiring

[8:36:54 PM]

that I ask questions of staff, and I have three specific questions and I made sure to lay them out so they're easy to ask and easy to answer. I really want to be careful -- especially since we started 20 minutes late and I'd like very much for us to be efficient this evening and very much for everybody to take their fair share of time, ask questions and move on. So that's what I'm going to try to do right now. So I'd like for the staff to answer a couple of questions for me. I'll start with this one -- would executing this rider violate the contract with the voters, and what kind of legal liability does that expose project connect to is my first question. And there's two others that I would very much like to ask.

>> Our legal staff is coming up.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, what time is it appropriate for me to explain the rider? Am I supposed to wait until all of the questions are asked or do I get an opportunity to explain it?

>> Mayor Adler: You'll get an

[8:37:55 PM]

opportunity -- let's hear what the issues are and so then we can narrow it down to things that you need to address.

>> Mayor, councilmembers, city manager Leah fireside for the law department. I would say that right now I think that councilmember kitchen has re-written her rider to make it much more prospective and to ask staff to come back with an option, and given the way that that's framed, I don't see a risk at this time. You're on mute.

>> Harper-madison: All right. I don't see a risk, but then I don't see a risk and then I didn't hear the last part?

>> I don't see a risk at this time.

>> Harper-madison: At this time. Thank you. I appreciate that. Because, you know, when -- well, it's fine. It's neither here nor there. I think that my next question may not be for legal but if you want to stick around just a moment. Actually, it's not. So thank you for your time.

[8:38:56 PM]

I appreciate it. So my next question is -- do we have any sense of how capital metro and atp feel about this proposal? Is this something that could cause turbulence during the GPA negotiations?

>> Kitchen: Is that for me to answer?

>> Harper-madison: I was hoping that staff would direct it, if they have any idea. If that's the case. And, if not, then, absolutely, you can answer, please.

>> Mayor Adler: The city manager is coming up.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Thank you, councilmembers, assistant city manager Gina fiandoca. We have not discussed this with capital metro as it's not been adopted by the council -- not been adopted by the council at this time.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. And my third and final question is -- are we pre-determining which transit investments will need to be cut as a tradeoff for

[8:39:57 PM]

moving these transit dollars to anti-displacement strategies? And I think that might be a combination of transit and housing. I don't know. I'm tired.

>> Mayor, this is housing and planning department. I would rely back on what was just said that analysis hadn't been done because we haven't had this vote taken by the city council.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, any follow-up?

>> Harper-madison: Yeah, I mean, two of my three questions can't be answered.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann, the thing to address as you respond for me is, you know, I remember that back as -
- for the two year, or three-year lead-up to project connect, really the only

[8:40:59 PM]

discussions or most of the discussions were taking place were about the transit plan itself and the elements of the transit plan as it was being developed in the community meetings, and as the budgets were being developed to see what it was that should be the project cost that eventually would be need to be paid under whatever finance system was done. Really proud to be part of a council that then came and interrupted that process or appended to that process, the recognition that at the same time that we were paying for that transit program, which had also put some dollars against any displacement measures. And I think that through the work of many people on this dais, the number that was ultimately adopted by the various constituencies was in addition to the costs of the transit project itself, there would be an additional \$300

[8:42:00 PM]

million that would be added to that total. It was to be able to address the displacement measures. It went to the voters in a combined totals of those two dollars, each of them independently calculated. So for me, councilmember kitchen, this is something that I don't think that I can support on a policy basis because of the way that this was set up, there was one number for the project that people had indicated in the community that they wanted to get done. And then a second rule to address the associated displacement measures. I'm really proud of the \$300 million because that was more than anybody that we're aware of in any city that had put against that inherent challenge. So from a policy standpoint, putting aside the legal issue, this is something that I can't support. Councilmember kitchen --

>> Kitchen: Mayor, may I speak to it?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

[8:43:00 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay, first off -- and thank you, mayor pro tem for your questions. Those are very important questions. Questions that we all need to answer at the point that we vote on the jpa. And we don't need to answer them today, because we're not taking action today. What this -- what this rider does, it is a policy statement that is just asking for us to have an option to consider at the point that this comes back to us whether we vote on the jpa. So -- and to -- that's what it says. And so the questions that you're raising about violating the contract, this specifically says that we are not -- that if we vote for this, we are not suggesting that we would do anything in violation of the law. We can't do that. The second thing is that as far as, you know, turbulence between the bodies, none of the bodies

