

City Council Budget Adoption Meeting Transcript – 08/17/2022 (and continuing on 08/18/2022)

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 6 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 8/17/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 8/17/2022

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 17, 2022 portion of meeting]

[10:21:20 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We're going to convene the city council meeting on Wednesday, August 17th, 2022. The time is 10:20. We're at Austin city hall in the council chambers. We have an agenda today that has items that are mostly budget-related. In addition to the budget items, item number 2 is parkland dedication and number 12 is the license plate reader. We're going to begin this morning as I posted yesterday with comments from the community. I don't know what the number is today, but as of yesterday, it was over 60. So as I posted, we will do a minute for everybody speaking so we can hear from people, so the council actually has time to do work today as well. We're going to hear the speakers

[10:22:25 AM]

first. At the conclusion of the speakers -- and then we're going to take up items that can be disposed of quickly before we do the budget so that we can resolve those. It's going to be my suggestion, colleagues, that we postpone the parkland dedication issue until September 1st and that we postpone the license plate reader item number 12 to September 1st as well. If people want to ask questions about what the impact would be and the staff questions, we can do that, but that's generally going to be my recommendation. Item number 11 is the election ordinance. We can't vote on that until after we have done the decision about the tax rate. So 11's going to get pushed back and we'll do those things late. But we will also do the housing bond, 13. That's the contract with the

[10:23:25 AM]

voters. Item 15, ahfc, and 16. So it's my intent after we hear from all the speakers to see if we can handle 13, 14, 15, and 16, and 2 and 12, we might have those conversations to see if we're going to free up that time. When we're done with that and associated with that we're going to have just kind of a quick question and answer with staff about the amendments that people have brought, or questions so that people can help vote. And after we've gone through that, then we're going to try and engage feeling where people are. We're going to begin probably with the threshold question, on talking about pay, because I think if we have kind of a consensus or idea where we're going to move with respect to pay, that's going to give an indication of how much money is left over. If we were to do the employee

[10:24:27 AM]

pay, and I've heard you've changed your proposal this morning, councilmember Fuentes, from your group to try to do seven and to do whatever impression is available at the \$7 million place, which could would seem to allow some if not all -- maybe all, but if not, then some. Then I'm not sure with everything else that people have listed that we're really that far off with respect to what is left. But obviously some of those things we'll talk about. So, again, we're going to hear from speakers at one minute each. When we're done, I'm going to take care of some of the things we can move and then we're going to ask questions of staff. I think that's going to get us to lunch. If we can do all that by lunch. Councilmember tovo and then councilmember Kelly.

>> Tovo: Mayor, sorry that I didn't totally follow your outline -- proposed outline, but I think I heard you say questions at the end, and I would -- no?

[10:25:27 AM]

Quick budget questions of staff?

>> Mayor Adler: Quick budget questions of staff, speakers, and then I think we can take care of some things like the housing contract with voters, the ahfc meeting, the Mueller issue. Then probably quick questions of staff.

>> Tovo: I just want to make sure we get through that before lunch, because some of the -- we got a huge amount of information through the question and answer process, and they came in some yesterday, some Friday, and in reading through them, they generated some other additional questions, but they also -- let me just say, it is such a wealth of information and thank you to all of the staff who worked on it. I know there were a lot of questions and that's a lot of information and it's all really valuable. Some of the pieces of information I think can point us to some potential revenue sources and

some other things. So I just want to have that ability to get some of those quick answers so that we can tweak our amendments accordingly. And I think I might have to make

[10:26:27 AM]

a few changes based on some of the new information.

>> Mayor Adler: That's what we've announced we're going to do. Councilmember Kelly?

>> Kelly: I want to thank you for laying out the day the way you did. I'm not sure I'm amenable to postponing the license plate reader program. We have had that resolution in front of us for a very long time. I have postponed it at the will of the council to now to discuss during the budget. I'd like to revisit that after we hear from speakers and maybe even after lunch.

>> Mayor Adler: It could easily be then.

>> Kelly: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Let's begin with people who have called in. I think that we wanted to start with the remote speakers. And we'll start with those that need an interpreter to assist.

>> The first speaker is a Spanish speaker, so we have the interpreter on the line, Jacqueline. Can you hear us?

>> Interpreter: Yes.

>> Thank you.

[10:27:28 AM]

First speaker is Juan Pedro Munoz, and he will have two

minutes to speak.>> Interpreter: [Speaking Spanish]

>> [Speaking Spanish]>> Interpreter: [Speaking Spanish]

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: My name is Juan Pedro Munoz.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: Give me a second.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: I live in district 2. And I'm part of the labor.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: I'm here to

[10:28:30 AM]

propose and support the library for the city.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: We've been talking for years --

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: That -- what the card would do for us and the benefits it would give us.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: For the immigrant community.

[Multiple voices]

>> Interpreter: A picture --

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: Name, date of birth.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: And address for everybody.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

[10:29:36 AM]

>> Interpreter: All the resources that the library offers.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: Without having that id, it impedes people in the community.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: They're not able to access vital resources.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: If they're to be arrested.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: With contact to the authorities of immigration.

>> Thank you, speaker. Your time has expired.

>> Interpreter: When the only crime was --

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: To drive without an id.

>> Gracias. Next speaker is Amelia Casas for

[10:30:42 AM]

item 4 and 12.

>> Mayor Adler: For the folks that have an interpreter, we double the time so that they can --

>> Good morning, my name is -- hello, can you hear me?

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Good morning, my name is Amelia, a resident of district 6, policy analyst with the Texas fair defense project speaking on the proposed budget and postponement of item 12. Thank you, city council, for support you have shown for at the community investment budget. We are highly supportive of the budget amendments funding necessary eviction legal support and rental assistance, higher wages for city employees and medics and funding for the weather shelter. We ask that you vote for these. Speaking to the postponement of item 12, we oppose alprs, the money should go to rental assistance and wages. Because they are frequently used throughout the country to collect court debt, make petty arrests and share information with immigration enforcement agencies, we also know from the

[10:31:43 AM]

experience that APD violates policies set by city council. So any restrictions council sets on alprs would need to be captured in an ordinance to have full effect. Please support a community and pass the community investment budgets in full and postpone item 12. Thank you for your time.

>> Trenton hengenson.

>> Hi. My name is Trenton, I'm a leader at the catholic church calling. As the cost of living in central Texas goes up and wages remain flat, budgets are being squeezed hard. But the general fund will have \$1 billion. Council can prevent displacement of families with \$5 million in additional funding for rental

assistance, can prevent the displacement of families with \$10 million for mobile home repair. They must include this in the

[10:32:43 AM]

bond. At \$20 an hour, this council can begin to provide a living wage to the city's lowest-paid workers and by restoring \$300,000 in funding cuts for a job training program, council can lift generations of working families out of poverty. The math works. When budgets are tight, you can't afford not to fund these programs. Central Texas interfaith calls on city council to budget for working families. Thank you.

>> Lauren Ortell, item 4.

>> Hi. My name is Lauren Ortell, I live in district 1. I am speaking today in solidarity with the coalition who built the community investment budget. I'm excited to see some of the pieces of the community investment budget funded and some of you have even filed amendments. We know that the full package is

[10:33:44 AM]

what we need, the full \$74 million. The automated license plate reader contract renewal that cost \$114,000 should not even be considered. This technology puts folks at risk of their data and identities being used inappropriately. Surveillance does not make us safer. Resources do. Those funds should go toward the total funding of the community investment budget and other important items like ongoing emergency rental assistance and eviction prevention, support for austinites seeking reproductive healthcare, and free cap metro fares, among other things. It's up to you, mayor and council, to act courageously and fully fund the community investment budget plan. Thank you for your time.

>> Nisha devae.

>> Hi. Mayor and councilmembers, my name is Nisha, deputy director of a fund, speaking on item 4,

[10:34:44 AM]

we have provided direct financial assistance for abortion for Texans for 21 years. I'm speaking today in support of the amendment, \$200,000 in one-time funds for reproductive and sexual health and wellness, and also in support of the rider directing the use of the funds. We're also supporting the community investment budget calls from Progressive advocates including the call to take the first vote on the \$20 an hour minimum wage amendment. The recent decision in the downs case from the U.S. Supreme court has absolutely devastated access to abortion in Texas. If you are an austinite in need of

abortion care, you must travel thousands of miles and spend thousands of dollars out of pocket. It's impossible to convey the depth of this crisis in this short time. We have appreciated the steady support for abortion access from this council. You have shown time and again what's possible when we govern from our values. Please continue to take strong action in support of abortion

[10:35:44 AM]

access and reproductive healthcare. Thank you.

>> Rosanne Maria Perot.

>> Good morning, everyone. My name is Rosanne, she/her, due process, anyone under 18 can confidentially access abortion. We are the recipient of grant funding for support services along with Texas choice. Speaking today in support of the proposed funding for sexual and reproductive health services, including the amendment to add an additional \$200,000 in one-time funds and councilmember Ellis' rider directing the use of the reproductive health funds. We also support the community investment budget and Progressive advocates, including the \$20 an hour minimum. This year has been devastating for abortion access, from the abortion ban, sb8, to the

[10:36:45 AM]

overturning of roe V wade. We know all of these decisions only harm women and people who can become pregnant. Sexual and reproductive healthcare is a core part of our lives. We're grateful council is considering funding to protect the full spectrum of services that Texans need. Thank you.

>> Lindsay ignatowski.

>> Hi, I'm from district 4 and proud dsa member. I did want to say, one minute is not enough time to give people to speak. If there's time in the meeting, this meeting started 21 minutes late, that's 21 citizens that could have had their opinions. But I did want to express solidarity with the community investment budget. We've now compromised and shifted the goal post to focus on \$20 an hour as the city living wage. I hope we can pass that without

[10:37:45 AM]

too many difficulties. I understand that councilmember Fuentes made a change to her proposal, \$7 million was mentioned. I wanted to ask if she could perhaps explain the implications and what that means. Me and several others didn't catch that. I wanted to emphasize to vote no on the automatic license plate readers. There's no public appetite for these. Passed an act to protect reproductive rights

in Austin. If we're serious about this, we need to not have the readers which would undo a lot of reproductive protections. So, thank you very much and again, councilmember Fuentes, would you be able to give a really quick summary of that change for us?

>> Mayor Adler: If you want to respond, go ahead and do that.

>> Fuentes: My amendment is -- seeks to raise the wage to \$20 with a \$7 million allocation

[10:38:46 AM]

from the general fund, as well as additional direction that should additional funds be needed to use any surplus sales tax and a few other directions to staff. So, my amendment still keeps it at us raising the living wage to \$20, but it just changes the amount that we would appropriate during this budget cycle. And I believe we'll be having the discussion on the amendments here shortly after public comment.

>> Mayor Adler: Next speaker.

>> David king.

>> Yes, please support the community investment budget recommendations from go austin/vamos Austin, communities of color united, Austin justice coalition, and Austin parks foundation and preservation Austin. Please support the recommendation from the affordability Austin to reject Austin energy's proposed increases in customer service

[10:39:47 AM]

fees and rates. Please support a people's budget where at least 75% of the total city budget is dedicated to programs and services that directly help and support vulnerable families, low-income families, families of color, middle-income families, and small community-based businesses in Austin. Increase and recalibrate development and impact fees annually to ensure that development pays for itself and offset development impacts. Enact a commercial parkland dedication ordinance and increase the residential parkland dedication fees as recommended by staff. Dedicate at least 5% of the general fund annually for anti-displacement programs that directly help low- and middle-income families and businesses become resilient and avoid involuntary displacement. That would be \$55 million in the proposed budget. Thank you for considering, and thank you for your service.

>> Sam potaznic.

[10:40:49 AM]

>> Hi. My name is Sam, I'm a resident of district 7 and I am calling in support and solidarity with the community investment budget and calling on councilmember pool to withdraw support for the automatic license plate reader proposal. Don't need to spend money on this surveillance program throughout Austin. I'd much rather see us spend our money on a community investment budget, programs that support residents with rental assistance, with weather planning and resilience and extreme weather support. Thank you.

>> Elena Bowes. Elena, please unmute.

[10:41:50 AM]

>> Good morning, city council, my name is Elena Bowes, a resident of district 5. I'm calling to urge city council to support the community investment budget and continue to invest in our community by providing vital funds to the unhoused and employees of the city through city council, councilperson Fuentes amended to fund tenant relocation, and vela's amendment to offer rental assistance. There is a mobile home community in south Austin, south congress, a community that city councilperson Fuentes has personally fought for, that after fighting off the land

[10:42:51 AM]

developers, they have lost their fight to save their space, considered a sanctuary by many, for up to 21 years. A developer came in this past December and bought the land for the mobile homes. The last of this close-knit community are going to be evicted at the end of this month.

>> Thank you, speaker. Your time as expired.

>> Over and over again in Austin.

>> Scott turner.

>> Hello, I'm the president of the home-builders association of greater Austin speaking against the doubling of the parkland fee in the budget. High fees like this are a regulatory barrier to housing, because as a builder, your choice is to pay the fee and pass it on, or not build. Neither one are beneficial in terms of Austin's housing

[10:43:52 AM]

affordability crisis. It has a similar impact on density bonuses like mu2, reducing their ability to produce affordable units. I'd like to ask why we need to charge such a high fee when our parks are doing pretty well according to the proposed budget. And I'll read from page 68. The national recreation and park

association recommends a ratio of ten park acres per 1,000 residents for city's in Austin's population range. Part of the goal is to achieve 24 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. At the end of '21, we had 18 park acres per 1,000 residents. In the city's 2021 community survey, 74% of respondents were satisfied with the quality of the city's parks and recreations.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> It doesn't seem like we are desperate for parks like housing. I'd ask you not to increase the fee and instead, take a look at the impact that our fees, which are already the highest in the state, our land development code, which is outdated, and our

[10:44:53 AM]

years-long approval process have on affordability and attainability. And take a look --

>> Thank you, speaker. Your time has expired.

>> Balance our need for parks and the other things we love about our city. Thank you.

>> Ryan vedros. Jordan Middlebrooks.

>> Jordan Middlebrooks.

>> Connor brofy.

[10:45:55 AM]

>> Good morning, mayor Adler and all councilmembers. I'm Connor, he/him and speaking in complete opposition of item 12 to reject the use of automatic license plate readers within Austin. Against item 12, because it allows APD to track and share the whereabouts of those seeking abortion, undermining grace's protection. It is not shown to be a proven asset in clearing crimes. Despite Austin's crime volume being in line with national averages, we have seen a year over year decrease in crime clearances by the APD. This includes the years of the police budget continually exploding, as well as the years the alprs were originally used, 2016-2020. It should not be a tool given to the APD to compensate for their short comings. The department has always been fully funded. If it is reinstated per code, it has a fundamental lack of oversight. So, until Austin has had a

[10:46:55 AM]

chance to vote on the Austin police oversight act, the APD would have absolute impunity to sweep any infraction under the rug. Please vote against item 12. Thank you all for your time and for your consideration.

>> Ryan vedros.

>> Can y'all hear me now?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Okay. Great. Good morning, my name is Ryan, most people will know me as gumbo, they/them, calling from district 5 as a proud member of afscme 1624 and the Austin chapter of the democratic socialists of America. Before you decide on anything else today, it's imperative you pass the community investment budget, including \$20 an hour minimum wage for all city employees and amendments for weather shelters and reproductive rights funding. Workers run this city at every level -- not bosses, landlords, tech companies making pilgrimages here, or instruments of capital. Until the city stands up for its most precarious workers and pays

[10:47:56 AM]

them a thriving wage amongst the inflation crisis, we won't be a great city. Fund renters, worker assistance, and ems. Vote no on item 12 regarding alprs, or keep postponing it indefinitely. I don't know why you would vote to give more money to APD when their violent and racist actions have cost the city nearly \$14 million in damages. That's to say nothing of the vile, horrifying invasions of privacy and extreme surveillance the alprs would give to an unaccountable institution, an institution that has hardly done its job in two years out of spite because they rightfully came under scrutiny in 2020. The surveillance will harm black people, people seeking abortions, and many others that don't look like cis white men.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Vote no on alprs when they come up. Thank you.

>> Crystal Erickson Collins.

[10:48:56 AM]

>> Hi. My name is crystal, please don't vote to fund license plate readers. This kind of data can be confusing, and it often has a history of unfairly surveilling and policing people of color. Let's shoot that money away from an already overfunded non-complying police department into the services that will keep us safer, like rental assistance and eviction prevention, harm reduction and ems. Recently, my daughter was forced out of her apartment of seven years. She's been doing her bit to Austin's commitment to be a no-kill city. The apartment management began fining her \$10 per day and on top of

a previous increase in rent, she could not afford to stay. Let me tell you how hard it is to find an apartment in Austin on wages of \$16 per hour. Please raise the minimum wage to \$20. Thank you.

[10:50:01 AM]

>> Phyllis Snodgrass.

>> Mayor, city council, stu for the opportunity to speak to you today on item 13. I'm Phyllis, CEO of Austin habitat for humanity, in district 3. I'm here to speak in support of the affordable housing bond to be placed on the November '22 ballot. We are seeing a record number of requests for housing. The need is greater than ever. And we all know this. We must take action now with a bold investment in our community. The affordable housing bonds have been a very effective tool to get more affordable homes built in Austin. We cannot take our foot off the pedal. We need these funds now to continue addressing the need for more affordable homes, for hard-working austinities. Please vote yes for the affordable housing bond. Thank you.

>> Awais Azar.

[10:51:03 AM]

>> Mayor, mayor pro tem and councilmembers, my name is awais Azar and I serve on the board of directors of housing works Austin. We are part of the coalition of over 30 community organizations focused on affordable housing provision and advocacy that are supporting a 2020 affordable housing bond in the city of Austin. We thank you for your efforts to place a \$250 million on the November 2020 ballot, and working on a contract with voters that focuses on providing deeply affordable and long-term housing opportunities for the most vulnerable austinities throughout our city. There is no doubt that Austin is facing a housing crisis, with home prices and rents reaching record highs. As a community, we must act now with a bold investment to address housing affordability in our city. Considering the success of our previous bonds, we know affordable housing bonds are an effective tool for addressing affordability, creating jobs and generating billions in the local economy. These bonds play a key role in helping us fight gentrification and displacement and keep Austin a diverse and inclusive city.

[10:52:07 AM]

We want to expand housing opportunities and address affordability for all, and expand anti-displacement initiatives.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Thank you for your leadership and investing in affordability in our community.

>> Noemi Mercado. Noemi Mercado, please unmute.

>> Thanks.

[Speaking Spanish]

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> We're going to see if the translator is style on the line.

[10:53:10 AM]

>> I'm here.

>> Wonderful. Would you mind translating?

>> This is Jacqueline, the interpreter. Just a second.

[Speaking Spanish]

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: My name is -- Mercado.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: I've been an employee of the public library system for 28 years.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: And I'm calling about the proposal of the \$20.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: Because I've been there for 28 years and I'm still at \$18. And with the way the economy is right now, it's not enough.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

[10:54:14 AM]

>> Interpreter: My electricity bill is \$500. I'm asking to please -- siga.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: At least adjust my pay to \$22.

>> [Speaking Spanish]

>> Interpreter: Because I'm very stressed with the situation and everything that's going on. All I ask is for my salary to be adjusted. Thank you.

>> Rachel Shannon.

>> Nancy Lopez Cantu.

>> Hello, my name is Nancy, I am also a city employee since 2008. I'm in support of raising the

[10:55:17 AM]

wage for city employees. I have a 6-year-old who goes to school here in del valle, because I live 40 minutes outside of Austin. I also have a 2-year-old that's attending daycare. I can not afford daycare if the city of Austin does not increase our wage. I also ask that the city of Austin look into increasing the benefit, child care assistance program for the city of Austin employees. I work in the city, and I have my children in the city, and I need help in order for me to be able to continue to come to work and provide service for Austin public library. Thank you.

>> Rachel Shannon.

>> Mayor Adler: And after Ms. Shannon --

>> Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Adler: Come back to me. Go ahead, speaker.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we can.

>> Hello?

>> Yes, we can hear you.

>> Yes? Okay. Sorry, I just got passed over. Good morning, mayor Adler and

[10:56:17 AM]

councilmembers, this is Rachel Shannon, a resident and homeowner of district 1 for over 20 years. I want to thank you for your investment thus far in the community investment budget. I'm for you maximizing the funding in the budget so we can appropriately serve those most in need in the city, including our own workers. We don't need meagerly funded programs designed to fail so we can discard

them without giving them a real chance. We need robust investment and not in costly, unnecessary surveillance. At this critical point for growing Austin, we need ongoing emergency rental assistance and eviction prevention. The full \$12 million is not too much for that. A living wage for city workers starting with a \$20 minimum, robust weather planning and sheltering. Weather is now a multi-seasonal threat and here to stay. We need to plan as such. As for capital metro, for a city built on being a nexus of ideas and new technology and a unique

[10:57:17 AM]

natural environment, the lack of basic services such as free public transportation is inexcusable. This is a baseline need for the health of our citizens and during a worsening ecological and economic climate. If we can pay \$14 million to bail out APD because of their own mismanagement, then we can risk truly investing in efforts to meet the actual stated needs of our communities. Please fully fund the community investment budget now. Thank you.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: How many speakers do we have with us today that have children? Do we have anyone with children that would like to speak now so that they can move on? If you do, you can come now and speak. If not, we'll go back to the other speakers. These would be speakers with children.

[10:58:17 AM]

>> Speaker, before you go, mayor, may I ask, I certainly understand why you're offering that, but I wonder if folks without kids may not understand the implications of why you would offer that?

>> Mayor Adler: We have some restless children with us here today, and I just want to give those restless children the opportunity not to be entertained with us any longer than they need to be. So, if those speakers would like to speak, I want to give them a chance to do that.

>> My name is Kevin Welch, resident, district 8. Current president of the board at eff Austin, a local digital advocacy organization. I've already spoken with some council about item 12, automated license plate readers, but I wanted to urge you all to please reject the resolution as it currently stands. There are far more legal safeguards that need to be in this if we're going to do this at all. For one thing, you cannot have mobile license plate readers. They're too easy to politicize. You can place them in places that can criminalize activities

[10:59:19 AM]

the city council supports. You can't have third-party contractors with this data. You cannot work third party contractors with this. The office of oversight has real teeth to regulate this. I have brought a sheet of recommendations I've discussed that I would love if staff could hand out to council to educate them further on the issue. I encourage you, bare minimum, delay this issue until you research it further. Thank you for your time.