[8:44:00 PM]

have been briefed on this. Cap metro, I know, because I sit on it. And atp, I know they haven't either because I spoke to the chair of the atp board the other day about this. And you know as councilmembers we have scheduled that we'll have a conversation about the legal aspects, but we haven't done that yet and we will be having a conversation about all of this from the jpa. The third question about predetermining what needs to be cut, let me say to you that nothing needs to be cut. What we need to understand as part of what we decide as part of the jpa is what bucket of money is it appropriate for staff -- all staffing to come out of? You know, that's a question that we all need to understand and take some time to have a conversation about. The financial model assumes a certain amount of money for staffing and other costs of administration. And so that is not been shared with all of us, what that

[8:45:02 PM]

percentage and what that dollar amount is, so we need to understand that, so no one is suggesting here that we are cutting anything out of, you know, out of a rail line or buying a bus or anything like that. The other thing to understand is from my perspective, this is not an either/or. From a policy perspective, anti-displacement is not an add on. And the \$300 million was not an add on to the transit -- to the transit system. "Project connect" is about -- and what we talked to the voters about is the intent of "Project connect" to benefit everybody in our community. And addressing anti-displacement is part and parcel of that. You cannot separate it. It's not, we're going to build a transit system and then we're going -- and then we'll take care of some people.

[8:46:03 PM]

If we don't take care of people, we have not built a transit system for everybody. So, mayor, respectfully, I do not see this in the way that you just described it. I do not think that our conversations were about adding -- addressing anti-displacement as independent of transit. But my knowledge and

this acknowledges that these are all conversations that we need to have. So all of this is asking is for us as a council to consider making a policy statement recognizing the importance of preserving funding directly for the benefit of people in our community at risk of displacement, recognizing that addressing equity and anti-displacement is central to mobility and the intent of "Project connect" to benefit all people in our community. And this -- and providing council the opportunity to consider options that are legal -- that legally align with the contract with the voters.

[8:47:04 PM]

But options about how we deal with the staffing costs, options to at least consider and ask the question, is there a way for us to address staffing costs without pulling it out of the \$300 million for strategies? We need to do everything that we can to help everybody benefit from this. So I'm just asking to have the opportunity, and I would like to ask us all to make the policy statement that that's what we want. We understand that we have to work through the legalities of it and we have to work through the financing of it, but I think that the policy statement is simply that we all want the option to consider that we -- that we, um-- that we use the \$300 million entirely for anti-displacement strategies, entirely for people to the

[8:48:05 PM]

extent that we can. And I'm just asking that we have the option to talk about that. So that's what this -- that's what this rider does.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I appreciate your desire to have this option. From what I've been told when I've asked, this is not legal. According to the contract with the voters. I mean, this process seems like it has an impact on the partnership that is making me a little bit uncomfortable. And I also am -- I'm just concerned that, you know, our community also benefits from the money that was put into the transit project. And so it's taken from one to the other. You know, in the scheme of a \$5 billion project, this is maybe

[8:49:05 PM]

\$10 million. So I just -- I'm not -- I'm not sure why this is causing so much friction, and I'm just concerned about the implications.

>> Kitchen: Could I just say one more thing --

>> Mayor Adler: Hold on. Let's give some other people a chance to talk to. Councilmember Fuentes and then councilmember pool.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. Thank you, councilmember kitchen, for bringing this forward. I share your sentiments that, you know, we are looking at transit as anti-displacement overall. It's a mobility tool. And I do not see anti-displacement as a bucket or a separate bucket. It should be in everything that we do as a city. And I welcome this opportunity to put a strong statement out there and to consider this as a policy statement, but also as an option moving forward that we need to think about, you know, having an anti-displacement lens in everything that we do from our personnel to our strategy, to our communications.

[8:50:06 PM]

All of that goes hand-in-hand. So I am supportive of this budget rider and I really appreciate your leadership on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool, I think was next.

>> Pool: Yeah, thanks a lot. And I'm on the cap metro board too. And I'm really pleased to be one of the board members. And so I've got a pretty close view on what's going on with "Project connect" and the staffing. And what we have here is some stranded salaries. These are city of Austin staffers that are working on "Project connect," the displacement related to "Project connect". And my understanding was that that staff would be paid for out of budget connect dollars, separate from the displacement dollars. And that is because the whole point was to put all -- 100% of

[8:51:09 PM]

the \$300 million -- which sounds like a lot but really isn't a lot -- toward the actual bricks and mortars and the people who we are going to rehouse or hopefully not displace. But we have city staff who are working on this, and we have to assign their salaries somewhere. And in my mind at least whether we were having these -- when we were having these conversations last year and I admit that they were not fully formed because all of this is being made of whole cloth for all of us, we're plowing new ground. I made the logic leap that since this work is project connected, that the funds for these staffers would come from the same place as the other -- the other salaries did, which puts it on "Project connect." That's the seven penny increase so that the voters approved last November. That money continues infinitely,

[8:52:12 PM]

forever, unless and until there's, you know, another -- I guess referendum to stop it. So there isn't any -- there is no endpoint for that funding. There's a real finite and clear endpoint for the \$300 million amount. That was part of the contract for voters to go for displacement. I did not see that as paying the salaries of the necessary staff on the city side who would be helping or doing that work entirely. That's why I support couple councilmember kitchen's offer to have this conversation at a time when maybe we're fresher, and maybe a little more focused on it. And so I would urge that we allow this piece to go forward so that we can then have a little bit more time and get the input from our staff, so that we can have very reasoned, logical conversation about it.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria?

>> Renteria: Thank you, mayor.

[8:53:13 PM]

And I am also a trustee and I went through the whole process. You know, we have a concern for it, because I know that we'll have to have legal interpret it and settle it, you know. It is a contract with the voters and whatever we do to try to alter anything we have to run it through the attorneys and make sure that it's legal to do and we're not in violation. But the great thing about the contract -- I mean, that bond election for displacement is that the federal government is setting aside a huge amount of money to match the funds that we have voted on. So this is going to give us a great opportunity to bring even more funding down from the federal government into the displacement bucket. And so -- but we can have that conversation later on. I am not afraid to have that conversation. But I know that, you know, when we do a bucket, and we do a

[8:54:13 PM]

contract to the voters and when we try to alter any of that, that we have to run it through the attorney general to make sure that it is legal. So we'll find out about that issue. But it's two separate issues that went before the voters. And you always have some kind of administrative costs associated with any of these types of bond elections. So I just want to just leave it at that.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: To be clear, I just want to make certain that I say of course equity and anti-displacement are a priority. That's why I brought forward the etod isc. While I appreciate getting the bang for our anti-displacement dollars, making that transit dependent riders have access to

[8:55:14 PM]

a world-class transit system, I also have deep concerns about the legality of this proposal. "Project connect," had overwhelming support last November but we know that there's a small group of die-hards out there who are circling and circling and waiting for any opening to swoop in and to go in for the kill. And so any perceived violation of the contract with the voters would be a golden opportunity for them. We've seen transit opponents stick on the wheel of the voters before. In Houston, and helped the light rail expansion for years after the voters gave their green light. We we are already decades behind the curve. So I think we need to be incredibly deliberate about how we move forward. I would hope for both our land-use reform and our transit plan to be both caught in a judicial limbo. If our legal team is comfortable

[8:56:15 PM]

with this language before us, that's one thing. But we know that there's going to be pushback from cap metro, atp, when it comes to sitting down to hammer out the joint powers agreement. So I don't personally know that moving forward with this is terribly productive at any level. And I would like very much to ask if my colleague is open to bringing this back as an ifc so we get the opportunity to talk to cap metro and some of the other bodies? I prefer that. Otherwise, I can't support the item.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Well, thank you, mayor pro tem. You know, the cap metro board, which I sit on, as does councilmember pool and councilmember Renteria, have not talked about this. So if anyone is telling you that cap metro is opposed to this, the board of cap metro has not had a conversation about this. So I think that that's important to understand. There is no opposition from cap metro at this point in time.

[8:57:15 PM]

So I just want to make sure that that's clear that, you know, this is a policy and legal question to be made at the board level. So -- and that's -- and I heard the concerns that were raised when we talked about this before. That's why I changed the language to make it clear that this was just an option to come back to us that was legal. I mean, we -- obviously, and I couldn't agree with you more -- we cannot do anything that is illegal.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Any other comments. All right, colleagues, we have the list of riders in front of us. I'd like the record to reflect that I am opposed to kitchen br3. I'm treating this like a consent agenda. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I had made the suggestion earlier that we treated motions in the way that we did. Thank you for that. I'd like to suggest we do

[8:58:16 PM]

the same with budget riders where we take them up collectively, but the record reflects those as motions made by the council members who brought them. And if they had a co-sponsor, I didn't really anybody had co-sponsors, if they had co-sponsors, they can be listed as co-sponsors and then perhaps you could be the default unless you're voting against it.

>> Mayor Adler: That's good. And if I'm voting against it, then everybody else --

>> Tovo: Is that the only one you're voting against. I will be councilmember kitchen's co-sponsor.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Okay. Further discussion?

>> Mayor, could we just vote on like kitchen br3 separately.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll vote on kitchen br3 separately.

>> Renteria: Mayor? It seems like most of them were consent items riders, like consent.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Renteria: Are we going to vote on the consent all

[8:59:19 PM]

at once or go one by onement.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to attach to the main motion, but councilmember alter suggested we have a separate vote on kitchen br3. So let's vote on kitchen br3. Those in favor of including kitchen br3 please raise your hand. And I have -- those opposed kitchen br3 please raise your hand. Those opposed? Me and the mayor pro tem -- anybody abstaining? Councilmember alter.

>> I'm abstaining.