>> I have a question for you. What was the change that didn't allow third-party contractors for this type of technology.

>> Yes. The data cannot be held by

[11:00:23 AM]

vendors. It must all be with the city of Austin.

>> Okay. Got you. Thank you.

>> Thank you for coming down here. You said you live in district 8. I think you might be the only district 8 person who signed up to speak. I want to review the materials because it sounds like you have a lot of advice to offer on this and I appreciate you taking the time to come down here.

>> I would love to speak with you, council member Ellis. I love some of the work you've done in the district.

>> Ellis: Let me give you a business card so we can connect.

>> Le: --

>> Vela: Mayor? Sir? What has your model legislation -- if there was a city, state that got license plate readers right, who's your

[11:01:23 AM]

guide.

>> The truth is I don't think anybody has gotten it right but the people who have done it the best is New Hampshire. No hit in three minutes -- all data is wiped, erase, if there's no hit within three minutes.

>> Vela: Thank you.

>> Any other questions before I -- thank you so much. I really appreciate it.

>> I have a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on one second.

>> Kitchen: Just more information about how the three-minute thing works. On its face it would seem like you never use it. What does that mean.

>> If there's an active felony or warrant on the license plate you can know that in three minutes. The only safe data is data not collected all but if you must collect it the shorter the

[11:02:23 AM]

time, the safer.

>> Kitchen: If there's a warrant that's already in the system so it will bounce against it.

>> I'm a software engineer -- if it's in the database -- you can know in a couple of seconds.

>> Kitchen: In other words, you can flag it already.

>> Yes and you don't need to keep that record if there's no hit.

>> Kitchen: I was thinking what you meant is you collect it and sometime later someone would go and check against it but you can automate the hits.

>> You can. Potentially post hoc fishing for crimes -- building a case after the fact. You can know if there's a warrant on the license plate within three minutes.

>> Kitchen: I understand what you're saying.

>> Mayor Adler: When HPD talked to us and we were talking about

[11:03:24 AM]

the quick wipe or right away, they said one of the application with the device is if they identify there's a crime and now they have evidence and they have a suspect for a crime that occurred last Thursday that they didn't have then and they want to establish the person was in the area at the time to check and see if the person was in the area at the time, if it was wiped they would no longer have that functionality.

>> I do hear that. That being said, like all policies you have to weigh benefits with risks. I think the risks far outweigh the benefits. In 2020 in England the entire national database was leaked. Years of records of every record, everywhere they've gone. I don't think how you don't spin that as surveillance. People have a right to travel

[11:04:26 AM]

freely if they haven't committed a crime and 99.9 per cent of the people these systems register have not committed a crime.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much.

>> My name is Rodney Sutton. I'm -- I, too, am a city employee. I've been the city since 2020. Here we go again talking about how to keep our employees -- well, my answer is for you to do better than the fast food places. Do better than fast food places. They're starting their people off up to \$18 an hour.

[11:05:27 AM]

\$20 an hour would be a great help for the city. And then our heat conditions and stuff like that in our trucks can be overwhelming. We got people that pass out because of the heat in our trucks. That's not good. They keep saying they're going to fix the issues and they haven't been fixed yet. They give us the run-around. They say they're going to fix it when winter comes and we have to deal with the same issues next year, which is not good for employees. Trash recycling is the sixth most deadliest job in the world, number five in the United States. I think that needs an incentivize. If we do not pick up the trucks, you'll have other elements -- raccoons, possums, things of that nature that will

[11:06:30 AM]

affect the city as well. Also, day care is essential.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you for your service to the city and for coming down to talk to us today

>> Tovo: I want to echo that thanks. I'll just say it from here but when you came down in June, you mentioned the air conditioning in the trucks and my office followed up with it. We've followed up with what the plan was. I want you to know how impactful your testimony was and when you come down here, all of you -- I appreciate you raising that. If you want more information about what we received about a what the plans are -- they're making good progress but having supply-chain issues. It's not a new issue this year

[11:07:32 AM]

and as I understand they have gotten a prototype that would be on top of the trucks to provide some air conditioning. I think that pilot worked out well. As long as I'm on the dais, which isn't that much longer, I'm going to keep on talk of it. Again, thank you. Thank you very much.

>> Mr. Sutton, would you mind letting that young man do his civic duty and put him in the chair for a picture. You've got to back away, dad.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you ask him what he thinks about some of this stuff.

>> Fix it all.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much.

[11:08:39 AM]

Anyone else with children that would like to speak now? Let's go back to the remote speakers. Thank you.

>> Next up is Brittany bays.

>> Morning. My name is Brittany bays. I'm chair of Austin housing coalition. We are a nonprofit housing developer -- businesses and residents who support affordable housing. We help repair houses and provide low-income households. Wanted to speak on item 13 and thank the mayor and council for placing the bond on the ballot. Your leadership will allow us to expand affordable housing opportunities and help those most in need in the community.

[11:09:44 AM]

Affordable housing is critical. That's for those 30 per cent or below of the median income. In Texas the national low housing income initiative is noting every 30 people -- only 22 of those affordable homes exist and our own strategic housing blueprint in Austin estimates a gap of 60,000, of which we've only built about 7200 of those. This bond provides crucial funding to address our housing crisis in Austin. Thank you so much for your leadership and support of the issue.

>> Greg Bosley.

>> I live in district three. I'm member of the Texas state

[11:10:46 AM]

employers union. It's clear the people want to move away from a false model of safety and towards a model that guarantees every person's right to housing, good union jobs and recreation. We've made that clear in the protest, the election of Jose Garza. APD has abuse of using surveillance. They've used the center to spy on activists, events celebrated by black culture and the juneteenth celebration. I urge you to reject any

[11:11:48 AM]

additional funding for surveillance tools. On the other hand I want to draw your attention to -- the union rallying outside for a living wage.

>> Thank you. Your time has expired.

>> We know from previous speakers have?

>> Jordan Middlebrooks. Jordan, are you with us? Please unmute. Frank nester.

>> My name is frank. I'm a member of Austin

[indiscernible] As well as the employee union. I am calling because I'm in

[11:12:50 AM]

support with all my fellow public employees in asking that you raise their wage to \$20 an hour. The city is getting increasingly expensive and we need that to survive. I'm trying to find a way to leave town because I've had a couple stressful months. My mom has been in and out of the er. It's hard to leave town if you don't know if your power is going to stay on. I'm asking instead of pushing budgeting to things like APD and alpr's that will spy on you, we need to invest following the community investment budget and provide healthcare, safe housing, affordable housing, and great jobs for all of us in the city.

[11:13:52 AM]

Thank you so much for your time and attention. Hope you have a great day. Bye.

>> Jordan Middlebrooks.

>> Hi, everyone. Are you able to hear me.

>> We are. Thank you.

>> Perfect. Well, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on behalf of the city budget. I have been heavily involved with a lot of the work being done to invest in our social programs and services. I support all the recommendations coming out like increasing minimum wage for ems worker, affordable housing. I do want to spend the time talking about budget specifically around Austin energy and our energy portfolio. One big topic that comes up is

[11:14:54 AM]

the power project which we had decommissioned. There's been no information shared about what's happening with that outside of the decisions -- the decision to no longer shut down the plan. I want to ask council to not approve projects related to that. It's misaligned to Austin being a Progressive city.

>> Thank you. Your time has expired. That concludes the remote speakers. In one moment I'll switch to in person.

[11:15:56 AM]

First speaker is Alice woods, followed by Alicia Torrez.

>> I'm Alice woods and I'm speaking in support of item 13 on behalf of stage development, three Texas based woman-owned affordable housing providers. We want to thank you for your leadership in putting this bond on the ballot. As a direct result of the 2018 housing bond we have built 226 affordable units and have another 226 in pre development. Our three projects in the pipeline are starting construction this year, June west and sayson north in district 7 which will provide

[11:17:00 AM]

affordable units for families. Katy lofts will start next year and will deliver 100 units of affordable housing. These are only possible with gap financing from the city. We need a source of funds to serve those most in need in our community. Thank you.

>> Alicia Torrez and Anabel Garcia. Is Alicia here? What about Anna Isabelle? After Anna then Carol guthry.

>> [Speaking Spanish].

[11:18:11 AM]

>> I live in district four. I am here to support enhanced library cards in the city budget. At workers' defense we have spoken about the benefits an enhanced library card would bring to the immigrant community and we would like to thank council member Fuentes in that aspect.

[11:19:17 AM]

A lack of I.D. Can prevent community members from getting resources. These would benefit those without legal status, people formerly incarcerated, lgbtqia folks and others. This would be more accessible to community members, no matter their status or circumstances. It is difficult to obtain and renew an I.D. Through the consulate. These cards are another way for the community to identify themselves. We ask the council follow the lead of other cities and vote

[11:20:17 AM]

for enhanced library cards.

>> Kitchen: Mayor? Could I quickly say I want to thank council member Fuentes for her leadership and I would love to be added as a cosponsor.

>> Vela: I wanted to say the same thing. I'm an immigration attorney who has seen my clients struggle to get valid I.D.S. It's very expensive. There's a Mexican consulate but if you're from other countries you have to travel very far to get an I.D. I would like to be added as a co-sponsor. I appreciate workers' defense bringing people to testify on the many issues that come before us. It's -- we have 23 and gave.

[11:21:20 AM]

We always have the voice in Spanish here at the council meetings. So thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: It's good to have an immigration attorney with us just to bookmark. Council member Casar and I were pushing this issues years ago. There were concerns about creating an data field that could endanger those who signed up. Not to discuss now because we're in public communication but when we get to the question/answer period if we could get you or staff to address that that would be helpful

>> Tovo: I remember that conversation and I believe mayor pro tem coal had introduced it.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we brought it back as a group

>> Tovo: Yeah. Sometimes the work we do here

[11:22:20 AM]

lasts long beyond our tenure so it's always good to recognize the others who have also worked on this issue. Council member Fuentes, I appreciate you bringing this forward again and thank you, mayor, for your work.

>> Mayor Adler: Next speaker.

>> Carol Guthrie followed my Chuma acora.

>> Good morning. I'm sure you know why I'm here. Your employees need \$20. We appreciate the 18 but it just doesn't get them there, so I hope when you deliberate today you will continue to keep your employees as your number one priority and get them that

[11:23:21 AM]

\$20. Vote yes for \$20. Thank you so much and good luck. .

>> Chumo akoro.

>> I'm glad to be in front of you. I miss Casar. I'm talking on mental health. They do not have representative. They don't have income to ask for. They do abortion. They don't come from other country. It could be a family member. I've been asking for a very long time. I sent you research demarcating area -- city needs to focus on the budget. That was economical and non-economical. We know economy is going bad.

[11:24:23 AM]

But mental health needs to be sponsored because I'm running for governor of Texas and I D not know if I'm going to win. I've been doing so much. 18,000 plus plate of food every day. I come out as a street nurse. I never failed you all. I need at least 6 million to buy a property or give us one of the packs -- one on oak spring -- or find a city property. Crisis might come again. I did well in coronavirus. I was writing research. Put mental health academy and I'll talk to any of you that is interested to help me. I need Austin alliance. I need recreation and two council members that will handle the funding for us. Thank you.

[11:25:25 AM]

>> Connor might beingly.

>> May I? To the last speaker, I see you only missed council member Casar, but I missed you. It's good to be back in city hall and see familiar faces again. It's good to see you.

>> Please. Two council members help me to fund the money.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. We appreciate you.

>> My name is Connor. I'm a resident of district three. I volunteer with the local housing assistance and am calling to reject the proposed police budget and provide funding to needy families.

[11:26:34 AM]

Some of the living spaces should have been condemned after the freeze, yet here they are still standing with people living in them. When residents complain they tend to be ignored or retaliated against. I learned management called the police and the city code department. These people took city assistance when it was available but the resident I was paired up was made homeless tempora temporarily. Coming back after living in a tent was not easy. I now live in a place that raised rent 20 per cent last year. Do not allocate more money to the police; allocate to rental

[11:27:35 AM]

assistance. That's it. Thank you.

>> Good morning, mayor, mayor pro tem, and council. I am the Austin policy coordinator at worker's defense. We're here supporting enhanced library cards. It is past time workers in the city be paid to live in the city. Our members are construction workers and they're moving away from Austin and continue to building on low wages. They would be direct beneficiaries of a \$20 wage. It's an equity issue and construction workers should be able to afford to live here. As for library cards -- this has been an initiative members have been thinking about, advocating for for years. We're hoping to get to the finish line. This helps all members verify ident identities.

[11:28:35 AM]

This is not new. We would be taking the lead of other cities such as San Antonio, San Marcus and Dallas. We encourage you to include enhanced library cards in today's budget.

>> Fran tatu.

>> I'm a resident of the hill country. As a homeowner and taxpayer and outreach volunteer, I'm concerned about the allocation of funds -- most specifically for the unhoused population, those with mental health challenges, all those struggling with addiction and would like to speak on their behalf. I am today in support of obviously the community investment budget and I would like to take 30 seconds to name those organizations.

[11:29:35 AM]

Access to activism, alliance for safety and justice, Austin area urban league, Austin pets alive, avow, crime survivors for safety and justice.... Grass roots leadership, housing works, indivisible Austin. Thank you. I yield my time.

>> Janet mcclarn.

>> I'm here on behalf of the roller derby community. Many of you have heard from our community about covering the practice area. I want to thank council member vela for proposing the budget rider. I want to raise the flag that it doesn't quite go far enough. We're talking about a hundred

[11:30:37 AM]

square foot space. It's a concrete slab and this rider directs the city manager's office to prioritize shade. We might get left out. This for our community is really important and if we're not named we might not be there. I want to make the case to specify that Austin roller derby community is important because without Austin there would be no roller derby in the world. This is a core part of our community as being part of the city. I want to thank you again and ask you to support the rider.

>> Kitchen: As part of our discussion on this rider I intend to make it clear that roller derby is part of what we want them to look at and also am happy to work with you after this.

>> Thank you so much. I can't tell you how much that means. I appreciate you all.

[11:31:38 AM]

>> Joy castowski and Lee monte.

>> I've talked to a lot of you on zoom lately. It's good to see you in person. I'm here today and -- on behalf of our letter that was signed by 17 other organizations to fund some high needs infrastructure within the parks department. I want to thank mayor pro tem's number four signage and way program, council member Ellis' investing in play, and council member vela's number four, allocating additional funds. These -- we work with the parks department and partners to prioritize what were the top

[11:32:39 AM]

needs not included in the base budget, so I urge you to support those as well as take a look at other items that have not been added. And thank you for your service.

>> Lynn monte and Paul Elridge.

>> Good morning. I've been with the city over 20 years and I'd like to take the opportunity to speak on behalf of the budget. I stand before you to ask you to consider amending the \$18 wage to \$20. We have city employees working two and three jobs to provide shelter, food, and insurance for their families. The four per cent increase and one-time stipend was nice but it was not enough. We are working harder to fill the staffing vacancy and it

[11:33:41 AM]

seems like we're getting very little appreciation. Thank you.

>> Paul Elridge and Maria Una.

>> Hello. I'm an internal medicine resident and resident of district four. I'm here to speak in support of the community investment budget and against policing license plate readers. I believe in programs to support communities and not funding to oppress and incarcerate people. \$10 million rent relief would prevent my patients on the edge of homelessness. Every day I see patients that cannot afford to take off work for a hysterectomy and they end

[11:34:42 AM]

up with chronic bleeding. Cannot afford rehabilitation for alcohol or drug abuse, do not have mental health services to receive that. Many of them fall into homelessness and live in scenarios that could have otherwise been prevented. As 40 per cent of all health is determined by social circumstances I encourage you to consider what \$10 million rent relief would mean for the city. Lastly, I ask you to consider funding for reproductive health as proposed by representative Fuentes

>> Tovo: This is not a question for the speaker. This is a question for my colleagues or the agenda or clerk's office. We're starting to get lots of amendments and revised amendments. But we're getting two files for each of those. I want to be sure those two files are always the same --

[11:35:42 AM]

the PDF and the excel sheet. Is that what's happening, that we're just getting an excel version and PDF of any amendments being sent out? Does anyone know? They look the same when I open them. But I have about nine of them. I just thought I would ask.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you try to find the answer to that and let us know

>> Tovo: For the public, we're distributing copies and getting them. It's trying to manage them.

>> Mayor Adler: Who is the e-mail coming from

>> Tovo: Casey Roberts from the agenda office.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Maria unda and Alicia Torrez.

>> Hello, everyone. I'm a doctoral student at the university of Texas, Austin.

[11:36:45 AM]

I'm a policy fellow with the Texas center for education policy. I'm here on behalf of

[indiscernible] And support for dual language camps, with the commission of immigrant affairs. It would go to a new education coordinator to continue with academic programming. As you know gentrification, the charter school system has decreased public school funding and has impacted black and brown students here in Austin independent school district, so these funds would greatly support our students and our families and continue the important programming that we provide for the community throughout Austin. Thank you.

[Buzzer] .

>> Alicia torres.

[11:37:51 AM]

>> I'm here to ask council to vote no for the license plate reader. Here to ask council member pool, council members kitchen, tovo, and Ellis to pull their support for the automated license plate reader. The only safe data is no data collected at all. We voted at the community. We said this does not make us feel safe in 2020. So I ask you do not belittle the efforts made in 2020, do not renew the automated license plate program. We already said at the community it does not make us feel safer. \$114,000 is a lot of money. I can name countless reasons or items that this could be -- this money could be put to use for. In particular I want to say the

[11:38:54 AM]

114,000 should be allocated to ending the raids on the unhoused community and go to increasing inclement weather shelter in Austin. I'm excited about the enhanced library program. I'm excited to see what the pilot program will look like. Thank you, council member Fuentes, for leading those efforts.

>> Mike Cante and Monica Guzman.

>> Good morning. I'm a resident of district nine, proud member of ashme 1624 and thrilled to be in my first year as an Austin public library associate. Our building and ground staff and our security staff are

[11:39:57 AM]

among the lowest wage workers at the city. These workers who preserve and protect our public space, who deal with the messiest of situations have a right to stay in the city. They deserve to be able to stay here, raise their families here and not just survive but flourish. I look forward to checking out materials with enhanced library cards and I can't wait to win historic housing bond in November. Thank you for championing the working class who cares for the city.

[Buzzer].

>> Monica Guzman.

>> Good morning, mayor and council. I'm policy director at go vamos Austin. Invest in additional 12 million

[11:40:59 AM]

to expand the income pilot approved by council in may. Invest in 12 million for contracts for nonprofit community organizations providing emergency relief for those experiencing homeless, to ensure disaster preparedness, spend down 3 million on arpa funds. Fund all six hubs. Train multilingual climates, provide training and devices to block captains across the city. Invest 150,000 in nature-based parks program, advance the children's outdoor bill of rights [speaking rapidly] Existing childhood park programming to make it

[11:42:01 AM]

available to home base providers who lack access. Invest a hundred thousand in community gardens, the north Austin ymca. I'm end it here. You can reference the recommendations given you last Friday. Thank you.

>> Noay alious.

>> I'm here in support of the \$20 living wage for city workers. This week I made a point of visiting my neighbors, my friends that work for the city and asking them what \$20 living wage would mean to them.

A lot of them, the first thing they led with was relief of their stress for paying their bills, paying for child care, paying their rent, paying everything that's been increasing in our city.

[11:43:03 AM]

\$20 living wage would definitely help our workers, our lowest-wage worker ins the city. I want to add I support the increase in rental assistance, funding reproductive healthcare and enhanced library cards. As an immigrant growing up undocumented in Austin, I understand the necessity of having an I.D. And how hard it is when you do not have access to an I.D. Thank you so much for that.

>> Rachel stone and then Scott Cobb.

>> Hello. My name is Rachel stone. I'm a member of district one. I wanted to speak in support of the community investment budget and against item 12. I'd like to put on my hat as assistant director and speak in

[11:44:07 AM]

support of the affording housing bonds. There are a lot of projects coming up that rely on the affordable housing bonds, especially members making up to 30 per cent median family income. Building affordable homes for homeownership -- these are the only funds available while some of my projects have up to 10 sources and the bonds are filling a much-needed gap for our homeownership opportunities. There really is no other source. They're incredibly important if we want to see homeownership opportunities for people in the city. Thank you for your support and that's all I have to say.

[Buzzer] .

>> Scott Cobb and Selena Z.

>> I'm wondering if anyone up there has had to get up at 5:00

[11:45:09 AM]

o'clock and go to a nonprofit in order to get emergency dental care? I think if you haven't had that experience you would offer an amendment of the 150 temporary employees receiving healthcare from the city who cannot buy dental insurance to allow them to buy insurance -- 150 people you would help for a cost of \$75,000. Otherwise, I'll see you outside in February maybe, 5:00 A.M. Want to thank you council member vela for offering the amendment for full-time life guards. If you do that, Barton springs will never close again starting as they did this year. That's an amazing thing. Thank you very much. Thank you for the bonuses for next year and the pay raise.

[11:46:09 AM]

If you do all those things, I think we'll have a great summer next year. Thank you very much.

>> Selena Z.

>> Hi, council. My name is Selena. I'm president of the Austin ems association. As I've been sharing, we are currently 23 per cent short staffed and we continue to have rising call volumes and we're unable to adequately meet the needs of the city right now. We know there are financial constraints on the city. I thank you for the amendments and riders you have brought forward to help us chip away at this problem. We have to think of our community and the way it's expanding. That's why I support council

[11:47:12 AM]

member Fuentes' amendment for good night ranch and council member Kelly's amendment for canyon creek. We have to build the stations. I know the builder said if this is delayed they won't work with us and the costs are only going to go up. As soon as good night ranch is built we have a paramedic that will be able to go there and we don't have locations for them south of the river. I also support the airport pilot. I have waited an hour at the airport trying to get in and also to wait for the plane to land and we need resources out there so that the ambulances in the neighborhood are available for the neighborhoods and I also support as part of the financial constraints -- I support council member -- pro tem alter's amendments to make

[11:48:13 AM]

sure we are not creating -- that we are making sure we are getting all the revenue that we are supposed to and not creating a further burden on the city. Finally -- I'm sorry for taking your time -- I do support the whole blood and simulation center. With rising gun violence, whole blood is the number one way we can stop deaths immediately. Our folks that are embedded with the other public safety agencies can get to gunshot victims within three minutes and provide whole blood. That simulation center will allow them to train together. It also alleviates our staffing crisis because it allows our folks to get through training much quicker with high fidelity simulation center. I'm available for questions on any of those.