>> Mayor Adler: So I have three votes no, I have one abstention. If everybody else voted aye that would be seven votes in favor. Everybody else -- anybody else that I didn't call?

>> Tovo: You might just call them out. I'm not sure.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Those in favor of kitchen br3 please raise your hand. I have councilmember kitchen, pool, Renteria,

[9:00:22 PM]

Ellis, Fuentes and tovo. That's six. Those opposed is the mayor pro tem, alter and me. That's nine. Those abstaining please raise your hand. Casar and Kelly abstaining. 6-3-2, it's included. Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I didn't mean to interrupt you. I had one more I needed to add to the consent package.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and add the ones that we have. All these on this page we're approved to go in. Please show each one made by the person who made it. I second them all except for the one that I don't think councilmember tovo seconded unless there are other co-sponsors shown, in which case it would be them. Councilmember tovo, anything else?

>> Tovo: Mayor, earlier we agreed -- I think there was consensus, hopefully we agreed to take up the

[9:01:22 PM]

heritage preservation fund at a later date so this budget, just the direction would be that we're doing that hopefully within the next 30 days and that the allocations that the staff have proposed in the budget would not be final until it's reviewed.

>> Mayor Adler: Staff okay with that? Yes? Anybody objection to including that? Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I didn't realize that we had to voice our opposition no it to be on the record and in that case I would be voting to keep on consent kitchen br2, but I would be opposed to Kelly br1.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The record will so note. All right. And then the tovo amendment you just read into the record is also made part of the rider directions. All right. I think that is our entire motion at this point.

[9:02:22 PM]

So now I'm going to go to the script so we can move through this.

>> Tovo: Mayor, we still have the homelessness items which I believe were also going to be included as budget direction, though they came forward as amendments, those that were --

>> Mayor Adler: I thought I had done that before, but in case we needed to, insofar as the page presented by councilmember Casar purported to allocate specifically the prior allocation or part of the prior allocation of arpa funding for homelessness, it is the direction of the council that those allocations be made to the overall allocation. And I think I asked earlier if there were objections to that. There were none. So if we didn't put that in before we're putting it in now, but I think it's in there twice.

>> Tovo: That's fine, I guess. Some of them -- in any case, I'm moving approval of them

[9:03:23 PM]

regardless. I do want to say host is in there now, not in the budget, but as a one time allocation. I want to say that's an expansion of the host team that I hope we would be able to maintain. So while it's in there as ongoing I would urge us if it's not part of the spending plan that comes out of the work that our homeless strategy officer is doing, then I would look, manager, to you to funding of it next year in the budget so that we can continue that good work.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter, did you have something?

>> Alter: Yeah, I was just wondering if we could refer to the document that the staff has rather than Casar's proposal.

>> Mayor Adler: It's our main motion at this point. It's the motion before us. And we'll refer to it that way. All right. Yes, councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: I had two things to say. One was what councilmember alter said. And the second is when we change the stipends from 80 to 90 it was raised to me the question of then council

[9:04:23 PM]

members' salaries are in that range so I wanted to provide the direction unless there's objection that this would apply to council staff but not apply to council members because I haven't heard any council members asking for it for themselves. But I would still have it apply to --

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that? Then that's included as well. Kel kel I don't have an objection, but I would like the record to reffect me voting no for a couple of riders. Fuentes br1, 2 and 3 and Casar br1.

>> Mayor Adler: So noted in the record, all right, we have the resolution -- councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Quick question. Are we doing with the amendments the same we're doing with the riders so that if we have any objections to any of the amendments that we can also register an abstention or no amendments.

>> Mayor Adler: The record can reflect that if you would like.

[9:05:25 PM]

Let's go ahead and proceed. I'm going to go back now to the script --

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I had one question.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I wanted to clarify that my amendment related to Austin cares, which was kitchen 2, it shows up on our spreadsheet as a zero, but I just want to confirm that having it on that list means that the language, the direction backup on my language is included.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, the answer to that from Kerri is yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo. Tovo mayor, I just need to make a couple of comments. Grackle green which we are accepting here as parkland, I want to highlight for our staff that I think we need to look at the policy of this is a pocket park that neighbors have maintained. It's being provided. They would like to have it

[9:06:26 PM]

dedicated as parkland which we will be diagnostic on this motion. But I think the policy is that they take on the maintenance. And when we have a willing group that we allow them to be engaged in the maintenance. So this is a policy conversation we need to have, though there is a dollar figure attached to it, it's my hope that the neighborhood that has created this pocket park would continue to maintain it and maintain it with park staff and I want to look at ways we can creatively balance that work in future so we're not taking on costs that we don't necessarily need to as the city. There is an amendment in the consent for the college food access item and we got the note from staff that there would be a cost in administering it and one estimate was \$100,000. This is a 50,000-dollar pool of money intended to be mini grants I hope to the five university colleges that are

[9:07:27 PM]

participating in the college student commission so it will break my heart if more of the money goes to administration than goes to actually getting that money into the hands of college groups that can create food access programs on their campuses for college students that are hungry. I know we have colleges across the city of mini grant programs and large numbers of grants being administered by our equity department and others, so please, please keep in touch with us and with the college student commission and if there are any problems, I'm happy to brainstorm and bring forward and ifc if necessary. But I think there are a lot of options there and some outside partner groups that might help us administer that grant so that we can really use that money. It is my intention that that money be used for grants, not for administrative costs.

>> Pool: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember pool.

>> Pool: You had asked if I had any of the budget amendments that I wanted to

[9:08:28 PM]

register a different vote before we vote on them as consent. And I do, I do. It's the Adler 3, the guaranteed income pilot, I did speak earlier today in opposition to it because I believe that it needs to be a program that's consistent across the country and supported at the federal level. I understand your points about having -- being in the avant garde and being at the front of the line but other cities have already done that. I'm going to register my no vote on that --

>> Mayor Adler: So noted.

>> Pool: Because from a public policy posture that should be a federal program.

>> Mayor Adler: So noted in the record. Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. Mayor, I would like to be added as a co-sponsor to Adler 3 for the guaranteed income pilot.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. So noted. Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Yes. On the consent agenda could you please sew me as voting

[9:09:29 PM]

no on Fuentes 2 and Adler 3.

>> Mayor Adler: So noted. Are we ready? Ready, guys? All right. We're ready to take a vote on items 1 and 2 to approve an ordinance adopting the city's budget as amended as well as to adopt the ordinance for fees, fines and other charges as amended. The law requires this to be a record vote. Will the clerk call the roll so each of us can state our vote. Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: I want to make sure that all of the fee changes that we included for ems will be incorporated. We don't have the numbers.

>> Yes, as we bring the fee schedule forward we will make sure those are included based on the amendment and the updated general fund changes that were made through the council's amendments. Thank you.

>> Alter: Sorry to group.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. That item two will also

[9:10:29 PM]

reflect the changes and amendments that were set out for item 1 deliberation. We ready?
Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: And I likewise need to confirm whether or not we're doing the code fiat this point as well? And colleagues, I did reduce that from my original amendment, which was to cut it by 50 cents to 15, one-five, just to reflect the ftes, but not to reflect the cost driver.

>> That would also come forward in the fee schedule ordinance.

>> Tovo: Thank you. Which is what we're about to vote on.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that change by councilmember tovo? Hearing none that change is part of the motion in front of us.

>> Tovo: With the accompanying direction.

>> Mayor Adler: With the accompanying direction. All right. Let's call the roll.

>> Mayor Adler.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Mayor pro tem harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Yes.

[9:11:31 PM]

>> Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Yes. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Yes.

>> Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Yes.

>> Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Yes.

>> Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Yes.

>> Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yes.

>> Councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: I call that a unanimous vote. Everyone in favor. That may be the first unanimous vote on a budget I've cast as a member of a council. I appreciate the hard work everybody put into this and the compromises that everybody made to be able to get here. Let's continue through while we're on a run here. We're going to take items three through five, three, four, five together. This is the Austin fire department, the Austin

[9:12:31 PM]

police department and the emergency medical services classifications and positions. Is there a motion to approve items three, four and five? Councilmember Alter makes the motion. Is there a second? Councilmember Kelly seconds that as well as Ellis and Pool and the Mayor pro tem. And Councilmember Renteria. It's been moved and seconded -- yes, Councilmember Alter?

>> I just wanted to make sure that -- I'm not sure which item has EMS, but that the division chiefs and the new assistant chief are reflected in those documents.

>> Yes, those changes are reflected in the EMS classification. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of items three, four and five please

[9:13:34 PM]

raise your hand. I see that as being unanimous on the dais. It passes. Vote of 11 to zero. At this point I'm going to recess the Austin city council meeting here at 9:13 and I am going to convene a meeting of the Austin Housing Finance Corporation. This is August 12th -- actually, this is the August 11th meeting that has been continued over to August 12th, 2021. This meeting is being held both virtually and in person. We had earlier convened to take testimony in the Austin Housing Finance Corporation. Is there anyone here to speak that would like to speak? Hearing none, is there an

[9:14:34 PM]

item for us to consider?

>> Yes, mayor, Rosie Truelove, director of Austin Housing Finance Corporation. You have two items to consider today. The first is a resolution adopting the capital budget for fiscal year 1-'22 and the -- '21-'22 and the second is a resolution adopting the Austin Housing Finance Corporation grant operating budget. And the housing assistance fund budget for the next fiscal year. And both can be taken on consent.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Is this a motion to approve those two items? Mayor pro tem makes the motion. Councilmember Renteria, councilmember Ellis both second. Any discussion? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? It is unanimous on the board of directors. It passes 11-0. I think those are all the items for us to consider, is that correct?