>> Kitchen: Thank you. Let me just say first -- you know, I'm sure on behalf of

[11:49:13 AM]

everyone on the dais, or they can speak for themselves, we appreciate the work you do at ems. I'm glad you spoke to the whole blood. I hadn't had a chance to ask questions about that specifically. It sounds like this is something that's needed -- both in terms of -- I think there's dollars for equipment and on going dollars.

>> We have done a pilot program and I have seen multiple lives being saved. I think there were two or three shootings downtown where our rapid team was able to get whole blood and we were able to save lives. I would like for you to hear about the life saving they're

[11:50:14 AM]

doing. People lose blood for medical conditions like kroens. We're circulating blood as opposed to normal saline or other types of fluids.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you for being here. I appreciated learning from you in drafting that budget to the amendment for the whole blood program. I think those are value adds for our community, especially at a time when we need to keep everybody safe and further our mission. Thank you for coming to speak on that.

>> Mayor Adler: How would you prioritize the ems related request.

>> I think the billing rider will pay dividends. The other thing is a gray component of these amendments is most of them don't come from the general fund. The airport pilot -- that comes from the airport enterprise, I believe, but it doesn't come

[11:51:16 AM]

from the general fund. The billing rider will -- I mean, pay for itself with increased revenue. You know, I mean, there are actually very few implications on the general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: How would you prioritize the ones that are general fund? There's the whole blood, there's the mannequin?

>> Simulation. It's which mission do we go with? I've seen wonders with whole blood. I've seen it be deployed amazing across the state and country, so I hope we continue that project. They're trying to build a new public safety campus northeast to take over some of the older headquarters. I think there are possible partnerships with ACC but I think it's important too.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to go through a speed round of

[11:52:18 AM]

questions with staff at the end of this and one of the questions I have is what would be the funding source for the airport. If that was a general fund request as opposed to an airport request. I don't know that -- is a question I want to tee up. If it was how would you prioritize the airport as compared to the whole blood issue.

>> I think with the airport -- so we have -- we have fire suppression. They're not suppose today be there for medical reasons. When there's a medical call we call a fire truck and outside ambulance. I think they should pay for that kind of support. If it had to come out of the general fund, to me it is a more efficient use of our dollars. The airport can justify having an ambulance there and that's a million dollars a year. You're pay for paramedics at

[11:53:20 AM]

peak times. It's more efficient and they can do triage more efficiently than even the firefighters. I've responded to the airport many times and a lot of times they are not people from Austin. They know this is the experience we'll have in the er, help them plan their lives to get in and out to the most appropriate care.

>> Mayor Adler: Apparently there was the mannequin, the whole blood, and the airport. My understanding is you would prioritize between the mannequin and the whole blood -- the whole blood first? Where would you put the airport if?

>> Yes. Whole blood, airport, the simulation center.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Council member kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Thank you. I guess we can talk about this later but from your perspective it makes sense that this is

[11:54:23 AM]

something that aviation -- airport pays for in terms of your ems pilot.

>> They should. I don't know if the amendment was submitted too late but they pay for fire suppression. They should pay for -- if they expand it will become more critical.

>> Kitchen: It's similar to other things they pay for.

>> Absolutely. I think ten years ago they sur chased an sru and had some funding available but at that time I forget why but we couldn't work out the logistic so we weren't able to do it but historically they were willing to pay for it.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I want to be clear that the fees to pay for the fte's in my amendment, those are assessed to the airlines. The airlines will be paying for this type of emergency services, to be clear.

[11:55:32 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Council member vela.

>> Vela: The only hesitation I have is I know the firefighters have presence at the airport. If they're -- to stay ready for any airline emergency, which makes a world of sense to me. I think that?

>> To be clear, they do come. They just -- can you clear us? Can we go? They require another fire truck to be there. I think that might be changing but they historically do not like to sit on medical calls.

>> Vela: Again, and I know we're doing everything we can. It's a chaotic, stressful environment. People have panic attacks and health concerns. There's a lot going on at the airport and I think -- it makes a world of sense to have paramedics there, especially on intense days where there's such chaos, labor day, Thanksgiving,

[11:56:35 AM]

Christmas kind of time.

>> Our presence has made the difference between someone catching a flight or not. I had someone who fell and bruised her ribs and we did an assessment and she was like I can still make my flight home. The other thing is having a room. A lot F O time it is an O motional environment.

-- An emotional environment. Maybe they have concern that they're having a heart attack. We may have to lift up their shirt. It would be great to have a room to do an assess.

>> Vela: Lot of people feel faint and a quick assessment could calm everyone down. I appreciate council member Fuentes for bringing the item.

>> Mayor Adler: Just by way of heads-up, I think that's something we need to explore.

[11:57:36 AM]

I'm going to support the move to the \$20 and in doing that, there's not enough money to do all the things that we ask, so we're going to have to look at these things critically and relative to one another and see if we can cut things back. I'm not suggesting we do on these. I'm just suggesting when we get to question/answer period it would be good to have ems or fire to speak to kind of questions we've raised. We have to figure out something up here. These are all good things. Only thing we know is we can't do them all as proposed.

>> We tried to keep them out of the general fund as much as possible but I know

>> Mayor Adler: To the question that you started with, there's nothing out of the way of time. And if it's the will of the council we can do that. All right, thank you. Next speaker.

>> Clerk: Jeff hollow and

[11:58:37 AM]

then followed by Michael Floyd.

>> Hello, good morning mayor and council. First thing I would like to say is I would like to thank all the Progressive leadership on council for supporting a 20-dollar minimum wage. This is a game changer. This is super important for our communities and I have to say that it's just really important to sigh that the Progressive votes on council are taking leadership on this issue. I'm also here to speak in support of council member Fuentes' amendment adding \$200,000 to the contract for cold weather shelters. This is small compared to the ask of the community investment budget which was three million dollars for cold weather shelters, but everything we can get into this next contract before the winter comes around it will make a difference. We've had two very traumatic winters as a community where community members have been left to scramble to solve a problem that the city has not been adequately capable of solving. So I hope this time around

[11:59:38 AM]

we can take a step towards actually at least for the first time in the history of this city -- [buzzer] -- investing in cold weather shelter. Thank you.

>> Clerk: Michael Floyd and then Kathie Mitchell.

>> Hello, I'm Michael Floyd, resident of district 3, member of all saints episcopal church and I'm here representing central Texas interfaith. We've been working with central Texas families for 40 years and we're here to remind you that our city budget is a moral document. Our budget must be judged on how it serves the families most in need. At this point this specifically entails three things. First the families

affected by rising rents. It needs the assistance proposed by council member vela. Second in few of the ongoing need for job training to lift struggling families out of poverty, the budget must

[12:00:40 PM]

keep workforce development funding at its present level to avoid a 300,000-dollar shortfall for such highly successful programs as capital idea. And third in view of how hard Austin's critically needed lowest paid workers struggle to afford to live here, budget needs to include a 20-dollar minimum hourly wage.

[Buzzer]. Central Texas interfaith calls on our city council to pass a moral budget that we can be proud of because it serves the families most in need. Thank you.

>> Clerk: Kathie Mitchell and then Kate granzioni.

>> Mayor Adler: How many more do we have?

>> Clerk: Three.

>> Good morning, I'm here on behalf of the community investment budget coalition and I just want to explain why we are strongly supporting the 20-dollar minimum wage and that you

[12:01:40 PM]

take it up first. I spent the last two days as many of us have combing through the agency budgets, kind of shaking the couch upside down to see what quarters we could find. And the thing that really leapt out for me having literally run my eyes over the entire general revenue fund is the number of departments where vacancies have really changed the equation. Where there are so many vacancies that the whole funding structure is frankly out of whack. Programs are not moving forward, services are not being delivered and you can see it in the dollars. And that's why we took this on as a priority because the city delivering --

[buzzer] -- The services that we all expect in our parks and in our pools and in our neighborhood development plans and across

[12:02:40 PM]

every department, in our animal services, in our adoption programs, being able to deliver those services depends on having the employees in place doing their jobs and we believe that 20-dollar amount is the first important step to getting us there. And then we can talk about all of the other ways we need to

expand our services. You have seen our list. You already know what we want. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

>> Clerk: Kate G and then Ophelia zapata. Is Kate or Ophelia here?

>> I believe Ms. Zapata had to head home.

>> Clerk: Then mayor, that concludes all the speakers we have registered.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Colleagues, let's talk. I appreciate everybody who came down to speak. Is there anyone that came to

[12:03:42 PM]

Speak that wishes to speak that we have not called? Sir, the items on our agenda today allows anyone who wants to speak ability to speak so I want to make sure there's no one here who would like to speak and has not had that opportunity. All right, colleagues. It is obviously noon. There's a program that's outside of this building that I think some of the council members wanted to attend. The next thing we would do I think right now is to ask questions of staff. Do we want to break until 1:00 and come back? Do we want to start with questions and just let council members who want to leave, leave? What's people's preferences? Councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: Whatever we decide to do, I hope we'll ask our questions with our colleagues because we just gain a lot from hearing those and won't be

[12:04:45 PM]

backtracking.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Pool.

>> Pool: I had hoped to attend the event on mobility but I'm not going to go. It's the luncheon piece and the speaker, but I want to stay here and do this work.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Other people? Councilmember Fuentes?

>> Fuentes: Mayor, colleagues, I prefer for us to break for lunch and then that allows those of us who are going to the luncheon to attend and for us to come back in an hour so that we can pick up.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Harper-Madison.

>> Harper-Madison: I'm curious if there will be another opportunity. So the value for me of having the lunch hour to contemplate some of the information would have been valuable. So I just wonder if there will be another opportunity after we ask our questions for us to maybe break one more time? I certainly

don't want to put any kinks in the day, but I would like to have some cushion in between everybody asking their questions and us resuming deliberations.

>> Mayor Adler: I think

[12:05:45 PM]

several people have asked for that. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: And that actually raises sort of a general question I meant to ask at the beginning of the day. My assessment is that we're not going to finish today and so that may also I think -- allow us to structure our day so that we are building in that time. But if that's other folks' consensus maybe we could just kind of figure out what time we're going to go to today, what we hope to accomplish and then we'll all have better expectations for what we need to accomplish.

>> Mayor Adler: Did you want to say something?

>> [Inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: We'll pick that back up later today. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: This is our budget day and it seems like this should be our priority. How many colleagues need to leave? How many people are we trying to accommodate with this? Because we have staff that's waiting. I mean, this is our budget

[12:06:47 PM]

day and I just feel like that's what we should be doing. If someone chooses to leave they choose to leave, but this should be an important part of our job.

>> Mayor Adler: I think if a bulk of clients wanted to stay I would probably stay as well. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I had declined the invitation simply because it was day one of budget and I didn't anticipate that we would have a moment to get away. I know this is where we start figuring out where is our questions, where are the amendments. I know there's updates coming through. Even though I care passionately about mobility and serve on a lot of boards about mobility like some of my colleagues as well, I had declined the invitation because it was day one of budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Ellis: Even though I know it will be a great session.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Mayor, I'm happy to stay and be part of the session. I think our staff need to have lunch at some point so it wasn't a matter of not prioritizing the budget conversation. It's recognizing that we have a long few days ahead of us and that we need breaks. So it made sense to me to be able to take a break and

[12:07:49 PM]

also receive an update on regional mobility. But if it's the will of the dais I'm happy to stay and be part of the questioning section of staff and participate in that conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's probably the best way. I think part of it is the timing issue. If we stayed here now so that we could ask questions of council, then when we took a lunch break people would have benefit of having the answers to those questions, which king might help us to better weigh competing priorities, but we would then go straight into questions right now so that we can use staff and get that information back. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, that makes sense to me. I share what everybody has said. As much as I'd like to go to the mobility luncheon, it makes sense to do as you suggest, mayor. So I'm wondering if we can do that, you know, ask the questions and then break for lunch. I'm also hearing what I

[12:08:49 PM]

think it was councilmember harper-madison asked, we may need some time later in the day because after we ask questions and kind of start our process, I would hope that today we could address what I hope is our first question, which relates to the \$20.

>> Mayor Adler: Can we pick this conversation up later?

>> Kitchen: Got it.

>> Mayor Adler: Appreciate that. What I want to do is this, I want to go through the questions that we have. Let's see how many questions we can get in. There is some executive session items that I think we need to hit and it would be good for us to be able to do that. I don't know, we have what was originally noticed. There's also a question about the -- there's a license [indiscernible] Question that's been set. There's a library card question that's been asked. And I don't know if we want to talk about just generally

[12:09:50 PM]

scheduling issues that might be important for us to discuss. We might want to hit that too. So let's start with questions and let's do this. Let's everybody ask a question. You can ask a follow-up to your question and then we will go to somebody else and we'll just keep rotating it through until everybody's questions have been answered. That will then allow people to ask the questions that are top of mind for them. Yes, council member.

>> Kelly: Before we get started on that, I was going to say after further consideration I am okay with the postponement of item number 12 to September 1st so that we can talk about it further at that time. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: So that might help us then. If you would check back, I don't know who asked for the executive session, but let's see if we can postpone that as well. Thank you, councilmember Kelly. I don't know if it's you or Kerri -- you are Kerri today.

>> Kerri for the moment and we do have staff of course

[12:10:51 PM]

watching the meeting and ready to watch virtually. May be a bit of a lag moving people over depending on your questions. It may help too, mayor, if there was a sense, it sounds like we'll want the ems chief on. If there's a sense of which departments we thought the questions were coming from we could move them over preemptively.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do this. Before we answer any questions let's go down the dais and daylight questions from the dais so we make sure we have the right staff present to be able to do that. You're not limited to these questions, but this is going to be the best way to ensure the staff is there. So let's just go down the dais. We won't give any answers yet. We'll just ask as many questions as we can out loud so that Ed and staff can have --

>> Alter: Can we just say which departments we need.

>> Mayor Adler: And that indicates who in which department we might need. Anybody want to go first? Councilmember pool?

[12:11:54 PM]

>> Pool: Just real quick, the questions you're thinking about asking?

>> Pool: I wanted to ask a question about the simulation training and whole blood, heal shelter, question about Ada restrooms, so parks. And let's see... Sobering center question. Is this how you want me to do it or ask the question?

>> Mayor Adler: If you think asking the question further directs people, you can do that. If you think that's efficient --

>> Pool: Let me go back up my list and see what I overlooked really quick because there was also the co-location at the airport, there was a question on what year the funding was and whether it would also include the new south terminal because it seems

[12:12:54 PM]

like if we're going to put it on one side we may want to co-locate on the south terminal too. So then I think I got some questions answered on the sip eligibility threshold and I thank councilmember Ellis for additional information in hers. I think that's it.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Someone else want to daylight questions? Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I think hr will have a presentation, but my questions will be centered on living wage and the compression calculation. That will be the focus of my questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember harper-madison?

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor. My questions will be specifically about our animal services item, the conservation corps item, sobering center item, the epidemiologist item, and then I also like my colleague look forward to the presentation from hr.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Someone else want to daylight some questions?

[12:13:55 PM]

Yes, councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I'm not sure that mine will be questions, but my amendments that have a fiscal impact are related to the parks department and hr/budget. So I don't have specific questions. I know we've been working on the back end with those folks, but that's where mine would be.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: My questions are going to be on the code department about the administrative specialist positions and why the need and the responsibility they're going to be doing. I also want to make a comment about the budget amendment withdraw that I'm going to do. I was notified last night that the program compliance coordinator position at the civil rights department would be reclassified back to the veterans' service.

>> Mayor Adler: Does that mean we don't need the veterans owe.

>> Renteria: We don't need it, but the position will be reclassified, I want to make sure that it gets cleared

[12:14:57 PM]

under the management services department or another appropriate department so I want to offer a direction on that.

>> Mayor Adler: Gotcha. So we want to keep the va person but it doesn't have a cost any longer.

>> Renteria: Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Thank you for daylighting that. Other questions people want to highlight? Yes, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: My apologies. The other one was the district level planning item that I had some questions on.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I'm probably not going to capture all of mine, but I have says about the asset forfeiture funds and in particular item 216, the response to 216. I also have questions about a reference to a special lower cased special fund within APD that was returned and part of the response to an earlier question and I'll figure out which one that is. I have questions related to economic development's responses to 116, 117 and

[12:15:58 PM]

120. I have a very general, very quick question about vacancy savings. I think those are my top level ones at the moment.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you.

>> Tovo: And I have a slew about code but those will come in the context of my amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen, mayor pro tem, councilmember Kelly, council member vela.

>> Kitchen: I share some of the questions people have highlighted. I won't mention those again. Let's see, I have a question about heal, specifically I had asked budget questions related to the placemaking that may be answered. I haven't found it yet. I'm going to look to see if it was answered. So there's that one. I had some questions related to harm reduction, a budget item I believe that's in the

[12:16:58 PM]

dac. Yeah. And then I have code questions also. And then also some coverage questions which I think will be covered when we talk about the wage -- they're benefits related to what people have.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Kelly, I think you were next.

>> Kelly: Yes, I have some questions about park funding that I'd like to ask.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I'm not going to repeat departments that have already been listed. I would like to talk with hr about the capital management system. I would like to get the estimates clearer for the enterprises for the proposed living wage increase and to understand if there are any related enterprise fee increases that would be required with that.

[12:17:58 PM]

We still don't have any information on that side of things. I have a question about the creative spaces approach. And I'll just note that there was an amendment by tovo that I was on related to the adac and there was another \$500,000 that was added that I was not consulted on and I have questions about applying that money. I do support funding for adac but I don't know if I support that piece of the funding. And then Austin resource recovery, there's a fee update that we just got, and it indicates there's some additional fees for coming out again that were not there before and I want to understand what those fees are for and what they're covering. I've also sent an email question so I may get that answered. And then I just want to flag that I had mentioned the other day about workforce

[12:18:59 PM]

and the funding. And I think I have straight what's going on, but I am going to want to provide a rider with direction on that just to make sure that the funding that was in the original budget for long-term workforce development is still going to be going or if that rfp still needs to go O they've done one for the arpa money, but not one for the regular money. So it would be just some broad guidance for when they do that rfp. But we're still drafting that. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen, do you want to go again?

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I forgot to mention, I do have a number of questions related to the epidemiologist. I think somebody mentioned that, I'm not sure.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Council member vela.

>> Vela: A couple of questions for parks. We're still working on the lifeguard ftes and trying

[12:20:00 PM]

to get the cost pinned down on that. And then as well a little bit of background on the hvac system with regard to housing, the five-million-dollar amendment and how that will be used and the direction on how they want to allocate those funds. We have an amendment to add some flexibility basically because a lot of these programs are just starting out and there may be -- I don't think they're quite ready at this point to say this much in this pot, this much in this pot, this much in this pot. I'd like to hear from them. And then from Austin energy and/or public health with regard to the phase II power plant -- fayette power plant in the testing, just questions about what has been done, like what information do we have and what would a good study look like, those are answers that I would like to get.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Okay. Before we go to the second

[12:21:01 PM]

round, the questions that I had that I want to hear a little bit more about the creative space assistance program. It's been suggested that that funding be used for the adc. Funding the adc is one of my greatest priorities for me in this process and that might be a way to do it. I just need to understand that better. But one way or the other maybe there will be general fund money, I don't know, but I would like to understand that better. I had the question about civilianizing the six sworn ftes in the real crime center and if there's been an answer to that I haven't seen it yet. I would like to know what the impact is of not adopting a residential or commercial parkland fee now if this item is going to be proposed to September 1st. And can we in essence leave it blank and come back and handle those as we consider the parkland dedication fee on the first.

[12:22:02 PM]

I have a question about the stipend, it was something that I had. But if we're going to go up to the \$20 an hour do we still need the stipend? I've never heard from hr whether that would be helpful or that level, so that stipend level. I have the questions on the ems at the airport that were raised earlier by the questions from Ms. Shean talked to us about. I'd like to try to figure out things that we're not already raised by other people. Austin energy rate on tax impact, I don't know if we want to talk about that issue, but maybe have them here for a quick question about how that was handled historically. I think it's been raised by councilmember tovo. I wanted to know what the impact is -- we've hit that

[12:23:03 PM]

on the \$20, but to get to seven million what are the implications are with that and the progression I want to know. We've been handed out a fee schedule that has changes in it. I want us to talk about that if there are changes, most recent changes that we need to elevate to make sure that the community sees them and understands them. The staff handed out a powerpoint that I'm sure we'll hear when we get the staff presentation, which happens some time after the questions, but I would just like to know if there's anything in there that's new that we haven't already circuited or if it's just giving us a presentation of the things we've discussed in the workforce sections. I also want aph to talk about -- there's an item in front of us that deals with anti-hate campaign which I think is a really good thing to do. I've been told that the most important thing we can do on any campaign is to be able to identify people who are alone or might need help or assistance.

[12:24:05 PM]

And I'd like paw to talk about that -- aph to talk about that and look at elevating that effort. Those are my questions. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Hang on a second. Going down my list here, there was one additional one, and it's the one on social service agreements and there are two options in there and I wanted to understand the difference between the two. I think it's tovo eight.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Pool: And then did you want me to more explicitly say what my questions are rather than just topics?

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think so. I think they're covered unless, Ed, if you want to hear more about any of those questions, let us know. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I am curious about what Mr. Cobb had raised about eligibility for dental and potentially vision, if that's something that could be a policy

[12:25:05 PM]

adjustment that doesn't have a budgetary impact. I'm curious about what's going on there.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: I think there's a q&a that someone asked that there's an answer on that.

>> Ellis: Okay. I'll go back and verify.

>> Tovo: I think it's in the 100 range of questions. It's council member Fuentes' and if I recall correctly it's a 70 or 80,000-dollar budgetary impact.

>> Ellis: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: A couple more and these are super quick ones or will be hopefully. The question about the downtown public improvement downtownpid. Possibly -- yeah, I think that may be it. I'm sorry, parks. Parks fee question.

>> Kelly:

>> Kelly: I also have questions about the enhanced library card that's being proposed so I would like to discuss that as well.