>> That is correct. We're done, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. The meeting of the Austin

[9:15:36 PM]

Housing Finance Corporation is adjourned. I'm now going to convene the Mueller Local Government Corporation here on our August 11th meeting as it is now continued over to August 12th. The time is 9:15 P.M. We have a quorum of the directors present. The meeting is being held both virtually and in-person. Do you want to take us through the items before us today?

>> Yes. Good evening, Sylvonia Holt-Rabb with the Economic Development Department here to offer four items on consent for the Mueller Local Government Corporation. The first item is approval of the minutes from the August 12th, 2020 board meeting. Item 2, approval of a resolution adopting the fiscal year '21-'22 Mueller

[9:16:36 PM]

Local Government Operation Operating Budget. Item number 3, approve a proposal to the Mueller Local Government Corporation bylaws regarding the conduct of business at meetings of the board and appointment and terms of office for members of the board of directors and officers of the corporation. And the final item, approve appointment of Diana Thomas as vice-president, Sylvonia Holt-Rabb as secretary to the Mueller Local Government Corporation. I offer all of these on consent.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Is there a motion to approve those four items? Councilmember Kelly makes the motion. Is there a second? Councilmember Casar seconds. Any discussion? Those in favor of those four items please raise your hand. I see that as being unanimous on the dais. They pass 11-0. Miss Holt-Rabb, congratulations on your election as secretary.

[9:17:36 PM]

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: And with that, that concludes our business and the meeting of the Mueller local government corporation is adjourned. I'm now going to reconvene the Austin city council meeting here at 9:17 P.M., continues to be the continuation of our August 11th meeting here, now August 12th. We're now going to consider item number 6 to ratify the property tax increase reflected in the budget. This vote is required by state law, the council member must take this vote separately to know that it will take more than the city taxes the city raised last year to approve the budget that we just approved for this year. This is not a vote on the tax rate. We will take a separate vote on the tax rate after this vote. Is there a motion to ratify

[9:18:38 PM]

the property tax increase in the 2021-22 budget adopted by council today. Councilmember Casar --

>> I'd be happy to do second then if you have somebody for --

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar makes the motion. Councilmember pool seconds the motion. Is there any discussion? All right, we have a motion by councilmember Casar, seconded by councilmember pool to ratify the property tax for the 2021-'22 budget. We'll take the vote. All those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? I'm showing that as being unanimous on the dais. It passes 11-0. All right. We're now going to take up item number 'approving an ordinance adopting and

[9:19:39 PM]

levelling an ad valorem tax rate for the city of Austin for fiscal year 2021-2022. There will be a short statement by law regarding the exhibits to the ordinance and we'll make a motion with language as required by state law. Council?

>> Thank you, mayor, council. Lela fire side for the law department. The ordinance you're adopting contains a finding and attachment. The finding is to the extent required by law you find that the owners of the properties identified in exhibit b2 have provided the city with documentation that their properties comply with the requirements of Texas tax code 11.24 which relates to historic tax exemptions. Then the exhibit b2 is the ordinance contains the listing of the properties that have been reviewed by the staff and the landmark

[9:20:41 PM]

commission and these are recommended to you as meeting the requirements of the tax code and the city's historic property requirements in the city code. You'll approve them for a partial property tax exemption when you adopt the ordinance adopting and leveeing the city property tax rate. And that is my statement regarding the attachments. Mayor, if you would like I can give you the numbers that you will need for the rest of this.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Do you know what the property tax rate is being increased by the adoption?

>> 54.10 cents per 100-dollar valuation, which is effectively an 8.7% increase in the tax rate.

>> Mayor Adler: 8.7?

>> 8.7. I didn't do the math. That's Eric Nelson.

>> Mayor Adler: All right.

[9:21:41 PM]

So the -- is there a motion that the property tax rate be increased by the adoption of a tax rate of 54 cents .10 cents per 100-dollar valuation which is effectively an 8.7% increase in the tax rate. Councilmember pool makes the motion. Councilmember Casar seconds the motion. The tax code also requires the vote on this motion to be by record vote. When I say we are voting to, vote, increase the tax rate, close quotes, the statute defines increase as, quote, the percentage by which the proposed tax rate exceeds the voter approval rate, close quotes. We have the option this year to increase the maintenance and operations portion of the tax rate up to eight percent above the rate we have been using for this current fiscal year. If we decide to do this it

[9:22:42 PM]

will be because of winter storm uri, which caused physical damage to homes in the city. Some of these homes have received a temporary tax exemption due to this storm. Who will make the motion to adopt the property tax rate is required by state law. I think we already said councilmember pool would do that, councilmember Casar seconds. Is there any discussion? We have a motion and a second that the property tax rate be increased by the adoption of a rate of \$54.10 per 100-dollar valuation. Will the clerk please call the roll so each of us can state our vote?