[12:26:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: Mayor, just to be clear, I have some questions about other people's amendments. I'm just noting my questions for the speed round of dollar questions.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's right. So it's now 12:25. My question is should we take a 30 minute break to get something to eat and give you a chance to kind of rally staff and figure out the best order to kind of approach this? You guys can get a little lunch too and then reconvene at 1:00 or 1:15. I will anticipate that we will have these questions, probably then go into executive session and then probably have an extended break where we can visit with one another about what we learned this morning in some form. Yes.

>> Harper-madison: Can I add a little something to your question about stipends. And I want to make certain that our hr director doesn't physically lock me in a closet when I ask questions about this because it's not necessarily budget related, but it's a question that I've been getting a lot. Folks are asking or saying I

[12:27:10 PM]

would be comfortable with the amount of money that I make if I didn't have to go into the office. If I didn't have to be concerned about fuel costs and childcare, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. They're thinking of other ways in order to not get to 20. I would like to figure out how to ask those questions in a way that it doesn't sort of muck up the questions. So director says, I'm going to ask you how to ask that because I am curious about as you're asking the questions about the stipends is there some value about people working from home and how it changes people's expenses. I'm going to piggyback how to ask

that question. And the other question I had was during the course of our conversations around code through the public safety committee, one of the questions that came up that, you know, a series of emergencies came up and we never closed the loop on the conversation around code uniforms.

[12:28:10 PM]

And I know that there were some implications, financial implications about uniforms. So I'm going to sneak a question in to y'all during the break about that as well. So just a head's up to both departments, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. All right, yes, mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: Councilmember harper-madison, to your point about the telecommuting, I just want to let folks know I was going to post to the message board but with the budget stuff I haven't done it yet because it will get lost. At our audit and finance committee meeting next week we'll be hearing from the strategic facilities group and they'll be reporting back on the resolution that councilmember Renteria made and I co-sponsored about the telecommuting and also about the public safety campus and other things related to planning. That won't get your question answered today, but since you brought that up I wanted

[12:29:10 PM]

to flag that and let folks know they could join us for that.

>> Mayor Adler: For the time being 12:30 let's recess until 1:15 and we'll come back with questions and then do executive session and then take another break. 1:15 come back. 1:15. Come back here for questions with staff.

[Recess].

[Music]

[12:31:47 PM]

>>

[1:38:01 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: 1:37, we're going to reconvene this meeting, August 17th, 2022. We have given staff just a bunch of questions to go through. They've had a little bit of a chance to organize, working quickly with very little notice, and have suggested an order for us to deal with the questions. I'm going to follow their suggested order. It's been posted so that staff or the public can see the order in which we're going to be generally following topics. We're going to do these questions. At the end of these questions we'll probably go to executive session. At the end of executive session, we're probably going to take a break. And we'll figure out the timing for those things when we come back then. Ed, I think the first thing on your list is hr? Okay. If you wanted to say something first, I didn't mean to cut off

[1:39:02 PM]

you or Carrie. Did you post that schedule?

>> I think that what the mayor is referring to, Ed is going to go through which order we're going to have the departments come in, so he's letting the people in the city departments know.

>> Mayor Adler: If you could email that to me, I will post it to the message board.

>> Perfect.

>> Mayor Adler: And then the public and the council can have access to it. Email it to me, and we'll post it.

>> Thank you, joy. We're ready for you to start.

>> Good afternoon, joy Hayes, director of human resources. Council, we met last Tuesday,

[1:40:03 PM]

and between Tuesday and today we've had a variety of questions that span a variety of concerns relative to the pay recommendation and other scenarios which you presented. Today, let me first just thank the team who's literally been working seven days straight since we met to try to answer the questions. Today as we bring up the presentation and move to slide 2, I want to give you an overview of what you can expect in this very brief presentation. I wanted to make sure everybody heard the same information. We're going to talk to you a little bit today about the questions you've asked relative to the proposed living wage at \$18, the questions relative to potential scenarios at 19, and the \$20 estimates for all funds. There were some questions that wanted me to break down cost relative to general fund and for enterprise and total city cost. So in all scenarios, we were providing that information. I had an opportunity to speak to

[1:41:05 PM]

several different councilmembers relative to the justice for the the -- justification for the ranges, the assumptions, and we'll talk you through that. I want to come back to compression, because there are multiple ways compression hits. I think some are really wanting to better understand what compression issues we are addressing in the recommendations we have provided and the assumptions we will provide, and what compression issues are not addressed in those. You asked us to think outside of the box, to step outside of our hr norm to come up with potential methodologies to address pay equity. We had one relative to stipends. We have that scenario with you as well. And then there was some questions to specifically identify hard-to-fill positions and where they were in the pay ranges. And so we asked for the opportunity to, kind of, get through the presentation, because there is some interconnected information. And then we're available to answer any of the questions that you have. And I've attempted to put in

[1:42:06 PM]

here everything I got from you all individually as well. So as we move to the next slide, this slide was a part of the presentation we made on Tuesday. And just kind of want to talk a little bit about the question of compression. Does the presentation that we've provided -- do the scenarios we've provided address compression is the general question that we've received. I want to remind you of the different areas of compression. It's not just one area. So, when there's a little difference between an employee and their supervisor, that's compression. If there's a minimum wage increase where pay scales are impacted and the level of coverage needs to be covered, that will address compression. How much we need to put in between each pay grade to make sure that they're equal and there's enough. The market rate of a job increases and the employers that we bring in are making more. For instance, if you've been in a position, administrative assistant for five years, you've

[1:43:07 PM]

gotten some percent increases. But if the market goes up and someone from the outside comes in and that person has the same amount -- years of service you do, but because they're coming into it with a higher market, they could be making more than you with similar experience. That's compression. The market rate for starting salaries increases faster than the organization can afford to give raises. That would also be compression. I want you to know, in the scenarios we have provided you and the numbers we've given you, our plans address compression among subordinates and supervisors and amongst levels, but it does not address compression amongst peers. So in any of these scenarios, you may well have employees that come to you to say, hey, the crossing guard is making equivalent to the market value of my position in this space. That may be true because in addition to creating a market, we've also now prioritized the increase of living wage, which may compress the different positions into a smaller group,

[1:44:09 PM]

because we're eliminating those job functions. That's something that we will naturally address as we move forward. It is not something we can immediately address here. But we are going to give you some examples of what we could do to immediately address it, for your understanding. Next slide. So, this one is the \$18 living wage, won't stay on it long. We're just showing this one because there was a request to understand what those costs would be by enterprise department and citywide. So we've just answered that question by breaking those numbers out for you here to show you what the cost -- and, of course, all of this is built into the recommendation that you've already received, but it's broken down by enterprise department. Next slide. So, there were questions from councilmembers relative to the potential for a \$19 living wage. Temporary employees would move up to 19. It would be a 27% increase versus a 20%. Regular employees would move up

[1:45:09 PM]

as we've given you in the methodology. We're not taking -- if you're in zone one now, then you will go to zone one in the new methodology. But if you're in zone two we will just guarantee that as we change the pay grades, you are at least at the entry of zone one, making sure you're currently in that pay grade. That is our methodology. And this is the range. There have been questions about what's included in these ranges and can you get any more precise than where you are. Of course I have not had the opportunity to go to the departments to truly understand the impact of these increases. And so I want you to give me some space and flexibility to be able to go back and figure that out. So that's why the range is there. What we show you here, based on the methodology that we did with the \$18 an hour, you see what those ranges are, looking at the top of the range, beginning with general fund, enterprise, and

[1:46:10 PM]

the citywide cost. I want to answer another question that's come up relative to the justification for why there seems to be a larger percent increase impact to the enterprise. When we're at the 18, there are a limited number of employees in those enterprise departments make that amount. So there's less of an impact. But the higher we go in the living wage, the more you're going to begin to impact the largest population of employees. And those are the ones that are in our enterprise department. There are some questions relative to if we go to 19 or 20 if there's going to be an impact to fees. And those questions, Mr. Van Eenoo can address. We're focusing on the staffing component. These are our numbers for 19. What I tried to do for 19 and 20 is provide pros and cons. These questions have come up. Next slide

takes you through those. I won't stay on it long. Of course the higher we go, the closer we get to the desired

[1:47:10 PM]

living wage from the committee, commission, and councilmembers. Provides additional compensation at the lower end. And at the end of this presentation, I'll show you those positions that we have identified to be the ones that have the biggest issues relative to recruitment so that you can see the impact that these strategies will have. The cost of this is that it's less than the living wage resolution. And again, I just want to emphasize that the pay scales are going to have to be altered to accommodate the increased living wage. I believe with this one, the \$19, we'll have to get rid of another pay grade. Instead of getting rid of three -- is it three? Instead of two, we'll go to three pay grades being dropped and we'll have to make the adjustments to the other ones. What does that mean for you? Probably not as much as it means to me, because I'm going to be the one when this process is over to go back and create the pay scales not based on market, but just to make sure we have equitable space between them.

[1:48:12 PM]

The less number of pay scales I have, the more I have to compress them. So, that is just simply a task and challenge for hr to accommodate that process, but I just want you to understand it does remove three pay grades. And then as it relates to cost and rezoning, there's going to be more. And so it also gives us less of an opportunity to see the recruitment strategies. But we recognize that this is not just about the recruitment strategies, it's about creating and sustaining a living wage that you think employees can have in order to move forward. It will increase pay at the lower levels of the pay scales, but it will not create the same opportunity for increases for those in the middle and at the top of the pay scales. And so we do want to point that out for the \$19 an hour. Our next slide speaks to the \$20 living wage. I've had some conversations with many of you all on this one. I think this would be a 33%

[1:49:12 PM]

increase. This would be remove four pay grades from our current pay grade system. And we would want to just point out with this one, that there are a lot of questions about do we really need the full range and what really is a part of that. So we can talk through that. I do recognize that there is a new amendment that suggests \$7 million, which would be in the middle of that range. Whether or not that would be enough money, I can't say as of now, but certainly as the amendment is written, departments would have to be able to adjust. I know as it is written we would use additional funds. Mr. Van eeno can speak to that. But what we would expect from departments -- what I can't tell you is trend. I can't tell

you if we're going to go up on the rates and hire everybody and positions are going to be filled and people are going to be in positions and departments are going to need the full scope of budgeted money for these positions versus if they keep a higher vacancy rate.

[1:50:16 PM]

If we continue to see a trend of hard to recruit positions, there could be potential vacancy savings that could adjust for the additional amounts across the city. I want to be able to share, I don't have the ability to truly understand that. The other thing that I want to point out, and we can move to the next slide, is a going the three -- that going 33% up on the living wage, everything we talked about with 19 would still be there for the \$20. Also, I want you to recognize that you're now going to create space where you may hear more employees with some concerns mid-level and at the top. For instance, a crossing guard will be making similar to what you would see in another position that is already marketed at \$20 an hour. We can make some adjustments over time, but I cannot address that ultimate compression issue for peer-to-peer in the recommendations that we're providing now. What I would say to summarize this would be, the city has made a decision to prioritize that

[1:51:17 PM]

living wage and make -- over time, make adjustments to calibrate the other pay scales to address those needs. And we would have to do that over time and address those concerns of employees that look at it from a peer-to-peer space. That's where it would go. One of the major conversations that I've had about the \$20 is, is \$7 million enough. And my answer is, I don't know, but certainly we can work with that and make some decisions. It's going to take us some time to figure that out. And certainly as directed in the amendment we would have to either come back or have departments make adjustments to accommodate the additional funds that they would need in order to cover it. Some of those positions I won't even be able to look at until next summer because those positions, we hire for summer. And so it will take us some time to be able to evaluate that. As we go to the next slide, one of the bigger questions that

[1:52:17 PM]

have been asked, what's in your assumptions? How do you come up with these ranges, what's included? I've asked Rebecca to walk you through when we come up with the 19 and \$20 assumptions that create the range. Let me remind you, I don't have a range for 18, time to do the work. For 19 and 20, more for 20, you my impact families. If you have an operator lead and a supervisor, if now the operator position is now going to be condensed into a pay grade right at or below the lead, I'll need to move the lead and the supervisor to higher pay grades so that that compression issue is addressed. And so that is also work

that we will have to do. And I'll let Rebecca kind of walk you through some of those assumptions that led to the ranges that you see before you.

>> Hello, Rebecca Kennedy, assistant director in the human resources department. So, as she mentioned, these are the factors that we look at --

[1:53:18 PM]

what are the pay scale impacts, like Joya just mentioned. Once we move everybody, we're dropping up to that lowest pay grade we would have. We then have to look at how does that impact others in those families to make sure that we're providing enough differential between those different positions. We're looking at the higher entry amount for those pay grades and bringing up our employees to that minimum entry, if they are not already there. Employee compensation, taking those employees to the new grade, or to the higher entry of the current grade, looking at the higher living wage results across the board. So, what we plan to do is bring everybody up into either their new grade or the entry of the current grade, and then apply the 4% on top of that. So, as we move up in the living wage, that 4% will be greater. Our temporary workforce, we look at annualized hours for

[1:54:18 PM]

temporary employees and we realize these vary greatly. That's one of the variables that comes into this. We have to make assumptions on that looking at historical trends, but it's hard. We're not really sure how these workers will be used. They could be used more, which would drive up our costs. As our vacancy rate decreases, our labor and costs increase. So that's another variable that we're looking at.

>> One of the questions that came up in a couple of our conversations is, is there any way you can give us some examples about how we address pay that's equitable across the organization, not just impacting those at the lower end of the pay scale. So we did come up with some. And the next one, the one way -- next slide -- that we could address all versions of equity would be to give everybody the same increase, right? So if you gave -- this example is based on the 18. If you go from 15 to 18 for

[1:55:20 PM]

living wage, let's say everybody got a 3% increase. That would eradicate any level of compression concerns at any point. However, as you can see, cost for that would be pretty exorbitant. To answer the question -- and I'm really speaking to you and to every employee that's watching right now that says, you know, what are you doing to value and retain me, which I know many of you all are attempting to accomplish. The reality, our methodology ensures a certain level of compression is addressed, but the peer-to-peer compression would only be addressed in creating a space where everybody would get the

same thing. So in this scenario, at a \$3 flat increase, we would eliminate and replace the 4% across the board and every employee would just get \$3. The scales will remain equitable because everybody's moving up. And so it would be minimal work. And if I close my eyes and dream really hard of the easiest way to do it, this would be it. But I would have to open my eyes to the reality of cost that that

[1:56:21 PM]

would be in order to do that across the board. But I wanted to give you that as an example, because some of you have asked the question, how would we go about creating that equity. To this extent, the next slide, what if we did it by percentage. And this is the pros and cons to that. I've already kind of gone over those. The next slide speaks to the same thing. If everybody got a 20% increase, 15 to 18 is 20%. 20% across the board, this is the cost. The flat dollar amount of \$3, it would create a positive impact to those at the lower end because \$3 is a higher percentage of salary to those at the lower end than it would be to the top. Opposite of that, a percentage, those at the top receive more because 20% of a larger salary would be more than the smaller. So definitely with a flat dollar amount there would be an emphasis on those at the lower end, with a percentage amount,

[1:57:22 PM]

those at the top would have some benefit. In both of these cases, as you can see, it doesn't create an opportunity that's feasible for the city because it's an unsustainable amount both now and in the future, which is why we can't just give you those direct opportunities for equity. Next slide. I think I've gone through most of these. And one of the key positions -- and some of this matters, and sometimes with living wage it just doesn't. But our entire market system is -- entire pay system is based on market. So the more variables that are considered that are not market-related, the more we have to create some equity, because ultimately, we know for a fact that as we go into this budget, I'm over market. And that may be fine. The market may catch up and give us opportunity. Definitely, with this one, it would place most positions significantly out of market. And as we move to the next slide -- I'm almost done -- market matters, particularly when you're trying to ensure equity so everybody is hired doing the right job, making the

[1:58:22 PM]

right amount, minimize the risk of litigation with perceived inequity in salaries. To the request for stipend, there were questions relative to what we could do outside of the box. We're -- this is so outside of what we would normally think and do. We're really excited about the out of box mindset with this one. It would be assuming that temporaries move to \$18 an hour. What we heard from the Tuesday meeting is some discussion of is it really appropriate to put the temporaries at the same salary as

regular employees who have to competitive go through a process to receive it, who are required to pay the 8% to retirement. With this plan, with this plan what we would recommend if you were to look at a stipend plan would be for regular employees to go up to their pay grade, four percent, and give a living wage stipend to those employees which would equate

[1:59:24 PM]

to an 80-dollar per period cost just for living wage. Then for those hard to recruit positions, your 911 and other positions for which you are concerned about, we could do a two dollar biweekly stipend. The one dollar and two dollar would be based on the qualification that \$19 an hour and \$20 an hour is really in alignment to where you would want to be. We would be able to accomplish that, but it would not be permanent funds that are in there that are baked in the fte which would give us more opportunity in outer years to make some decisions relative to cost and value of positions. So here would be the cost. The way we calculated this is I went through and attempted to very quickly identify our hard to recruit positions and budgeted this based on the cost of what it would be to give those in those titles two dollars versus a one dollar. I will be honest, as we baked this one of the questions would be the

[2:00:24 PM]

ability for departments to say hey, I'm not in your equation. I think two dollars would help me hire. But this makes the assumption that those hard to fill positions are those that have 10 or more vacancies is the methodology I use to run these numbers. So the 80-dollar stipend for general fund as you can see the enterprise and across the board, the 60-dollar. And so the funds for this year would be somewhat similar to what you're already projecting, but it would give us better opportunity in outer years to do it. It would also allow us some time between now and the end of this fiscal year to determine if it was effective to have it at 19 or 20. If it was effective and you wanted to keep it we would absorb it into the recommendation for next years so employees would not see a loss, but it would give you more flexibility to really determine whether or not these strategies are effective moving forward. Now, I will say if there's a desire to really stay at \$20

[2:01:25 PM]

an hour, I wouldn't recommend the stipend because the stipend really only benefits you, because of costs would only benefit you if you were looking at an alternative to get employees to a 19 or 20-dollar rate without having to make that formal commitment. But it is an option that we look at for stipends that address some of the broader concerns. As you move to the next slide of the stipend pros and cons, I think understanding what the stipend, it keeps us in line with what we've already announced. The analysis done is on the assumption, and we have a better opportunity to give you direct prices versus

ranges because we directly know which employees were adding to that. It doesn't obligate future budget. It proceeds from temperatures and regular temps. Regular employees would go at 19 with the regular stipend. They would be at 19 and then you could direct your hard to recruit funds to hard to recruit positions at two dollars that would equate to

[2:02:26 PM]

a minimum of \$20. The market can be evaluated for the next budget cycle and roll that into the base or continue with the stipend depending on your choice. The cons to this plan is it costs slightly more than 20-dollar living wage, but all employees would see an equitable increase across the board beyond what they see in the current methodology. It's much less than the three dollar flat fee. And it doesn't count towards retirement so those employees who receive a higher percentage of the actual costs for that money because when it's not actually in your pay, we don't calculate the eight percent, so employees would see that. And the higher costs for the enterprise is a higher cost because you are having such a significant more impact to those enterprise funds. Next slide, please. So I've got three slides and this is kind of to the economy that councilmember alter and others who just simply asked the question where are our hard to fill positions? So this is based on a

[2:03:28 PM]

July 30th pool and I looked at those positions who had 10 or more. The top positions you will see here beginning with the 911 call taker at 44 and all of the positions that you see. Column 2 gives you the number of vacancies as of July 30th. Column 3 provides you the pay grade. I think that speaks to the question we had last week, what pay grades are ultimately impacted by these vacancies and are we going to impact them with this plan for 18, 19 or 20. I will point out at the 20-dollar plan I believe the impact will go all the way up to pay grade 19, and you do have some positions, if we'll go to the next slide and I will provide these to you, you will see that some of the positions, I.T., I think some of our engineers and other positions, are not going to be impacted by the living wage. Our business process consultants. But as you can see as we go from slide to slide, those vacancy numbers do go down.

[2:04:29 PM]

However, I will note that in some of these positions, your aviation and others, I don't want to start picking and choosing now, they have a critical impact to the infrastructure. Their jobs are very, very important to the overall ability for the success of the department so I don't want the lower vacancy numbers to suggest that there's less of a need in those areas. Next slide takes you down and finally this gives you the full scope of positions based on those with 10 or more vacancies as of the July 30th date. I also provided you in the next column what current entry to those are. If you will go back two slides for

me for the original one, thank you. You will see the entry of those and where the new proposed entry would be. So everyone in those titles would be at least at the entry of the zone at the 18. So I think when you look at this overall it does speak to the fact that a majority of the positions are in pay grades below the 20, which

[2:05:29 PM]

mean that most of these employees will be impacted, but there are some critical ones that are not impacted by this but would be impacted by the four percent. I'd also just probably end with the reality as we move to the next slide that four percent is one of the highest across the boards that we had in the history of the city. And so we do believe that the four percent may not address all of the compression as we discuss. It definitely has a significant impact that is beyond what we have done in previous years. I provided it here and we can certainly send this out. We were lit wally tweaking it as you listened to citizen communication so we couldn't get it all done in this morning's period. But this gives you an overview of the potential cost to all of the different options that we've provided to you. So I'm optimistic that this gives you the answers to

[2:06:29 PM]

your questions, it gives you options as you've requested and we've given you as much information as we could to justify the ranges for the 19 and the 20. And thank you so much for the opportunity to share.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, questions for hr? Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you, and thank you so much director hays. Thank you for this information. You said you would be emailing the presentations so we could take a look at the presentation? I did want to comment and note that equality versus quality having an across the board increase would be equality for me. To me equity is taking a look at who of our workforce has disproportionately impacted by rising costs and ensuring that they are better positioned to get to the floor of \$20 per hour. That is truly an equitable strategy is that we're looking at those who are not

[2:07:31 PM]

at the same playing fields. And we know that right now our city of Austin employees are below market when it comes to ACC raising their minimum wage to \$20, integral care is at \$20. Just this morning at the rally that we had with workers an aisd trustee says she intends to take this to the district and ask for higher pay. So we already know this would have a great impact. The resolution that we passed and thank you again for colleagues for adopting unanimously that resolution that prioritizes and defines the living wage as a priority for us this budget cycle and it was directly focused on our lowest wage earners

and that was the scope that we were looking at. I was very happy to see a reinvestment in the workforce within four percent of across the board increase to all of our employees. Make no mistake, every single employee is getting a

[2:08:31 PM]

four percent bump to their pay. And as you mentioned earlier, some of the positions are seasonal and we wouldn't be trying to fill them at this higher rate of \$20 until the summer. So we don't truly know how much it's going to take for us to allocate from the general fund to bring us to that \$20. It will take some time. So one question I had is around compression and better understanding how we got to the 5.5 range to 10 million. Thank you you and your team for meeting with us earlier this week to discuss that in greater detail. I still have some lingering questions. And I think it will be helpful for my colleagues to also receive this information. You mentioned when you factor in how do we get the 5.5, part of the formula included looking at the number of temporary employees. And factoring in the amount -- the average amount of hours that they would

[2:09:32 PM]

work. When I went back and reviewed the memo I saw that some of the employees who are listed between the 18 and 20-dollar range that we would potentially be impacting by raising the wage, it was 775 employees. Of which a portion of them were temporary. But I couldn't factor -- I couldn't get the math right in how y'all got to that 5.5 million number. So could you just walk us through I think for everyone's awareness, how that compression number was factored? Do we have Mr. Dorr here?