>> Mayor Adler.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Mayor pro tem harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: You probably need my video to be on. Yes.

>> Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Yes.

[9:23:44 PM]

>> Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Yes.

>> Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Yes.

>> Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Yes.

>> Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: No.

>> Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Councilmember pool.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yes.

>> Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yes. Called I call that vote 10 -- I call that vote 10-1 and that passes. Do we have any more items for action in front of us? That concludes our business. Manager, I want to thank you and your staff for preparing this budget and for taking us all through this process. These things have worked more smoothly the last several years and I appreciate that. I want to also thank my

[9:24:45 PM]

colleagues on this for everybody working. These things are not easy, especially because we're not allowed to kind of meet collectively and talk through these things, so we work out a lot of things live and as we all meet on the dais. But everybody's staffs did a really good job as well. And I appreciate Stephanie Trent who is like the star of the stuff for having given us the spreadsheet to be able to work through and organize thoughts. So thank you to her. But to everyone's staff, including my own. Manager, and then we'll have council get a chance to talk.

>> Cronk: First, mayor and council, just your appreciation for adopting this budget unanimously. This was incredibly important to set our city on a path forward. I want to thank the department staff who put a lot of work to ensuring that we were not only providing the services that our community needs, but doing

[9:25:46 PM]

so in a responsible way. I particularly want to point out budget officer Kerri Lange who a few months ago stepped in this role in the middle of the budget adoption process.

[Applause]. And has masterfully guided us forward. Thank you, Kerri. I know you have an incbd team around you, but really appreciate your work. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. Thank you, city manager. This process has been really great and I want to thank your departmental staff and I also want to give a big shout-out to my team, Jessica Coronado, and others for helping me get through my first budget with the city of Austin. And just incredible hard working team and I'm so excited to have been part of this council and to have made the commitments and priorities that we have made for our community. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: We unanimously

[9:26:46 PM]

passed a budget today that tackles the pandemic, increases our public safety investments, invests in parks and affordable childcare and also gives the average homeowner a break on their tax bill so I really appreciate everything that my colleagues brought forward in the way that we came together in this important budget. And as we continue to also advance the work on police perform and civil rights that we are committed to. I do want to thank Stephanie one last time and Ms. Lange and everybody on your team. Eric, I really appreciate what you did and I know folks upstairs and in the hallway did important work to get us here. And I also want to take a moment to thank all our city employees as the manager has in passing the budget and keeping the city going and

[9:27:47 PM]

maybe folks that we found a deeper appreciation for in this pandemic and in the winter storm. I appreciate that the council has moved forward on sending additional dollars and additional stipend to those city employees who are cutting through frozen pipes to get the pipes replaced or going up on power lines, who have been putting shots in arms and taking care of the community and I appreciate and I know we all appreciate what our staff do everyday and their advocacy of the civilians through afscme letting us know that this would be a year for us to bring forward dollars to retain you as our staff and to appreciate the work that you have done. So just a big thank you to the entire city family.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Kerri, do you know what the number is of the annual dollar change for the property tax bill?

[9:28:58 PM]

>> Minus 17.11.

>> Mayor Adler: I know that is twice the savings, manager, you had proposed in our budget 10 days ago. Anybody else? Councilmember Renteria?

>> Renteria: Mayor, I also want to thank the city employees and my colleagues for the hard work they did and the discipline and we took care of the employees by providing a bonus at the end of the year and extending their sick leave. So if they get infected by covid, I think that was an excellent idea and I want to thank the union, afscme, for setting me straight. I was going to give out a bonus to the ones that were

[9:29:59 PM]

vaccinated, but I think this came out even a better deal. And I'm really glad for them. And I want to thank them also. And thank you guys. You did an excellent job. Good night.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem?

>> Harper-madison: Thank you very much. I'll just echo the sentiment of all my colleagues with the exception of I have my very own Lauren heartnet, the real MVP that I need to say thank you for not having slept in probably eight weeks. Rest easy tomorrow. Thank you so much for all your hard work. I appreciate everybody.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I just want to extend thanks to my team, Amy, Juli, Ed and Willie, who have all helped me immensely through this process. But I really want to give a

[9:31:00 PM]

shout-out to Kerri Lange. She did awesome on this. Ed van eenoo has always done amazing work for us and she carried that through and jumped in and knew how to handling. So I know all of our offices have been working really hard and thanks to Stephanie, Trent, the goddess of spreadsheet, and to the mayor for getting us through things. I know there's a lot to talk about. It's all really important, but we did it, we all worked together and made some good things happen for our community.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anybody else? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Just very quickly because I know we all want to go home. I want to thank my team, I want to thank all the staff and my colleagues. I want to acknowledge that we have two new colleagues that went through their first budget. And went through it during a pandemic. So I really appreciate how they jumped in and were partners with us and just

[9:32:01 PM]

wanted to that can everybody.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I voted in favor of the budget today with mixed emotions. I know we were raising taxes when so many people have been impacted by covid and many other things. We understand with life there must be compromise. This budget we voted unanimously on today shows how we can come together in an agreement in what's needed for our city and in a time that things aren't always clear. Division is not always the answer and this is a clear example of that. I'm proud to be here today and I want to make sure that everybody knows this took a heavy lift to get here, including the staff with the city who we maybe have met during this process. I want to thank them for their work and want them to know it didn't go unnoticed. I also want everyone to know that I will continue to support public safety and I'm excited about the reimagining process that we have in front of us, and thank you, everybody.

[9:33:02 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. Last year we spent a lot of time talking about reimagining public safety and tonight we took some steps that I think are really going to transform our ems system in a way that we improve

health care for patients in our community and our health care institutions. And I think we really planted some important seeds. We also are taking some really important steps to keep our community safe through investments for wildfire, and there's a whole bunch of other stuff that we did and it's going to be really good for our community tonight. So I want to thank my colleagues, city manager, Ms. Lange who as everyone said, really stepped up and to you and your staff for answering my office's questions and really sitting and helping to problem solve creatively. I appreciate that. I want to thank my staff,

[9:34:03 PM]

Nina, Craig, April, and the rest of my staff for really digging in to the budget. Budgets are moral documents and I think tonight we've shown some of the clear direction that we want to go to as a community. And I think we can be proud of the work we did through this whole process.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Yeah, thank you. I'm just going to add my thanks too to our financial staff, to the manager's staff, really to all the city staff who helps support us from the clerk's office, and her staff to ctm, to Kay and others who make sure that we have the space and the time and the information we need to do this work. I have a terrific team, Shannon, Nikki and Ashley, and I want to send just a special shout-out to Ashley who has managed all elements of the budget process and has just worked tirelessly like so many of your staff has as well. I didn't add my name as a sponsor to a lot of the

[9:35:04 PM]

amendments that came forward only because I knew I was going to vote for them and I'm really supportive of them, but there has been some terrific work that you my colleagues have brought forward from councilmember Ellis's parks investments to councilmember pool's investments and out of school time. Councilmember kitchen, your amendment on heal. Mayor pro tem, your planning initiative. Councilmember Renteria, the sunscreen for your park, the park in your area. Councilmember Fuentes, I'm very supportive of the community health workers and excited to see that program going forward. Councilmember Casar, thank you for carrying the item about our city staff, the stipend for our city staff. Councilmember Kelly, I appreciate your work and the item especially that you brought forward related to homelessness. And councilmember alter, I really appreciate the creativeness that you brought to really thinking about how we could use our fees at ems and transform that system so that we could do some great public

[9:36:05 PM]

investments. And of course, mayor, I appreciate and share your interest in mathematicking sure that we're supporting -- making sure that we're supporting and bolstering our homeless officer. I also want to say a shout-out to the community. So many of the ideas that we are able to bring forward into fruition and so many of the investments that we've considered tonight originated as ideas out in the community or recommendations from the community from the one I brought from the college student commission to some of the others that we voted on. So you know, this is a critical work that we do alongside our community and so thank you to those of you who have been engaged in it and have supported it. It is -- it's been an extraordinary year and a really challenging one and I'm so proud that many of the investments that we've spent a lot of time talking about over the last couple of days are those for families and for individuals in our community who are in most need of those programs and those support. So I am especially grateful to have had your support on

[9:37:06 PM]

this dais for some of the increased investments that we made at the downtown Austin community court and in the health care for the homeless and some other -- some of the other programs. So with that, I'll just conclude.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I'd be remiss if I didn't add my sincere thanks to our staff, to my colleagues, to my district 7 team. Aibly ledly Luisa and my newest staffers, Heidi and list set. And to the community I appreciate what councilmember tovo just said in offering thanks to the Austin community. It really is a unique privilege and responsibility for those of us who sit on this dais in service to you, all of Austin. So thanks so much, city

[9:38:06 PM]

manager, for ably leading our professional workforce and to our cfo Ed van eenoo and our interim budget director Ms. La cantera and all of your team for your strong support for our work in this fiscal 22 budget session. A lot of this work goes on behind the scenes so people don't see us doing it until we emerge on to the dais and rest assured there are weeks and weeks of diligent work that goes on to bring a very big budget to fruition like we did today. So my deepest appreciation to you all.

>> Mayor Adler: Anyone else? Kerri, thank you. And with that then here at 9:38, the meeting is adjourned. Congratulations.

[9:39:07 PM]