>> So we reviewed the data based on the employees and how they are covered currently. So that 5.5 not only includes the temporaries, but also includes the regular employees and oh how much it takes to get them up to the base wage for the new

[2:10:36 PM]

case analysis.

>> Fuentes: So that was all the employees. Because when I look at the employees who are making 18 and 20 that are temporary I see 132 at 18 and 38 at 19. So about 200 employees. So I guess I'm struggling to understand how even if we looked at the higher number of 775 employees, why it would take five to 10 million to bring 775 employees up to \$20?

>> I think what you have to understand is when you make any movement to any employees there's an impact to all employees. And I think the range allows us an opportunity to look at not just those that are

moving up, but what everyone else will have to be -- all the other movements that will have to take place. There are some technical complexities to it. I'll let our newfound superhero Brian dorr who is a new common name now come and speak a little bit more to the complexity of how the ranges are developed and why

[2:11:36 PM]

it's more than just looking at the temps that are moving when we give you the range.

>> Thank you, Brian dorr, compensation manager. That number you're quoting, 775 odd employees that are between 18 and 20, there are well over a thousand employees who are learning then \$18. That would bring them -- the original cost would bring them from 15 to 18 and then now that they're at 18 that cst also includes not just those employees who are currently earning 18.

>> Fuentes: Okay. So run that by me again. Of the employees -- so everyone who is at -- how many employees are at between 18 to 20? The amount that I'm trying to focus in on is what additional revenues of the general fund do we need to allocate? Colleagues, I'm looking at

[2:12:37 PM]

page 3 of the August 1st memo that we received.

>> The figures that we produced previously there is 20272 employees who are earning between 15 and - another 500 employees on top of that. 2,700 employees that are learning -- temporary employees earning less than \$18 right now.

>> Fuentes: Right, but that number, the costs for them to get to 18 was already factored in the budget proposal that we have before us.

>> Right. But the cost to bring all of these employees would include them to bring them from 18 to 20. Not just the 700 who are currently earning 18. Because if we -- in that scenario now there are

[indiscernible] Who are earning between 18 and \$20. All of them need to be brought up. We're not just bringing them up to 18 and then the 18 bringing them up to 20.

[2:13:38 PM]

We're bringing them all to 20. So every dollar higher you get it's a larger and larger group of employees because it's all the ones that are below that original dollar amount.

>> Fuentes: So it's -- it's the 2700 employees that are you factored times that they would work full-time hours versus part-time hours. That was the base number you used in your calculation.

>> We use that as a proxy for other impacts, correct. That was the figures that we used. And not necessarily full-time, but working full equalized hours. Not necessarily 40. I'm saying the 20 hour a week employee working instead of six months they work a full year. Somewhere in the range there.

>> Fuentes: Basically if you factored part-time hours would be 1,040 part time.

[2:14:41 PM]

That's budgeted for someone full time. 1,040 hours is full time or part time?

>> Part-time. That's 20 hours a week.

>> If you are taking 2700 employees up two dollars to get to 20-dollar floor wage, that is the -- times that times the 1040 because you factored in part time. I'm trying to do math up here, which is not a good thing on the dais.

>> It's more complex than that. What it is is when we normally cost out the expenses for temporary employees I think I did the number yesterday, temporary employees on a current workforce right now they're budgeted in our hrms as approximately 26 hours per week is their budgeted hours. That's on average. Some have 40 hours' week, some are five hours a week, but on average. But if somebody is budgeted 20 hours a week, they don't

[2:15:44 PM]

necessarily come in 20 hours a week. They may come in more, more than likely they come in less. When we analyze any costing for employees we take their hourly -- weekly hours and we multiple by 52 and divide by 26 for pay periods. But temporary employees are not generally and historically intended to be working for 26 pay periods of the year. We have summer season nationals and that sort of thing. So what I was explaining in our meeting was that for budget purposes we take their weekly hours and we estimate that over the course of a year any one employee will work half of their budgeted hours extrapolated over the course of a year. So that might be a 20 hour employee working six months out of the year or it might be -- or it might be a 20 hour employee working 10

[2:16:46 PM]

hours really instead of the 20 budgeted over a full year. Might be somewhere in that range. And that was -- that's just an historical average that we've used and it's been successful. And I think in this case

there was all kinds of factors that director Hays and Rebecca Kennedy mentioned that it's not just temporary employees. I imagine that it would impact temporary employees, maybe a little to attract temporary employees, they may hire early college high school in the season, -- earlier in the season, may stay longer in the season. They may have positions that are vacante and get filled sooner -- vacant and get filled sooner,, but that is likely to happen on regular employees as well. So right now we have a very high vacancy rate. Maybe that gets filled as well. I don't have a way to cost that out. But the temporary employees was a good proxy. I imagine because if we have a set of employees who are supposed to be here for 20

[2:17:50 PM]

hours a week for 26 weeks of the year, historically that's not what they're doing. That's a good area that we can use that figure on. So it's more complex than just saying hey, they're working part time and now they're working full time. I wasn't saying we're taking all the temporary employees and saying they're working 20 hours a week a year. I'm saying they will be working closer to 26 hours a week.

>> Council member, I think it's -- I think it's important to know there's too much complexity into the numbers that we run to be able to give you your exact numbers with the limited time we have. I definitely think what I've heard some council members try to do is to really figure out how much of that is realistic within the range that you have so that we can move forward with some understanding. As you've laid out the seven million dollars it may be enough P but just as you've heard in the complex answer that they gave it's a

[2:18:51 PM]

science and it's not always exact. But it's certainly one that has been successful in us trying to give you some level of prediction as to what that cost is going to be. I think the other piece that's important is this is more historic in terms of the amount, right? We've typically gone up 50 cents, 25 cents, so the projections are easier to figure out, better to understand. There's so many unknown variables to the market and to other things right now that we just don't have. So we do want to give you more direct exact amounts for the 19 and 20 and we would just encourage you -- of course, it's hr, it's budget. We say go with the top amount because we're going to be conservative and I don't want to have to come back, but certainly we've have to yield to your judgment as to based on the realities of these complex equations what you feel like the amount would need to be if that is your desire to go to that amount.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. And I appreciate that complexity. And colleagues, version two of the living wage amendment that I have passed out

[2:19:51 PM]

yellow copy versions to everyone on the dais would seek understanding that our staff does need time to get a better and more precise amount of what it would take to increase wages for our lowest wage workers. This one seeks to cut a middle pathway by saying allocate seven million of our available ongoing funds from the general fund with the understanding that anything -- any additional funds are needed that we would use any surplus tax revenues that come in over the projected amount from July, August, September and really moving forward into next fiscal year as needed until we address any gaps. I think that really gives us enough time for staff to have those departmental conversations and also understanding that even if we post all 1800 plus positions that are currently vacant in the city of Austin in October, we're not going to fill those can overnight. So the fiscal impact of raising the wage will be realized over a course of many, many months so this at least gives staff a

[2:20:51 PM]

direction needed to move forward with this effort and us the time to assess what exact amount is needed. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes. I want to say thank you. I know you all have spent many hours of working on this and I appreciate the deck you just went through. It's very helpful. So I would say I am comfortable with a middle ground. I understand the need for a range. And I understand what you just said. And hr you will say it's the top range. But what makes sense to me is the middle range understanding that you just don't know because there are a lot of factors that are involved. So to my mind the 10 million is really on the outside in terms of -- I'm comfortable feeling like that's more than we need, but I also

[2:21:53 PM]

think that what councilmember Fuentes does is she's provided a backup. In case the seven million -- in case maybe it's not quite enough. She has written into her amendment an approach for a backup. So I am comfortable with that. I also wanted to emphasize -- and thank you for going through compression and explaining that. I also want to emphasize that the scope, this amendment was not designed to answer everything. It was designed to work to focus specifically on our lowest wage workers which as a policy matter our statement is that we need to raise our workers so they're making closer to a liveable wage. That is the focus of this. I appreciate what is included as you explain is compression. I want to get the terms right, but it's compression within the levels. It's not compression across

[2:22:56 PM]

pay raises -- pay types or pay rates. But as council member Fuentes mentioned, when you look at the whole package of what we're doing from a budget perspective, we're actually paying attention to all of our workers. And the four percent is designed to do that. And there's also some other provisions that people are looking at that are designed to do that. So I'm comfortable with that also. I also wanted to just emphasize another part of councilmember Fuentes' amendment. We haven't really focused on this part but it is in here and it is important. And that is to develop a plan each year to reach a living wage of 22 per hour and that just goes back to a number of years back the last time we raised a living wage. There was a thinking that we needed to figure out a way to look at that every year so that we weren't in a position to have such a big gap. So I just want to emphasize

[2:23:58 PM]

that after you get past all of this, not now, but as you get past all of this we need to build into our process and approach that allows us to get closer to the living wage every year. You know. So I just wanted to acknowledge for you and for everyone else that that is part of this amendment also and I know you know that. It's mostly to make sure people understand that. So I want to thank everybody that's been working on this. I'm excited about what I consider to be a major, major policy change. I realize we're supposed to be asking questions now, I'm sorry, I'm getting into advocating. But I think you answered my questions anyway about what the five and the 10 are in terms of a range.

>> If I could just add to yours. When we did the last living wage we did have a seven year plan. I just want to make sure that we know in the years we stopped we did other initiatives you had. So I definitely think moving

[2:24:59 PM]

forward hrd is going to recommend an incremental increase so we never get back to a space where you're leaning to do a 20 to 30% increase because it's difficult at that point. We also are very much in support of looking at plans that make sure every year we come back with an incremental increase that moves the pendulum forward to the higher amounts and you will see that as a recommendation from us as well.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: And part of that is hard because it's a big part of the budget and you had councils in those years that had lots of things that were real important. But I remember when the 10-1 council first came in there was a lot of discussion from the prior council on living wage and the numbers back then really identified a living wage that was in the low 20s and it wasn't even in the [indiscernible] Of where we would like to be able to go. And I am supportive -- let's see how the budget is looking but I'm supportive of going to 20, a lot of

[2:26:02 PM]

questions about it. In part because I think that when the city moves that direction and the ACC and integral care that what we're saying to our community is generally we want to get workers so that they put in a full days' work they can provide for their families and we don't want people to have to get multiple jobs and we social don't want people to full-time faculty senate day's of work in and still need subsidized housing or put in a plays where they have to subsidize anything because we end up paying for people that are below living wage one way or the other. At the same time, and I think this is really good conversation that you've given us and I want to look at. I have a question. If we were to do 20 and if we were to hold constant with the seven million dollars, there's a lot of work for you to do to be able to get from here to there? We're not exactly sure what the compression is going to look at. Is there any advantage at all in starting this in January as opposed to

[2:27:02 PM]

starting it in October? Would that make any difference at all? It starts it later so in getting to the 20 would there would be a three month delay in that and you would have more opportunity when you initiated it to make sure that people were really ultimately where they needed to be. Or not. Does that add anything if we're still appropriating the same seven million dollars? I won't be here for the appropriation in January when another budget amendment comes back to seek more of the sales tax revenue and other things that's needed but it will require coming back to the council and I want to make sure that we're doing in a way that ensures that we will be able to do this for people and not contingent or dependent on what a future council might decide. Does that have any impact?

[2:28:04 PM]

>> Can you turn your mic on?

>> Sorry. Let me ask you a question. Will you hold off in your proposal for all pay increase until January or would you want a four percent in October with a 20-dollar an hour? In your scenario are you suggesting that we wait for the full plan in January?

>> Mayor Adler: Well, I'm happy you changed it from my proposal because definitely it wasn't a proposal. I don't even know if it rises to a level of a scenario. My question is with the variables that we have, if we were to do 20 and if we were to do seven, is there a better way for us to do this than just the way it appears right now with how we're doing the four percent and how we're doing the -- and we still want to do the four percent? I guess I'm just asking the question.

>> I understand now.

>> Mayor Adler: Looking at --

>> What would the world look like if I close my eyes again? I think for us any time you

[2:29:05 PM]

give us more time for implementation we're going to advocate for it. I think any time you delay the implementation there's going to be cost savings to doing that. I think for hrd and for payroll and for those of us responsible for the execution I wouldn't want to make it too complicated because we can only do so many actions per pay period. So certainly January would create an opportunity. If I were to advocate for the employees for which we talk to on an everyday basis I would say those employees would want to see an opportunity, particularly with the current costs, to be able to see that at the same time and as early as possible. So my team would love it if you gave us until January to implement, but I think our employees would certainly want to see the opportunity to receive both the living wage and the across the board at the beginning of the budget. I'll yield to Ed as it relates to any questions relative to feasibility of pay if they have a position that's different from what we've shared.

[2:30:05 PM]

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Ed, did you want to say something on that? You don't have to, but since the question was directed to you, I don't want to cut you off.

>> From a financial perspective staff has proposed a range of 5.2 to \$10.4 million. Clearly if there's only \$7 million allocated to \$20 implementing it in January, reduces the risk that we may end up going over, seven million dollars for the January start date financially is about the same as \$20 an hour with an October start date if you're able to put the full \$10.4 million behind it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Maybe less financial risk, less uncertainty from a financial perspective.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, if I could follow up on that question.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand that you do. Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: Yeah, I think really what's happening is if we continue with the October 1 of this year

[2:31:06 PM]

implementation date, which sounds right to me, then staff still has the time to do the work between now and the first of January to work through things that they would be doing anyway. And we will have

put in play officially an increase that so many people are really pinning their hopes on. And I trust and I know that the great team in the human resources department is going to be able to complete the work in as timely a fashion as they can and work through all of the various unique circumstances that will arise. I don't think delaying to January 1 of 2023 will do anything except for it keep our staff waiting for a pay raise that they are really counting on.

>> I would also note that when we do a living wage increase and then the four percent it does put our employees at an advantage, the methodology we have before you is to raise the

[2:32:07 PM]

living wage and then add the four percent to the new wage and so we would want to make sure that we do those in tandem so they can maximize the tankibility for the increase.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, let's focus on questions now. Does anybody else have hr questions? Councilmember kitchen and then mayor pro tem.

>> Kitchen: So this question goes to something you mentioned, mayor. I think -- my question is I'm reading the proposal as -- if we need to look at additional sales tax revenue, that backup that comes in as directions, I'm reading that as direction right now to the city manager, in other words, the city manager wouldn't have to come back to us and ask us if we could use -- if they come back to us and say we think we need 7.5 or something like that. They don't have to come back and ask us.

[2:33:07 PM]

We don't vote then, we're voting now to say that if we have -- if it comes in above projections we can use the sales tax. So my question is I think to Ed. Sorry. I think my question to Ed is I am reading, and I think this is council member Fuentes' intent is I am reading the language area that talks about city manager is directed to identify additional sources of revenue such as sales tax revenue that comes in above projections to cover the costs should the cost be determined to be higher than 7 million. So I just want to confirm that this language in your mind would authorize you all to go ahead and use additional dollars and it wouldn't take another vote from council. The additional dollars that are specified here.

[2:34:12 PM]

>> Kerri Lange, budget officer. So what would happen is we would definitely, if seven million was appropriated to us then we would make that work within our budget. We would look at, we would charge the departments to manage within their appropriation and then we would look at what availability. So there may be some departments that would need to -- that we would work with over the

years to make sure they had the appropriation available, but we would ask departments to work within our appropriation in that year based on what's approved in budget and determine how they would end the year based on that.

>> Kitchen: Yes, but my question is the language in here authorizes using any additional sales tax that's over so I'm reading this that it authorizes you to the seven million plus if there are additional dollars in sales tax revenue.

>> And we would continue to look at what -- so we would be able to come back and identify what available sales tax was available, but I don't think there will be a need to come back and ask

[2:35:12 PM]

for an amendment or appropriation because we will work within our current appropriations.

>> Kitchen: Okay. That's what I wanted to verify is that this amendment here, the appropriation is the seven million plus any additional sales tax overage should there be some. I just want to make sure that that language is understood that way. That's my understanding that that's councilmember Fuentes' intent. Am I correct that that's the intent.

>> Fuentes: That is my subsequent but it seems like there's another way to go here. If we're asking for the appropriations that means the department is doing some vacancy savings. I'm assuming -- but the intent is if additional funding is needed that you all have the authorization to use any plus in sales tax revenue from the July a lot payment, August, September and moving forward to next fiscal year.

>> So once we approve the budget, the budget is approved based on that amount. If there is a need to move

[2:36:14 PM]

forward and make changes to the budget, we would have to come back for an amendment to the budget based on will changes that we are making to the appropriation for fiscal year '23. When we look at the additional sales tax that comes in for fiscal year '22, any sales tax that comes in in August, September for fiscal year '22, that will go to close out fiscal year '22 books. We will look at how those sales tax are then rolled into our appropriation and our reserves. And so there will be a need for us to come back to appropriate any additional funds. What I'm saying is there may not be a need for an amendment if departments are able to manage this within their current appropriations once the budget is approved for fiscal year '23.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: The question I think is not -- one avenue that's been identified is departments will be able to try to work

[2:37:14 PM]

within their budget and move stuff around, with vacancy savings or otherwise that can happen. But as far as actually using increased sales dollars that exceed estimates, the question is I do have to come back to council or can the manager just --

>> Kitchen: If we direct them --

>> Mayor Adler: It's a question.

>> I think that our budget officer has explained it well. If they go above the budget that you approve, if it's seven million dollars right now, if it has to go above that to meet the \$20 an hour for the departments, we would have to come back for an amendment from the council.

>> Kitchen: It's not what I'm asking. Can I phrase it a little differently? Mayor, is that okay?

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That was the question I had.

>> Kitchen: But I thought what we were doing, and maybe mayor, the question you asked was the answer but I thought I was asking differently. I'm not reading this to

[2:38:16 PM]

authorize seven million.

>> Mayor Adler: What I'm saying is the way that it is written is not legal. The way that it is written, and I understand the intent, it just can't happen that way. If there's additional sales tax money that shows up in November and December that really is needed to effect this, the council in January is going to have to do that. I understand the intent and language, but I understand that what they're telling us is you can't really do it that way. You can do it if it's within budget, but if you need more than seven million dollars communally across the system there will have to be an appropriation at some point, Ed will have to come or manager has to come and say there's more money here, can we put into the thing.

>> And I need to add to what you said, mayor, because you're correct but it's not even cumulative across the system. Of the seven million dollars we're going to allocate it to departments. A lot of it will go to pard because they have a lot of the low wage temp employees. Council will approve a budget for pard, a certain dollar amount of a budget for pard.

[2:39:16 PM]

City staff under charter cannot go beyond that authorized appropriation authority. If you approve 100-million-dollar budget for pay inclusive of the 20-dollar an hour living wage if it is higher than that we have for pay could go back to council under the charter.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think I understand what you're saying.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I think what we're saying up here is we would like to prioritize first allocation out of the box, any additional monies that may come our way and that are officially booked and available to be appropriated, then push forward with -- to fill the gaps on this 20-dollar -- especially dealing with compression. So it's being prioritized and I think we're all really clear -- it seems like we're all behind that on the dais.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Other hr questions? Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Thank you. I have living wage questions but I have some other hr

[2:40:16 PM]

questions so let me know when I should do those other ones.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Alter: So how many of our general -- how many general fund employees do we have? And how many of those are

[inaudible].

>> We currently have a total of 8,485 general fund employees. Out of that there are 3,211 sworn.

>> Alter: Okay.

>> We could provide you that if you would like us to email that to you.

>> Alter: I think that would be great. So we set out in June that we wanted to put a -- prioritize increasing wages and for our staff our general fund has 3,000

[2:41:18 PM]

roughly you've 8500 that are sworn who are not impacted by any of these moves. And what I'm really trying to understand is we have three public safety contracts that we are trying to negotiate. It's really important to me that we provide living wages also for our public safety professionals, some of whom are making below \$20 at this point in ems as we know, some who are making far above that. But we are going to have to be planning and preparing and making sure that we have the funding set aside. And

while this amendment says to do that it doesn't provide any money additionally above and beyond what is outlined. So I'm not even sure we can ask this in public session with the negotiating, but I'm concerned that as we make these choices to lift up those who are making the least, that we are also taking the steps that we need to to plan for how we

[2:42:18 PM]

are going to meet the needs of our public safety professionals where we really have life and death decisions in many cases out there. And so, you know, that's what I'm trying to understand that and I'm not -- I would feel a lot more comfortable with taking this step if I felt like we had addressed the other piece. So let me think about how to ask that question and we can have that when we're talking later because it may impact some of the choices we make about the other funding that we make in order to make this choice possible. Second, we've heard that there is an impact on our employees funds, and that is not costless. In order to fund that we often have to raise fees. We have not heard yet whether we would have to raise any fees this year for the estimate. So can we hear what those costs are? Because I don't want to get to the fee stage and find out I have to raise a fee without knowing that in order to take this step.

[2:43:21 PM]

>> Yes, council member, mayor pro tem. What we've realized is there will only be an increase to the tuf, a 15% increase to the tuf. All the other guys departments will be able to absorb that increase without doing a rate change.

>> Alter: Okay. So that is another two dollars for our taxpayers, for our ratepayers? Fifteen-cent per month?

>> Yes.

>> Alter: So it's 180.

>> 1.08 per year.

>> 1.08 or 1.80 per year?

>> 1.80 per year.

>> Alter: Essentially what I'm learning through this process is within our

[2:44:21 PM]

enterprise funds we don't have a lot of workers on that lower wage end so it has a lower impact. As we move from 18 to 20 there's more. I asked several questions about the vacancy rates in the q&a and just looking at the general fund alone, those rate -- vacancy rates in practice as opposed to what was estimated for the vacancy savings for this fiscal year were well above the 10%. Can you tell me what you assume for vacancy rates because we are talking as if this will help us recruit, etcetera, that will affect the vacancy rates, but it also won't happen overnight. So I'm trying to understand if the potential funding that the departments would have because they still wouldn't be able to fill those positions, you know, immediately, October 1st if they're open. Does that make sense?

[2:45:30 PM]

>> So I believe your question, council member, was about vacancy savings and how we budget for them. The general concept being we have I think Latoya said, Rebecca said, eight thousand or so general fund employees. Clearly they're never all filled at one point in time. It's not possible. People leave their jobs for a number of reasons, people promote up to higher paid jobs and there's a vacancy created and we're always in the process of trying to fill them. What we do broadly for vacancy savings is to look at a three year trend of what their vacancy savings, what their vacancy levels are. And it varies a lot by department. Some departments are able to fill their positions, have lower turnover, able to fill them more quickly. Other departments have a lot of turn major and do a lot of internal promotions so they have a higher perpetual vacancy rate. But we look at the historical trend and that's how we budget for vacancy savings. What we don't do is try to chase the vacancy rate because we don't want to

[2:46:32 PM]

balance the budget on the back of vacancy savings. We want departments to be able to fill the positions. Like everything we do in our budget we're conserve difficult on those estimates to typically departments will exceed their vacancy savings numbers and a lot of times they end up using that savings for other things. They use it to hire temps, they use it to provide incentive pays, they use it to bring on consultants, use it for overtime. Just because you might see on a report there's this vacancy savings in excess of what we anticipated in the budget, it doesn't mean that the department isn't reallocating those savings to meet their service needs in another fashion, again either through temps or overtime or through consultants. Or to meet other departmental needs.

>> Right. But early in the year they may not be reallocating that as much.

>> Absolutely. Early in the year, if you look at some of our early in the year financial reports we'll generally report that we're projecting we'll end the year at the same as our

[2:47:33 PM]

budgeted levels because we don't really have enough date. But as we get further and further along in the fiscal year we are constantly updating our year end estimates for how much savings will a department in aggregate have. Some of those savings come from vacancies, some come from other areas. Departments end up spending more money on things in some areas than they thought they were going to and they save money in other areas. So a budget is a plan. It's constantly being worked on throughout the year as departments are reacting to changing circumstances. But when we put a budget together we're estimating bottom line savings from all these different factors, how much savings do we think we'll get from each department at the end of the year and then that becomes a key building block. When we start talking to you about one-time savings and money that we could put to one-time needs, a lot of that comes from our departments' budget staff working with the departments to estimate those year end

[2:48:33 PM]

savings. But those savings are all baked in to budget that we're proposing to you and trying to maintain our 14% reserve level.

>> Alter: So there will be vacancy savings probably in that first quarter that if we have to reallocate more money. I want to make sure that we're thinking through as many of the pieces here because this is a big shift that has ramifications in very complex ways and it's important to me that if we're taking this step that we have thought through some of these pieces. But some much these vacancy rate numbers are pretty high. Some are sworn, but even some of the non-sworn are above 15% as it is.

>> I think right now last report I saw our citywide vacancy rate is maybe 15.9%, which is elevated. It's typically in the low double digits, but in current labor market I could bring down a ton of

[2:49:34 PM]

department directors to tell you about the woes they're having trying to fill positions right now. And it's not just the city of Austin. I hear the same thing from my counterparts in Travis county and other agencies that hiring right now is a real challenge so the vacancy rates are elevated. But typically in our organization for various reasons the 10-11 percent vacancy rate would be about normally where we are. It fluctuates during the year and council adopts a budget and we add new positions to the budget and it spikes up and we start filling those during the course of the year and it trends down. But on average I would say we're 10 or 11% and we're elevated from that right now. But that's not our goal for the future. We're really encouraging our department and these guys are coming up with all kinds of innovative programs to incentivize people to come to work for the city of Austin and we're hoping to get the vacancy rate down next fiscal year.

>> Alter: Thank you. Can you help me understand how we would protect pard in

[2:50:34 PM]

this process given that they have such a large number of these employees relative to other departments? It seems like we need to take some extra care. There's the golf enterprise fund would be able to handle this. They're not -- they have a lot of employees and I -- we ask so much of pard in so many different ways and we give them so few resources. I'm concerned that we make sure that pard has what it needs to move forward with this. And obviously some of their lifeguards wouldn't be hired until the spring so there is time to plan for that, but other employees are temporary only insofar as they're not full time.

>> Protecting pard specifically in relation to the 20-dollar living wage and how it may impact their budget with so much uncertainty on how that will actually cost?

>> Right.

>> I think we talked a lot

[2:51:34 PM]

about the things we could do, but most of them require council action. So the department would look at their budget and manage their budget. To the extent the department has evacuated vacancies, it's not our desired state, but to the extent they have elevated vacancies, they could use vacancy savings on what we project in the budget to help offset these costs. Several folks have mentioned sales tax estimate. If we end the fiscal year, the future is uncertain. We're making estimates about how we're going to end the fiscal year, but if we end the fiscal year better than we're expecting we can come back to this body and recommend to you to appropriate more funds to the parks department. And we could also look at how this is implemented across departments. It's seven million dollars but will get spread across the departments and even that will be some guesswork. And if we get it wrong we can come back to this body and say we put too much here and not enough here and with your authority we can move it. There are a lot of things we can do to make it work.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: One second. Councilmember Tovo, did you

[2:52:34 PM]

have a comment?

>> Tovo: I wanted to make a quick comment. Mayor pro tem, I think you raised a really good point about one of the departments that really could use some additional resources to help manage this increase, but you mentioned in particular the golf enterprise fund. And I wanted to say that, you know, I have talked about this a few times and I asked a question in the q&a and haven't had an opportunity to really sit with the information well enough to craft any kind of further action, but I do wonder if we revisited the idea of charging out of city residents different rates at our golf courses as we do at all our other park facilities now they may have additional capacity to handle that increase. So it doesn't make sense to not charge different rates for out of city folks who are not helping support the

[2:53:35 PM]

amenities of the city through tax dollars. So that might be one way of managing some of this increase if we took a look at that golf enterprise, at the golf courses and adjusted those green fees.

>> Alter: I think we already did that. I remember reading a q&a.

>> Tovo: I think it was mine.

>> Alter: But they already are doing that. It's just they made it difficult to determine that you are a resident so everyone is pieing the higher right. And if you go and get your resident card then you pay the lower rate, but it's not a per time thing. You have to go through a process to access it. It's not if you go one time. If you're a frequent user then you can get the resident rate.

>> Tovo: Yeah. That was the question that I just got the answer to. It may have come in a couple of days ago but I only saw it last night so I really need to sit with that information. It seemed to me even with the changes they made that there still may be opportunities there.

>> I agree with the direction. I wanted point out there was an answer there.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything

[2:54:36 PM]

else?

>> Alter: I have another question for them on something else. So there is funding for five million dollars in funding for the capital management system, something that I very much want to get done. But in reading through the backup it says that the five million is backup if you can't do the \$10 million as debt financing. Can you explain that? And then councilmember Ellis had an amendment that said it was going to be ready in January and my understanding is the rfp hasn't closed. So it can you help me understand where we're at and what the timing is and whoever is supposed to answer?

>> In terms of the funding strategy, yes, council member, there was a bill passed in the legislature last session that allows cities, city of Austin, to issue bonds for the

[2:55:37 PM]

implementation of cloud-based technology solutions. We have never done that before. We don't know that that's going to actually work in the market. It's one thing to have the legal authority to do it, but it's another thing to structure a bond sale around a cloud-based solution as opposed to a tangible asset. We don't have experience with that. Given the importance of the acm system we thought it was prudent to include funding in the budget for that and if the bond sale works and is successful then that five million dollars could be allocated to other purposes. I don't have a great -- maybe we could go back and check with folks in terms of the timing of when the hcm system really would be ready to move forward and we would be ready to do that. Typically we do these on a reimbursement resolution process so off the cuff I would say it probably would be next September, September of next year, before we really knew whether we were going to build a structure bond deal around those funds. I will try to get you a more definitive answer.

>> Alter: Please. And I did add to the legislative agenda about the

[2:56:39 PM]

cloud-based so I'm glad to hear that you are attempting to do that. I think it's important that we do both -- we make sure that we could use that lever and actually move forward with hcm money. I will think more about that process for that. What is the status of the rfp?

>> So that was a misunderstanding relative to our conversations with the council office. We planned to have both contracts back for approval to council by the end of this year. The software attend the implementation piece, those will be back by the end of the year. It wasn't the actual implementation that will happen at the end of the year.

>> Alter: Which, the fiscal year or the calendar year?

>> Calendar year.

>> Alter: So of '22.

>> And more information is coming out to council members relative to that very soon.

>> Alter: Great. Glad to hear.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: We've posted now to backup with the order of the presentations are, so if you look on the message board.

[2:57:43 PM]

You can have this or throw it away. I handed out an excel spreadsheet that best of our ability this is what people have asked for. I've already seen amendments that have come in post-doing this so I don't vouch for the numbers being right. And if we've made any mistakes I apologize for those in advance. This is just my office's worksheet that I'm handing out in case people want to look at it. Staff did want to do a different form and you can see it all on one page, but staff's is the better one. That one will actually be real. And you can't manipulate it the same way for us. You can look at it. So might not have the same functionality. I could post the excel spreadsheet so that people could actually manipulate this as well if it's not already posted. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you. I'm glad the mayor pro tem had brought that up because I know we had discussed because I have a budget rider about the -- hang on.

[2:58:45 PM]

Sorry. There's a lot of sheets of paper up here. I'm sorry. So I have a couple of budget riders that pertain to this type of service. And so I know that we had had a conversation about the ability to restore returning employee's service time for vacation leave and service incentive-pay calculations. So we were -- I apologize if I misunderstood some of the dates in that conversation, but we were trying to figure out a way to calculate this because we had heard the current system doesn't have a way to calculate this and the new one will. Is that the understanding? >>

>> We don't know what the new system will be able to do. We can add through the process of attempt to do it. I want to be clear the two piece, the service incentive pay to be able to give people credit for years service and it was the vacation, to be able to come back. I think right now you're asking me relative to the vacation

[2:59:46 PM]

piece.

>> Ellis: For the budget rider no. 3, it's about vacation leave and service incentive pay but it deals specifically with how you're calculating the years of service to the city. The one about when service pay kicks in for new employees is an amendment that is separate.

>> So relative to these two pieces, our system does not have the capacity, when you km back to the city of Austin, it accepts your entry date, your start date and calculates from there. So in order to be able to capture previous service, we would not only have to create a new system or figure out how to

reconfigure it but we would have to collaborate with employee retirement system to know the historical times you worked. If you worked one and ten years ago we have to connect. We did reach out to give you an idea of what we could do to the employee retirement system. They do also have some concerns about our capacity to get that data and to be able to capture

[3:00:46 PM]

it and calculate it appropriately. Our answer would be we would need more time to be able to do both of those. Ideally, in the fact that we're looking at a new system, as we go and procure that system, we want to figure out ways to do it. But we need to collaborate to figure out, one, how the system could calculate previous employment and add it and then, two, how we can merge with a retirement system to calculate total year of experience versus the current ten year.

>> Ellis: Thank you for that clarification. I would hope there would be a way to use the employee retirement system information to be able to do this. My understanding is the years of service are kept there and those are up to date with how many years someone has worked for the city regardless of whether there was a gap in service. Is that correct?

>> Yes. That's why we reached out to them first. The challenge is capturing that in real-time for employment.

[3:01:47 PM]

I can't speak for ers. They had some concerns. I'm not in a space to articulate what their concerns were. Certainly, I can provide updates. Just to understand that, for every person hired on the on boarding process, I think it would be a manage juror demand if I have to call ers to confirm every person if they have the years of service. We would have to create a data system of sort to refer to that, in order to do that. Right now, with the manual system that we have right now, it is impossible. But certainly, with the direction from council, it's certainly a project we can look at, figure it out and determine how best to accommodate that. I just wanted to make it clear, it would not be something we would be able to do in time for this budget year.

>> I hope that if council agrees this direction could serve as that guidance to go figure out a way to make it work, I understand that we have a new system coming online that's not going to be quite ready for this fiscal year. But I really think this is

[3:02:49 PM]

something we need to be doing if we're putting all the time and energy and dollars behind the recruitment. I want to make sure that we're being equally incentivizing with the retention. Since this has been brought up to me that people have left the city and when they come back and set back at zero, that's not a strong enough incentive for the all the knowledge and experience someone has working for the city. I want to make sure we look at it how his trickily. Bring in the best and the brightest and the people who are providing expertise. I also wanted to ask how is parental leave calculated in this? If somebody leaves the city or takes leave to have a baby, when they come back, are they set back at zero? Is the clock back at zero?

>> No. That's not a separation of employment. When an employee leaves for parental leave, in some instances after six weeks, they utilize sick or vacation time

[3:03:52 PM]

depending on the circumstances and the decision. That's like when an employee leaves to get any other medical treatment that requires them to take time off, there is no break in service and they'll disconnect -- from the hours they have.

>> Fmla doesn't calculate into this? I know we've had conversations about parental leave and what the city covers, what fmla covers and at the same time holding positions open for people who aren't able to come to work, to make sure their job is there when they do come back.

>> There's a great deal of services and benefits we provide employees in a multitude of medical spaces. We can provide that information. But the fmla does protect their position up to 12 weeks. Employees still have the ability to come back and ask for extensions or opportunities to continue on -- for a leave of absence to address medical issues. Those are approved through the hr department and the city manager's office. I can assure you in the four years I've been here, I've never declined the opportunity for employee to receive an extended

[3:04:54 PM]

period due to medical issues. I would add, councilmember Ellis, one of the incentive programs that when we created the sip was for employees not to leave. One of the reason is to incentivize, if you continue to receive this incentive. One of the concerns we've heard from other offices, if we allow people the same opportunity at the higher level, then it wouldn't be an incentive for people to stay because they could come back and continue to receive it at the same level. I don't know that that changes. But I think for us, our first step would be to figure out how we do it and to figure out what the hours are. But we also need to respond to you relative to the cost of that because currently, I don't have the capacity to give you that cost. So our next steps would be one the feasibility of it. But two, to capture that information and give you a cost analysis if we were to follow the plan which you're requesting, what that cost would be and what the risk or liability would be to the city for the additional hours of vacation.

[3:05:54 PM]

So we would also provide that detail to you as we do more research on the idea.

>> I appreciate that. It was mentioned earlier that it was put in place because you wanted people to stay here longer. But I think when some of the incentives don't kick in until year five or you may leave for some reason or move and then come back to the city and you're set back at zero, I just know there's not a lot of people right now that do the same work for their whole life. We used to live in an era where people gave us 20, 30 years of service. You certainly see that in the community, in city employment, but there's a lot more people that leave and come back and leave and come back. Their knowledge that they've built up over the years is something they're hearing we want them to come back and bring that knowledge with us. If anyone else has questions, I'm happy to defer and then I did have another question about holiday pay.

[3:06:55 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem. Hr questions?

>> Alter: This is on councilmember Ellis' rider or amendment. So I'm just wondering if there's a way to do this where it's -- like it's not something that the employee has the rights, when they're deciding to leave the city, it's not their right but something that a hiring manager can go to hr and waive in some way so it's for hard to fill positions where if there would be a way to structure it. I am concerned about the incentives it creates to leave the city on the flip side of that. I know it seems to me, often we're filling particularly hard to fill positions with people who are coming back to the city and so that there -- I'm wondering if there's a legal way to make a differentiation of that.

>> We look at exception process that may allow us in the system to be able to turn that on and off and make adjustments to it. Right now it's a calculation

[3:07:57 PM]

that's set. As we do the research, we'll look at the ability in the system to be able to turn that on and off to allow an exception process for a recruitment strategy.

>> Alter: Is that something that we would then not budget for this year?

>> I don't have the capacity to do it at all this year. I don't can even know how to do it. I could not do that this budget year. But I certainly can come back as quickly as I'm able to communicate with ers and

the technology system to give you that information. We can possibly look at it in a year. I don't have the ability to do it this week or any time soon relative to the restrictions we have in the system.

>> Mayor Adler: Which item number are we talking about here?

>> This is my budget rider no. 3.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> I mean this all points to why we need a human capital management, someone who actually functions in everything we've discussed today with all of the pay things. It would be a lot easier if we had that system functioning as well as electronic pay sheets.

[3:09:00 PM]

So councilmember Ellis, I would be supportive if we want to put in a rider exploring the pros and cons and bringing that stuff in and making sure we have the ability to implement it next year. It doesn't sound like we can proceed at least as written or at least with the budget part of it and I don't know that we've resolved fully understanding some of the implications for those who are -- who might decide to leave because they know they could come back, which we don't want to incentivize.

>> Which is the budget item associated with this?

>> This one is a rider.

>> Which doesn't have a budget implication.

>> Which doesn't have a budget implication. I agree with you mayor pro tem, we could turn this into the direction --

>> I'm sorry. I thought it was Ellis 3.

>> It was rider 3.

>> There is an amendment no. 3 more about the eligibility date than how the number of years of calculated with continuity of

[3:10:01 PM]

service. I agree that yes, they do overlap. I think there's a way to figure out as a dais do we want to bless trying to get here to make sure that the human capital system can do this as you're working through the contracts and making sure as we build that machine, that it is at least able to do this and then whether or not council blesses that as a policy decision could be two things that we work through with this particular rider.

>> Mayor Adler: With respect to Ellis amendment 3, does that stay as the budget item or is that implicated by the conversation we've just had?

>> That can happen separately because Ellis amendment 3, which is changing the service incentive pay qualification years from five years down to three years is something that the system in place can utilize and this is something that the county, I believe, makes you eligible at three years and the state makes you eligible at two years. And so I just want to make sure we're being competitive. But we could still implement the

[3:11:03 PM]

amendment rider no. 3 to make the years down from five to three for eligibility of service incentive pay with the system that we currently have in place. Is that correct?

>> That is correct. I did want to clarify. In the last one, it's not just the human capital management system, which we can absolutely do. It's merging that data in collaboration with ers into the system. I want to clarify we'll need the cooperation with ers to accomplish. To your last question, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Hr questions, let's continue on further. Councilmember tovo, councilmember --

>> Tovo: This is related to some of the conversations we're having. It may be a question for finance. We've discussed this before. I think the answer is no. I want to verify that there are -- that all departments, if they have vacancy -- let me ask it a different way. Are there any departments that are able to roll over their vacancy savings into a subsequent fiscal year?

[3:12:05 PM]

Other than actually -- okay.

>> All savings do not roll over to the next year.

>> Tovo: All of the vacancy savings in -- question 117, all of those vacancy savings that are left unspent at the end of the fiscal year go to -- 167, they all go into the budget stabilization reserve?

>> So, correct. Savings that happened at the fund level are rolled down to the budget stabilization reserve.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: On that topic about rolling into vacancy savings but at the start of a new fiscal year, you refund with the full salary all of the ftes that are lined up but still exist in the department, right?

>> Correct. Everything is fully funded each

[3:13:06 PM]

year, correct.

>> Then on the service incentive plan, I just want to give a thumbs up to the concept. I worked at the state for a while and took a break and then was looking at going back. I would have lost all of my tenure and all of the time that I had accrued. I was one of those people who rarely was sick and barely took all of my vacation time, which is pretty bad when you think about it. So I mean, I should have been using the personal leave given to me. But if I was going to go back, I lost all of that and I started back at zero. That does not support bringing strong workers with expertise and experience and knowledge of the job back into the workforce and that is absolutely what we're trying to do. I just really, really like the amendment that lowers the number of years and I like the rider that would allow it to be triggered. I don't know about the trigger on and off. But it does seem to be a really

[3:14:08 PM]

important piece for rerecruiting good long time employees who maybe have left for a while and coming back because they recognize that this really is the place where their heart is and this is the work that they want to do. Thank you so much for bringing that. I am looking forward to having these changes going forward for our workforce.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Additional hr questions? Councilmember kitchen. Remember, we have nine more some odd departments to get through.

>> Kitchen: It was raised earlier about the dental benefit, the temporary employees. Can you speak to that and tell us --

>> Vision is covered completely by employees. That wouldn't be a cost to the city. Employees would have to cover that. Dental, I believe the cost was \$84,000 to cover temporary employees in the question that we answered.

>> Kitchen: Okay. \$84,000 would provide -- is that the same kind of dental benefit

[3:15:08 PM]

that is for employees?

>> Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Sorry about the confusion on which was an amendment and rider. On your amendment 3, that -- right now in this accounting it's all being set to the general fund. Can you break that down for us at some point today between the general fund and enterprise funds and let us know if there's any impact to any fees.

>> For the sip recommendation?

>> No. For the pay eligibility threshold.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Because I understand that has more of an impact on the enterprise funds than the \$20 an hour wage does. I wanted to check on that.

>> Okay.

>> They have more employees that are --

>> That are impacted.

>> By that than they did for the \$20 wage. But that also reduces the

[3:16:09 PM]

ongoing general fund amount that we need to account for.

>> Yes. We also made some adjustments. I'll let Rebecca break it down on S.I.P. For this year. To your point, councilmember Ellis, we are moving and progressing with it. If you'll break down what we did this year for S.I.P. This may be a nice Progressive move to next year.

>> One of the things we used to do for our service incentive pay was it was based on a calculation. This year, with the city manager's budget, it was moved to a flat \$100 per year starting at five years for employees. Instead of receiving part of that calculation, which some of our lower paid employees would receive less, everybody would move to that \$500 range and then it would be based on \$100 per year for every year of service. That gets paid out the first paycheck of every December.

>> Thank you.

>> Up to \$1500.

[3:17:10 PM]

Sorry.

>> Then, I had one other question. There's a couple of proposals related to lifeguards. And I'm just trying to understand how those interact with moving to \$20 an hour.

>> So as we go forward, when \$20 -- if \$20 is approved, we will look at the pay grades for all of the different levels of lifeguards. We'll make adjustments to those pay grades as appropriately. We'll have to move some of them up depending how the compression hits when we compress the pay grades. We'll make sure that for the temporaries, they will be at \$20. For the full-time lifeguards, we will zone them according to making sure they are at the appropriate entry of the new zone.

>> Okay. And then the -- just to clarify, the councilmember Ellis, your rider related to lifeguard bonuses is, like, if we need it

[3:18:14 PM]

statement? So that -- that's not an amendment at this point. We would assess whether we needed that given the \$20?

>> Exactly. There were vacancy savings that allowed for that this year. We wanted to make sure that we were able to look at that at the appropriate time for next year. Which would probably be about midyear. Just making sure. We think pard has this within their budget. If they don't, we would like to know. Recruiting lifeguards takes some time to get people trained up and ready to go to work. We figured we'd visit that at the appropriate time.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Ellis

>> Ellis: I wanted to quickly mention, I was able to find the Q and a that pointed to the dental policy. And the total line item was \$84,000 but it said \$14,000 was employee contribution and \$70,000 was city contribution. I wanted to make sure we had those numbers as we figured out

[3:19:14 PM]

how to work with them. I had one last question. I have a budget rider no. 4 about providing city employees a third personal holiday. In 2002 when a personal holiday was added to the benefits package, the rca said there was no unintended fiscal impact. I just wanted to see -- is that the same case now? Is that different this year? If it's different, then why?

>> We don't -- I don't have the data from 2002. That was provided for that when we changed from one personal holiday to two. One thing that we have done as we've done research on our holidays is that we still have staff that we have to continue the business. Even on personal holidays, departments may have to pay for other people to backfill or for overtime. Those were some of the costs we looked at is what

might that be for those overtime and backfill costs to our employees that they have. An additional eight hours of leave that they're able to take

[3:20:15 PM]

a year.

>> Okay. That's helpful. I hope as we work through all of these pay and incentive policies and programs that my intent with this would be if we can successfully incorporate all of these other incentives to make sure people want to come work for the city, hopefully there wouldn't need to be overtime if we've got fewer vacancies and people are there to fill in that position. I'll keep working on it and see if there's any more questions. We can work with you behind the scenes. Really hoping to make sure we can accomplish this goal and not have it come out of overtime. Have it be something that there are available personnel to cover those hours.

>> Absolutely. I want to remind you, you all gave us the direction to do the family friendly initiative. We're in the process of doing that right now. If that is indeed some of the incentives that we hear that employees want to incentivize them to stay, we'll give that information to you as well.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Just want to clarify because this causes confusion sometimes. Because there's no

[3:21:17 PM]

anticipated -- it doesn't mean it doesn't cost anything. It's something we know what's going to happen and nothing unanticipated about it. Not apples to apples.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other hr questions now? All right. Thank you very much. Probably not the last time we'll have questions, unfortunately. Okay. Ed, who do you want to bring up next? Pard?

>> I think we're going to start with parks next.

[3:22:44 PM]

I don't think there's a presentation here, Ed. We go straight to questions. Does anyone have any questions for parks? Councilmember [indiscernible].

>> Good afternoon director. How are you doing? Just quickly on my full-time lifeguard item we're about to file an amended version of that to reduce the fiscal impact for this year. Can you describe a little -- one of the things we're thinking about postponing the -- I guess back loading it to the last six months given that they're going to be authorized in October. They're going to have to do the new job posting and post and so

[3:23:44 PM]

on and so forth. We don't really anticipate hiring any lifeguards as full-time immediately and so the fiscal impact would not be for the full year. I'm sorry. Am I explaining that correctly in terms of converting folks from temporary to full-time employees?

>> Yes, sir. So I think that the impact will lessen the amount of money that's taken out of the temporary. But overall, from the following year, assuming that this is ongoing and we have these full-time, there will not be a lesser impact in the years to follow. Right? So somehow the budget will have to be made whole or we'll have to analyze what budget -- what impacts there were so that we could either reallocate or move money around or be able to in subsequent fiscal years or be able to supplement that budget by some amount that we see

[3:24:45 PM]

because we made this decision. But to answer, I think, your question is that if we were to start, I'm going to use the number 15. That's the number that I have in front of me. If we were to start 15 lifeguards. At half a year, we would be able to reduce the fiscal impact this year by a little over \$100,000. It looks like it's about \$121,000. It would be \$120,000 less if we started at six months. Less of an impact at six months versus if we started at them at three quarters of the year and were able to hire in January by way of example.

>> And you're saying that in future years they would have the current projected budgetary impact, in other words for the '23-'24 year, those would be full-time employees moving forward. The budgetary impact for the

[3:25:46 PM]

next year would be more of the current, the cost in the current, right?

>> Yes. Because even though we're starting them six months later this year, we would be -- those individuals would be paid for the full year the subsequent fiscal years.

>> Okay. I've got the number at 200,000 from the temporary from the existing temporary positions budget and 460,000 from the general fund as a 22-23 impact. Is that correct.

>> I have 467,000. To be honest, we've been going back and forth with numbers. I would rely on our friends from the budget office. I think you all know math is not my super power. I rely on my friends in budget. But we're in the same ballpark.

>> I just wanted to bring that to the dais' attention.

[3:26:47 PM]

We should be able to knock money off the ongoing ftes by reducing the item we're working on and should be red any just a bit. Moving to the hvac item. I know in discussions with parks foundation and with y'all, you got a lot of hvac systems to maintain and you really need the systems in that area. Could you elaborate on that at all?

>> Sure. So obviously we have approximately 60 facility, recreation centers, cultural arts centers -- she's here. Cultural art centers. Nature centers, so each of them have an hvac system that we keep running and we use our facilities as cooling stations and use them during heating. We use them during cold weather

[3:27:47 PM]

shelters. So I'm going to hand this over to Leanna who can help us talk a little bit about the need for that position. Why it's so important to us.

>> So I would just add that we have more than 600,000 square feet that are air-conditioned on a number of buildings and we have two hvac technicians right now to take care of all of these facilities. Even with the assistance from contractors, they are not able to catch up. Just to give you an idea for the last -- for this year, for the ten months, we have had more than 380 work orders. So that's more than one work order per day, which is difficult to manage. So additional help -- we have had two technicians for the last five years at least. So that has been an

[3:28:49 PM]

underresourced area. And as the director said, we have cooling centers, we have all of these buildings that are serving throughout the year and in many emergencies.

>> I appreciate that. I also bring the amendment in the spirit of the sheltering, the -- and the resilience, goals of the city. Obviously, heating and cooling is not working in recreation centers, it's not going to be

much use as a place where people can cool down in the summer or warm up in the winter. In that spirit, I hope that this is an item that we can support in the budget.

>> Councilmembers, if I could also -- when I take a look at all of the amendments, I tried to prioritize them in ways that would make sense for the parks and recreation department and part of that was about multiple outcomes. I think I might have said that to you previously. In this particular case, the reason why this particular item

[3:29:49 PM]

risers to one of our priorities is that it's not just about the centers and services that we provide and not just about the emergency responses that we're able to provide, but also having an understanding of hvac and being able to incorporate that into our green jobs program that could be possibly part of something in the future that is an accc program. There's three different ways we could take this position or we could utilize funding for this to meet multiple outcomes. I wanted to make sure you knew we were thinking more globally.

>> Thank you very much, director. I don't have any more questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool, councilmember Kelly.

>> Pool: I wanted to ask a question about the bath house. This relates to the Ada restrooms and public parks. I know there was a point when the vision plan for the

[3:30:54 PM]

renovations -- and I think I might have blawt some direction or a -- brought some direction or a rider back in the midst of budget preparation time this past year about the adult changing table and whether it could be accommodated at zil Kerr. And I know that the item that we're looking at from councilmember tovo, it's her Ada restrooms in public parks, tovo 1. She suggests other -- there could be other places for that particular kind of a restroom. I wanted to get a kind of handle on a, are we still looking at the zil Kerr bath house. Is there a place in the parks to accommodate it and then, second, what are the logistics and planning and costs around that sort of thing? And is one enough?

>> With regard to zil Kerr park, we continue to look into the possibility. It's not about the bath house.

[3:31:58 PM]

We're looking for another facility at the park that we think would be appropriate to have the adult changing space. In order to proceed with that, we would need to have a feasibility study to understand

what will mean to go into construction. So we would -- as a first step, appreciate having a design consulting team that will include a structural engineer and, of course, planning and electrical in order to be able to have a better grasp of what the costs are going to be. With Zuker, it's a metro park visited by so many. We think that's a proper location. At the same time, we stepped back for the last year to allow for the vision plan to proceed before we make permanent decisions on where this would

[3:32:58 PM]

go.

>> Okay. So that is -- maybe councilmember Tovo would want to speak to this. This is the \$100,000 that you're talking about in one time -- oh, no. Yes, it is Tovo and Ellis is co-sponsor. One-time funding from sales tax. Is the \$100,000, that is simply to fund the advance work to determine the design and the costs and the appropriate location and accessibility.

>> Yes.

>> Okay. And then we have a sense for, we already have one now at the airport I'm reading in here. This isn't to pard now. It generally occurred to me. I think I mentioned this earlier. If we are going to be expanding the airport to another terminal, we probably should start including the planning for Ada

[3:33:59 PM]

and another one of these types of facilities in the new extended, expanded airport footprint. Is there another location, back to pard, is there another location you're looking at potentially?

>> We actually have an early example, which is the -- the restrooms that were very recently opened, it is not a high tech example. It is a -- it's not an adjustable table. But it serves the exact same purpose. We would like to make sure that having this is going to be -- it's probably more appropriate because it's more resilient to vandalism, it's more resilient to breaking and --

>> Rather than like a hydraulic lift or something like that.

>> Right, right. So that it's already there, which also gives us an understanding of how to manage

[3:35:02 PM]

had such a facility. So that it's not open to behavior that might be problematic.

>> Or any damages.

>> Yes.

>> Thank you. Councilmember Kelly, then councilmember tovo.

>> Kelly: Thank you. One of the items I brought forward as an amendment was for a play for all abilities park, which is an outdoor facilities for kids, people of all ages to develop skills and to really be able to access equipment. So I had some questions regarding that. I did turn it into a budget rider. We're no longer requesting the funds, this is more exploratory to look at the different aspects of it. One of my questions because it came back at 5 to \$10 million price estimate or cost estimate, what types of resources would be required to build a park like that for the people in the community to utilize?

>> Do you mean what types of construction resources or do you

[3:36:04 PM]

mean -- or all of the above?

>> Kelly: Yes. And then we'll get into funding in a moment.

>> I'll let Leanna answer this question. We have -- I'll let her answer the question.

>> I hope I answer it the way you wanted. Again, we're looking -- we have playgrounds that are becoming all inclusive playgrounds but this is a different scale. When we're talking about all abilities park, we're discussing the possibility of having one in a metro park. That will also require additional parking, restrooms and other facilities that would be supporting that all abilities park, which will be extending beyond a playground. So we have been in discussions with one of our partners, and during this very early

[3:37:05 PM]

discussions, we are estimating that the cost is going to X seed \$5 million. Again, this will become a much more real cost when we get further into defining the scope.

>> Kelly: What I'd like to add to what Leanna said is that there are entities, there's companies and resources that are available that are already manufacturing equipment or playground structures that can be considered all abilities. It's not as though we're having to custom build things, but it's a matter of the size, UT a matter of making sure the infrastructure and all of the things leading up to the park as Leanna had stated are all Ada accessible. And then all of the amenities that would be surrounding that park, that those are also Ada accessible to the highest degree possible since we're saying that this is an important investment for individuals with disabilities to be able to come

[3:38:06 PM]

and visit that. There's also a difference between just Cree pating a playground and creating a park. I think that's why the estimate is such a wide range. When we think about developing a park, we're thinking about that differently than setting up equipment for a particular playground. My experience has also been that there are all abilities parks that are divided into age groups, just like regular playgrounds. So it just depends upon how much in each of those age groups that are age appropriate that also are all abilities and how big that becomes. That's why the range is such that am -- I would say as far as funding resource, we have a very willing partner in the Austin parks foundation who has already been setting aside moneys as they are doing capital campaigns for receiving donations and -- we're putting some of that money aside so that they can build out their treasure chest, per se, of

[3:39:07 PM]

that money so that they can contribute to something of this magnitude. We have explored locations. We visited some of our staff and apf have visited parks up in Round Rock and have some ideas. That's how we were able to come up with some of the estimates. There's some excitement around that although it hasn't been launched to a full-fledged program yet.

>> Thank you for -- I'm a firm believer of a city of our size as diverse of a community that investment in a park like this would really help the individuals in our community access park things a lot easier. Park playing equipment and that sort of thing. From the city side, could you maybe explain a little bit about funding mechanisms that we have available from our end to fund a project like this?

>> Sure. I think they're similar to how we fund other capital projects.

[3:40:07 PM]

We always have the bond. Because it would be a brand new development and it would be something that would be serving a surrounding community, we could also use parkland dedication funds. In that particular area, if there were mitigation fees from some sort of a chapter 26 project, those could absolutely go to something of this nature. And then, we could be exploring grants and obviously we already talked about our partners.

>> Thank you very much for explaining that. I also note from my prior experience serving on the gofr's committee for people are disabilities. These really enrich the lives. My heart is looking for the council to support this coming to a reality for our residents. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo and --

>> Tovo: Just a couple quick questions. One not to be answered today. I'm interested at some point in knowing whether or not the park -- the playground that's

[3:41:08 PM]

being described would fit into the vision plan that was created. It seems like that would be -- that's just a question. Whether this fits into some of the planning that had been done at Emma long.

>> At Emma long or Walter long?

>> I'm sorry. Walter long. Thank you. My questions for you today are, the budget question 129. I had asked the question about whether the pool fee -- the fees that we charge individuals who are having events at our pools and need to pay the fees are based on the lifeguard wages and it looked as if to the response to 129, those haven't been updated to the most recent lifeguard wages as I understood the response. Is that a fee change that the staff are prepared to bring forward an amendment to or is that something we should think about changing from the dais?

>> Councilmember, could you please clarify. Were we talking about the rental fee or the admission fee.

[3:42:11 PM]

>> I'm sorry. It's the rental fee. I think the rental fee as I understood it, from looking at the fee schedule in the budget, the rental fee is based in part on the wages that are required to pay the lifeguards but they're using the old lifeguard wages rather than the updated ones. So I wondered if pard intended to bring forward an amendment.

>> Sure. We haven't had that discussion with the budget office. As you all know, we put forward the ref enough schedule and the schedule -- we were unaware at the time what the living wage might be. This was obviously -- we could have a conversation with our partners in the budget office and determine whether that's necessary. We might want to run the numbers and say, well, what really would be the impact based upon the number of rentals. That is not collecting that revenue so detrimental to the budget that it would necessitate that we should immediately move

[3:43:11 PM]

forward or is it something that we could recommend that we would take care of in the next fee schedule process, which would be for the next budget cycle. We can certainly have that discussion and then perhaps P --

>> I mean I would like the wage -- it seems like a simple amendment. Perhaps I'll just bring it myself to make sure that the fee is updated to reflect the current lifeguard wage or unless somebody who is working on lifeguards would like to do that. In any case, when we're assessing fees based on what it

costs to provide the service, I think those who are renting, they should pay the updated price. I'll go ahead and --

>> Fair enough. I think we're --

>> If somebody --

>> We've noted it.

>> Does that mean y'all are going to bring that forward? Or that I should prepare one?

[3:44:14 PM]

>> We can get that updated in the fee schedule for amendment for this fiscal year '23.

>> That would be wonderful. Thank you so much. Then my next question relates back to the amendment that councilmember pool was describing that I'm bringing forward with regard to the restroom. The adult changing table equipped restroom. So the fee that you had provided, the estimate that you had provided of 100,000, I wondered if you thought that it could be reduced at all because of the experience the city has already had in constructing one of the -- I want to shoutout the art board -- give a shoutout to the airport for being one of 12 airports in the whole country to have provided one of these to travelers. That's great to hear about holly shores. Thank you to the parks department for doing that at holly shores. Do you think that that -- I understand so much of the work and the analysis is site specific to the conditions at zil Kerr and to the fact that that's a historic asset as well.

[3:45:17 PM]

Do you think there are any cost savings on the estimate based on the fact that the city of Austin could potentially leverage the learnings over at the airport?

>> I wish that I could say yes. But the answer is unfortunately no. We put together that cost estimate based upon knowing what you just already told us, knowing that those are existing.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

>> >> Kitchen: Hello. I have a question that probably relates more to the future. But it's similar to councilmember Kelly's. I know that there's at least two of the cultural facilities that are going to potentially require some more funding to complete. And those were originally bonds. So I am assuming that this is something that we can come to grips with later. We don't have to as part of this budget process. Specifically, I'm talking about

[3:46:18 PM]

the Asian American resource center and the Doherty arts center. There may be others. I'm aware that these two maybe have identified additional funding that may be needed in order to complete plans. So here's my question. My question is two parts. First, in terms of identifying additional dollars that might be available, that does not have to be accomplished now through the budget process. So that's question number one. Question number two is if you know, can you give us an idea of what kind of funds we might should be looking at for the availability of that. Again, I realize you may not be able to answer that second one at this time. Does that make sense? The two-part question.

>> Uh-huh. I'll rely on Leanna to provide additional information about exact numbers. But I can tell you that just about every capital improvement project at the parks and

[3:47:18 PM]

recreation department and I would venture to say probably any of my colleagues in the process of building anything is exceeding the allocated budget that was provided during the bond. We're not talking just about those two. We're talking about any project. Any swimming pool project we're in the process of building. Any project. Any tennis center. But for those two specifics, I'll let Leanna tell you what we think that the delta will be at this particular point of time. We can also talk about funding sources after I give her a chance to answer.

>> Thank you.

>> If I may start from the Asian American resource center.

>> Uh-huh.

>> When we were during the bond, the 2018 bond, the facility extension plan for -- was not completed. So we were not in a position to have a full understanding of the -- of what we needed to request. That was the case for the Asian

[3:48:20 PM]

American resource center and for the carver museum. So both of them during the 2018 bond received funding that we knew up front was not sufficient and the expectation was that we will be able to continue with a small phase one after the expansion plan was completed and be ready for a next bond to support the project.

>> Okay.

>> Now, you also mentioned the deck. That received 25 million during the 2018. It is a project that is on a side that has quite a few constraints that have become more clear during the last two years, and in an effort to make a number of this direction from

[3:49:24 PM]

council satisfy the communities surrounding, we know and we have communicated that the amendment to cancel -- council, we have a budget shortfall based on the most recent cost estimate that we received, that is substantial. We were planning to provide more information in an upcoming meeting. So we can --

>> That's fine. I don't need the details right now. I can wait for the meeting.

>> We think this is such -- this particular conversation warrants even perhaps a briefing to the council. So we're planning on that in the month of September.

>> That's fine. I'm basically trying to make sure that this is -- these are not issues we have to address right now during the budget. That's what I'm wanting to confirm.

>> When you mentioned cultural centers, I believe the Mexican -- I don't know if you said this. Mexican-american cultural center is also looking at some

[3:50:27 PM]

shortfalls. Every project that we're working on right now, we're creatively looking at ways to increase the funding.

>> What kind of options might we have? Without going into detail, is it another bond? Is it cos? Do you guys know at this point?

>> It's all of the above. Each of those have a certain set of consequences or considerations. But all of the above. We've also looked at pld funds that we were able to move into certain locations. Again, everything is on the table.

>> Okay.

>> In the case of the swimming pools, we also were able to apply for and receive some grant funding. We're looking at every angle.

>> What's your timing for an answer --

>> Is this budget?

>> I don't know that I have a direct answer yet. We don't have to address this in this budget, right? Ed, no?

>> How about if we come back to you with the information that you're looking for.

[3:51:27 PM]

But we can do it via a memo or communication so it's germane to this budget and it's not germane to a future budget and -- or future capital project.

>> So midyear we can address, right? Ed, is that right? Okay. That's what I'm wanting to ascertain. These are issues that you need to work out more information on that. But we don't have to wait until next year to determine that. Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else for parks? Go ahead.

>> Looks like I'll close us out. I wanted to share my support for the larger size diaper changing station. I know when I first got to council, one of the first initiatives I passed was to make sure there was a baby changing table not just in the women's restroom, but other parents who need to change their kids. This has been a standing item on the committee that the mayor put together for people with

[3:52:28 PM]

disabilities. They've been asking for it for a while. I'm happy to be a co-sponsor. Especially the rec center has more Ada accessibility and playground equipment that's Ada accessible. Whether it goes in zil Kerr park. I would be equally happy to make it available in any park.

>> Mayor Adler: Let keep going. It's 4:00. We're going to start losing some people at 5:00 to go to remote. Let's keep moving through here with our lightning round of questions. Homeless division. Thank you.

>> Mayor, I think this is helpful for the next stages. I actually think it's a yufl innovation.

>> Mayor Adler: I didn't mean to imply that it wasn't. If we can focus on the questions and what we have and focus on questions, we're going to have plenty of time to deliberate and make arguments and all that kind of stuff. Certainly, I agree with you,

[3:53:29 PM]

this is very helpful. Homelessness division. Anybody here? Okay. Councilmember harper-madison had a question.

>> We're trying to figure out who had questions. I think you were suggested as someone who might and councilmember pool also.

>> Mayor Adler: What? Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for homelessness? Go ahead.

>> Pardon the disruption everybody. I was playing super mama today. We had a sick kid. So can you give me real quick where y'all left off

>> Mayor Adler: No problem. We've finished with parks and opening up for questions with respect to the homelessness.

[3:54:32 PM]

Strategy officer is with us in case anybody has questions in this area. We've opened it up generally to the dais.

>> Thank you. No questions.

>> Mayor, we don't have any questions, I don't think. I'm not seeing any questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: Yeah. I just wanted to get -- I'm trying to understand -- I mean, I don't -- I think these are questions for -- they may be questions for my colleague. I don't really understand what we're proposing to fund with Adler 1 or with kitchen 1. I wanted to better understand those and hear the perspective of our homeless strategy officer.

>> Mayor Adler: If you could speak to each of the items. I think that makes sense. I think there are probably two or three items. You could speak to them if you think they're appropriate or

[3:55:32 PM]

why. Adler 1 was the homelessness services. The \$406,000 number. Can you speak to that one first?

>> Yes, sir. Mayor and councilmembers. So the Adler 1 amendment adds approximately \$400,000 to the aph budget to support the work of our community partners who are particularly involved in data analysis in supporting the homeless response system leadership council. Another critical capacity building and system operation needs. That could include echo, which is the hud designated lead agency in our community whose operating support contract has remained flat for several years despite a very rapid growth in our system and in our work that is not limited to them.

[3:56:33 PM]

We could use some of those funds for other contracts to support the system, but in a nutshell, it really speaks to the incredible acceleration of work in this space.

>> And we don't have room within the \$79 million that we've allocated or within arpa for that?

>> We'll likely do some targeted investment with echo through arpa for very specific purposes. But there are some fundamental mandated roles that echo has and needs to carry out either through direct staffing or through subcontracting that have been increasing over the years and really were underfunded even before the arpa funds came down.

>> Thank you.

[3:57:34 PM]

And then can you help me understand for kitchen 1 what that would be funding?

>> Yes. So the initiative currently depends in part on the operation of two bridge shelters. South bridge and north bridge. With a combined capacity of about 135 or 140 beds. That capacity based on the turnover we're seeing in shelter, really is-sized approximately to the 200-person goal that has been set for this fiscal year. The north bridge shelter, which is the former country inn was actually purchased with general obligation bond, affordable housing general obligation bonds is intended and, in fact, with that financing source must be converted to permanent housing. Simply as we decommissioned it

[3:58:34 PM]

as a pro lodge last year and we're ramping up and had an opportunity to utilize it for -- temporarily for bridge shelter. So this amendment directs, first of all, staff to locate another bridge shelter facility to replace north bridge and directs manager to utilize any appropriate funding sources whether those be certificates of obligation or general obligation bonds, as well as some home arpa money that we could utilize in this way. Probably -- the general fund budget, excuse me, is an allocation of 1.75 million. Which would provide the cost of operating that shelter for approximately six months of this fiscal year, acknowledging that it would take us a moment to identify and acquire.

[3:59:37 PM]

This is important because we have been operating northbridge not with general funds but rather predominantly with emergency solutions grant covid dollars that were available to us along with a bit of arpa funding which we anticipate will be exhausted likely in approximately March of this year. So we

would not have existing money or existing funds to operate another shelter for the rest of the year should we acquire that facility.

>> Alter: And you're saying there's not arpa dollars for that?

>> That's correct. The way that we have set aside a million dollars in arpa funding for operating northridge for a portion of this fiscal year because at that time we did not have direction to create another

[4:00:37 PM]

shelter. The rest of the crisis and shelter dollars in the arpa spending plan have been included in a solicitation for shelter and other crisis services. That solicitation has gone out, evaluations have been completed, and lauda Fuentes, who is with us, may be able to remind us whether recommended applicants have been advised at this time. But those funds are moving toward community-based contracts not only for shelter, but in particular for street outreach and some other crisis-related services.

>> Alter: And is there a balance of heal funds available?

>> A balance of -- I'm sorry?

>> Alter: I wanted to clarify there was a balance of heal funds from arpa available still.

>> Yes. But the balance of heal funds or the heal funds that were indicated in the spending plan were for rapid

[4:01:39 PM]

re-housing for the permanent portion of this housing effort. Of course when we have bridge shelter, the efficacy of that shelter is really based on the ability of us to move people out of that shelter and into permanent housing. So in the initial acceptance of arpa funds, council directed us to set aside at least six million dollars of arpa funding, the state and local physical relief funds for rapid re-housing associated with heal. So that is the amount that is currently there unspent for heal but dedicated to another purpose.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. While you're commenting on these, there's also the civilian conservation corps. We're proposing to amend that, colleagues, to put in language that asks that as that's being organized and done that there be some

[4:02:40 PM]

attention given to how that core could also provide pathways for people for employment and also to help support the homelessness response system. Would you talk about what you envisioned for that or what that might be?

>> Yes, absolutely. So as detailed in the rider, I think the direction given there is -- has a potential for two primary benefits. One is obviously direct employment and training of people who are experiencing homelessness or have recently exited homelessness. And I think there are jobs within the current corps that could be well suited to people who are coming out of homelessness. And we certainly could -- and I would anticipate do some thinking about potential other types of employment that would be a good fit for this population. The second piece is other

[4:03:41 PM]

needs within the system that could be met through the accc that would serve the system whether the people employed in those programs had experience of homelessness or not. And so let me give a few potential examples. We have some landscaping needs around facilities serving the homelessness, whether they be city facilities or facilities owned by our partners. There could be outreach. There could be other kinds of work that really would support our homeless response system and provide some career pathways for people participating in the accc generally.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. And I think that I agree with the language of the mayor pro tem for this amendment. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I have a couple of questions.

[4:04:41 PM]

Just to start with the last one, is this adjustment to the -- and the expansion of scope for the Austin civilian corps -- conservation corps, is this something that the homeless strategy office requested? I understand the mayor has brought forward the amendment, but I'm asking if your office --

>> While we did not request this as part of the current budget process, it is consistent with conversations we have had with accc over time, thinking about ways we might better leverage that program. And so again, I think we did not have a specific conversation requesting this, but fully support the rider and believe that there is significant opportunity there and have heard interest from several partners in this space in creating and participating in such a program.

>> Tovo: I guess one real fundamental question I would

[4:05:41 PM]

have if accc, if the rider in -- in relationship to this rider, one fundamental question I have is why we wouldn't seek to do some of that expansion through downtown Austin community court program, which has been working in this space, as I understand it, for several years. And I know that the dac is coming up later, but they have a program that they're probably best to describe, but that their clients who are clients of the downtown Austin community court as I understand it do work in our parks and in other city facilities. So I don't know if this is the appropriate time but I guess I'll ask that question of the dacc later, but I guess I would ask the question of you of whether you've had conversations with the dacc about their program and the way that it could serve and meet the needs of individuals experiencing homelessness in the way that you've described.

>> Certainly. And I definitely would want Pete Valdez to join us whether now or later to

[4:06:43 PM]

ensure that this is correct. My understanding of the work programs that -- the work program that exists through the dacc is that it's a community service-based program. So it is part of the disposition of charges that might have brought people into the downtown Austin community court. The other piece I would say is that dacc does fantastic work. I think that if we are piloting something like this in my view it has the best chance of being successful if we open it to the entire population rather than focusing on a more narrow population that interacts with the city. I see that Pete has joined us so I'll let him speak to that.

>> Yes, what Diana said is correct. The majority of the people that we are sending out to work as part of our community service program to complete beautification

[4:07:45 PM]

projects throughout this city is I think what you might be talking about, but we also do employ people with lived experience through our keepsake program which is relevant to what I think you are talking about here today.

>> Tovo: And I guess my point is and thank you, I think I had asked a question. I think I had asked a question, maybe somebody else did in the q&a that responded -- that provided the information about the way in which clients are able to utilize this to do and you've described to fulfill their commitment to the downtown Austin community court. But I guess my point is that we have a city department that in essence has a workforce program for individuals experiencing homelessness both through violent keepsake -- violet keepsake for wages and add a fulfillment to their responsibility to the downtown community court, it would seem like maybe the better effort is to expand that to allow there to be

[4:08:45 PM]

wages offered for that work as well for work within the park system because you are already working with individuals experiencing homelessness in workforce in essence. They're not paid wages through the park department, but that would seem to be a smaller stretch of an expansion than it would be to get accc to take on a whole new element of work that -- whole new element of focus and expansion. That's kind of what I'm struggling with here. What is the better program to expand? And at the moment it seems like the dacc would be a more appropriate fit for that kind of workforce work and that important work going on in our city facilities. Is there a reason -- I guess I'll turn this back to our city -- our homeless strategy officer-- I guess in looking for that kind of program can you help me understand what you see as the benefits of going in a

[4:09:48 PM]

different direction rather than working with the downtown Austin community work with their existing program, which how long has it been in place, Pete?

>> If we're talking about the violet keepsake program --

>> Tovo: I know that is more recent. I was really thinking about the community service program in our parks and other areas.

>> That's been around since 2005.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Tovo: No, I had asked our homeless strategy officer that question. Now we're discussing the merits of the amendments, but since we had gone there it just seemed efficient to continue it. Ms. Grey, can you help me -- can you respond to the question I asked about --

>> Certainly. What I would say is that we have workforce development strategies that do span a number of our departments. Dacc, as Pete has said, the work that is done there is not I think explicitly

[4:10:49 PM]

workforce development but certainly has some job experience value and has some value in our parks. We have substantial contracts through Austin public health and workforce development that will be increasing this year via investment of arpa funds. One of the pieces I think that is important for accc and could be a real value is again that the rider as written as I understand it is not only employment for people experiencing homelessness but leveraging some of the other potential crews for training to

provide value into the homeless response system. While supporting those career pathways that have been targeted through the accc. So I think that each of these opportunities does offer something a bit

[4:11:53 PM]

different. We are happy to spend some more time on that if council so directs us, but from my perspective this rider asks us to identify opportunities and do some exploration and analysis for council and city manager which we are happy to do.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. So it sounds to me like Ms. Gray that really what we're talking about is there are two aspects of this if I'm understanding the accc. One of them is just the people. We're talking about workforce development and I don't see any reason for separating homeless people from other people in terms of their access to training. So I'm hearing that. I'm also hearing that it may be that the kinds of activities that the accc are involved in are things that offer some workforce development that may be different than other kinds of programs that we want our

[4:12:54 PM]

homeless population to be able to take advantage of also. And then there might be some specific projects that contribute to the homeless response system, right, if I'm hearing you correctly that may not be appropriate for the accc to take on. Is that what I'm hearing you say? Can you give us an example? Or maybe you don't know yet what kind of projects those may be.

>> So as an example whether city facilities or one other thing I brought up is other facilities having landscaping needs, but something that I do think that is consistent with the framework of the accc right now is we have facilities that need ongoing maintenance, right, that is a course for larger and more complex jobs. We utilize the building services division, but there is a fair number of -- amount of work in the city facilities and the

[4:13:55 PM]

facilities across our system where individuals in an accc program could be learning basic maintenance skills and working within those facilities to build their skill base to move them forward again while bringing value to the city and our non-profit providers.

>> Kitchen: Thank you. I don't see any reason to create a separate program for people who are homeless.

>> Mayor Adler: In addition to the comments that were made, it's a good program. The dacc, councilmember tovo, is a good program too. The American youth works is an organization that provides some workers for some of the programs and the civilian conservation corps, I think that's great. Maybe the dacc could also provide workers for some infrastructure as

[4:15:30 PM]

encoder technical issue].

>> Tovo: I'm going to take a look at your revised rider to see if there's an opportunity to look at the dacc. I would assume that I would need to really go into more detail with Mr. Valdez to be sure. I assume that that program also provides some levels of support that may be really important to the participants. I think expanding it to being wage based as well could be a real advantage if that's something they could administer, but my thought is that there may be a real utility to going in that direction. I want to be sure that if your rider passes to explore this angle that it also includes the option that it is non-prescriptive enough to have [indiscernible]

>> Mayor Adler: If you read it to be that purpose, it would be intended to pick up that kind of thing as well. All right, any further questions for homelessness services? Is director Sturup here?

[4:16:33 PM]

>> She is.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think I saw her on the screen a moment ago and I see her -- there you are, thank you. One of the riders -- and I really appreciate mayor pro tem's bringing it and her work in hate crimes in the city and I also thank all my colleagues working on the hate crimes task force, one of the things I started in this city that I'm most proud of is a hate crimes task force doing work with the anti-defamation league at the time and the executive director at that time. So I really appreciate that work and that participation as well as going to community to elevate the issue of hate crimes and how to respond to it and that kind of things. When we were having the mass shootings and we were processing a lot of the hate crimes, one of the recurrent messages we were getting

[4:17:33 PM]

from professionals was that if communities really wanted to do something that were really helpful, what might be really helpful would be to help people be vigilant about identifying people in the community, neighbors, co-workers others who might need help and support. In fact, that might be one of the most important things that a community can do with respect to hate crimes. This is something that we've

been talking to your office about doing independently for several months now, director Sturup. I just wanted to -- we've brought an amendment to the mayor pro tem's item, again not to be prescriptive in terms of how it would be done, but also to say hey, when you're reaching out about hate crimes and you're suggesting to people what it is they can do to be proactive, this is something that we have a real miss if we're not elevating as part

[4:18:37 PM]

of the response -- the community response to hate crimes. Can you talk about this aspect of it?

>> I can, thank you. Good afternoon. Adrian spire run, Austin public health. I will start, and I see that my colleague Jessica king has joined me on the virtual podium, so I will pass to her as well because this is an opportunity to do some great cross-departmental work. And so for the conversations that we've had I do think there's a nice segue for us to create using a public health approach prevention to the messaging campaign that Jessica and her team have been talking about for anti-hate. So not only having education around what that looks like, what we need to do as a community to stand against it, but also having a clear pathway for those resources that you've talked about. So not only kind of using

[4:19:37 PM]

the when you see something, say something model, but also the helping hand. That we do have a list of providers in our community that we can bring into this effort to make sure that we are having equitable access to mental health resources, understanding that if we can get people in to services and normalize the community seeking mental health when needed that will be key to us helping to reduce the violence and amplifying the anti-hate message. And Jessica, I don't know if you want to add anything from the campaign side of that.

>> I'm happy to. This would require a multi-departmental response. So certainly the office of violence prevention, the equity office, as well as cpio, APD, any department that is involved in helping

[4:20:37 PM]

the community first identify, the difference between a hate crime and a hate incident and then the steps to take to really secure the support resources or action needed to address the issue. And so that is what the campaign is intended to enzap cull late, that's the campaign we discussed with certainly councilmember alter's office and a few members of the community. The next step is to broaden that communication with other offices, including the quality of life commissions. And especially communities that are really the targets of those hate crimes and hate instances. So to the degree that we can make

sure that we can keep it a very clean and simple message but at the same time equip people with actions that they need to take and help others, then we can build the messaging.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you both. Any other further questions. Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: Mayor, hopefully you and I can have a chance to talk about this offline so we don't have to take

[4:21:39 PM]

everyone's time. I think there's a yes and here and I think we need to do a little work in thinking about how to do that and making sure that we have systems in place. I have a lot of concerns that we don't have a systems in place for people to actually go to when they raise these issues and so I think that is absolutely necessary and we have to build it, but I think you and I need to think about how those work together so that we can accomplish both in the right time and in their own right space without waiting even longer to get the first part of it done. I absolutely have been on board. We've been meeting biweekly with the equity office for months now and have a particular few of things. I know you've been working for years on these issues, but I think we need to think about a yes and. And I think you and I talking about it with our staff will get to a good place for us to move forward in this budget.

[4:22:40 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's I would like to be able to do that with you and I think we can reach it without holding anything out because I think it's important to move forward on this and some things we talked about was just -- there were several different places people suggested to call, ranging from 311 as well as there's a state line and a local line. But yes, I very much like to work with you on this to make sure that we could do this whole thing in a very timely way. All right. Any other questions on this? Okay. Yes. Councilmember kitchen? Microphone, sorry.

>> Kitchen: I have questions for aph. Is this the question to ask those. It's a different item that we're talking about.

>> Mayor Adler: Should we take advantage of having director Sturup with us now? Yes, this is the time. Go ahead and ask the questions.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I have some questions about

[4:23:43 PM]

the mayor pro tem's item related to response to disease outbreaks, and I think this is great. I really appreciate the mayor pro tem bringing this forward. I would just like to make sure I'm understanding

the use of the dollars. It appears to me that there are two aspects. One of them has to do with additional epidemiologist and the other one has to do with communicating -- perhaps more communicating to the public. So I wanted to ask you, director stirrup, about each one of those. So first the 350,000 if I'm looking at it directly. Can you help me understand what that would be used for and just give me the -- how you think that relates to the need? Does that make sense?

>> If I can, I want to make sure that I'm pulling up the right amendment.

>> Go ahead, take your time.

[4:24:46 PM]

>> I don't remember which rider number it is.

>> It's alter 6 and I just posted it yesterday. We were working with our staff and I think she's referring to the funding for the monkeypox response.

>> For the epidemiologist specifically?

>> There's two aspects of it. I have it on both. But the first question was there's dollars in here, about 350,000. If I'm reading it correctly it's for public health campaign or contracts with external partners. I'm just trying to understand what the thinking is for the 350,000.

>> All right. I will start and I would invite assistant director Kimberly Maddox to add the details to the funding sources because I know there are several things. I want to make sure that I'm answering each question specifically. And so if we're talking about the 350,000 for monkeypox, what we've learned from covid is that

[4:25:47 PM]

in the absence of pharmaceutical measures that our best method of keeping the community safe are the non-pharmaceutical interventions. With monkey pox, it is the avoidance of high risk behaviors. So to be able to communicate those out proactively to prevent us from getting to a space where there is mass outbreak or surge it's important to have those resources. Because we are not in a state declaration, we don't have the resources that would normally be available. So the additional dollars would help support those efforts. Kimberly, is there anything that I should be adding to that?

>> All right. Good afternoon. No, I mean, the only thing

[4:26:47 PM]

rather than the public education campaign as director Sturup talked about is the other expenses that are we are incurring for monkey pox, including contracts for vendors to assist in the vaccination process and some other expenses that we are occurring that are above our normal operations.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So would those type of expenses be reimbursable. I guess if at some point it's declared an emergency, can you back-reimburse for stuff that we're spending now.

>> Yes, ma'am. We have created the funding codes and put all the tracking systems in place should there be an opportunity for reimbursement in the future.

>> And last question on that. That opportunity would require a declaration, right, from the state or the feds or help me understand

[4:27:48 PM]

what it would require?

>> So we do have the federal declaration. We also have our local declaration. It would come from the federal level if FEMA opened up our project for reimbursement. Unfortunately those two actions don't actually trigger that type of response and so it is something that we're watching closely. We reached out to our Haggerty consultants and working with the experts at hesom on how we can prepare should that opportunity become available.

>> Kitchen: My second question relates to the epidemiologist. This is requesting four epidemiologists. And I apologize, I should know this. I know the mayor pro tem has been staying on top of it, but do we have one epidemiologist right now? How many epidemiologists do we have?

>> I believe the number is nine.

>> All right. I'm really knowing that I am

[4:28:49 PM]

not on top of that. So we have nine currently and we need four more?

>> Yes. In order to meet the recommended amount for a population of our size, keeping in mind that many of the epidemiologists that we have are grant funded. So at times that limits the flexibility of the type of work they can perform. And in addition to disease outbreaks such as monkey pox and covid, our epi team is also responsible for any foodborne illnesses. If we have west nile. They're involved with the allergy blooms. So any outbreaks at a congregate facility or nursing home it's important to really have our team staffed up appropriately would be key. It would eliminate some of the back logs that we saw with covid and some of the difficulties that we're having now in the office.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

[4:29:51 PM]

And I'm sure you wouldn't be able to hire them immediately or maybe not. What difficulties are there -- are there any challenges is a better question? Are there any challenges do you think in hiring epidemiologists. In other words, this is probably a conversation for later in terms of whether it makes sense to have a half year funding or not. So let me just ask you, do you see any difficulties if we adjusted the dollar amount to more closely match what it might take in terms of time to hire additional epidemiologists?

>> I think that would be a reasonable plan.

>> Okay. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else on Austin public health?

>> Tovo: It is a question

[4:30:52 PM]

that bridges several departments and I don't need an immediate answer now, but in looking at the answer that came back to, I think it was council member mayor pro tem alter's question about the arpa funding. It looked as if all of the money has been identified. There have been uses identified for all of that funding and I would appreciate just getting a confirmation about that. Some of the language in the actual response was a little strange so I just wanted to verify. Would it be helpful if I told you what question that was in particular? It is question 52 so again some of the answer was about -- we're spending some of it on public health, we're spending some of it, a whole lot of it on homelessness and the language -- I think the language that I wanted -- the reason I wanted to verify it is because though the narrative talks about having obligated --

[4:31:54 PM]

having -- that the remaining funds are going to be used in the coming years on the projects listed below, the language on the table itself says remaining unobligated amount. I assume the meaning there is that the amount that these particular amounts are being assigned to those projects from the currently unobligated amount. But I can't really square that language with what I think is the message here which is pretty much all of the dollars have been spoken for. So the up shot of my question is are there any arpa dollars that haven't already been spent or identified for a particular project?

>> Mayor Adler: Is Diana here? Is she still with us.

>> Tovo: It's really a question for finance because it spans all of the arpa funding. It's just a table.

>> So that table shows the

[4:32:56 PM]

amount encumbered or have been obligated through contract so the department have already either spent some of the dollars already or are in the space where the funds will be spent. But the short answer is through the framework every amount in arpa has been allocated to a department or a program and so there aren't any additional funds available through arpa funding that -- at this moment. We have to go back and look at the framework and reallocate some of the funds.

>> Tovo: And maybe after all this and we have some time maybe someone can explain an obligated amount, remaining unexpended amount I get. Remaining unobligated amount is different from the language we usually use. Again, I just can't make it square. We don't need to get down into the details. You've given me the answer I wanted. Thank you have very much, Kerri.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anything else before we go to next topic? Let's go to the next topic there.

[4:33:56 PM]

Thank you very much, team. , Director grey, director Sturup.

>> I think the next topic is housing and planning. We'll take a second to get folks moved over.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I think we have housing with us. Let's ask questions. We're going to start with councilmember harper-madison, councilmember tovo, councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I have a procedural question. How late are we going to go this afternoon into the evening for this, for our meeting today before we recess and come back tomorrow?

>> Mayor Adler: Well, my hope had been that we were actually going to be able to do this today. It's apparent that that's not going to be the case. So in those situations where we go too late on the day I think the law probably allows us to extend a meeting to the next day, something that we'll have to

[4:34:57 PM]

do.

>> Pool: So about what time?

>> Mayor Adler: So colleagues, that's a question that is in front of us. I don't know how long it would take us to get through the questions. My suggestion would be we try to do that because I think that might help people tonight in terms of framing up their lists and what they want to do, but maybe we stop with that and then start tomorrow with the threshold question of living wage issue when people have a chance to see how the pieces work.

>> Pool: I know that we're having dinner brought in. Do you think we might be able to finish our deliberations and our questions here today by 9:00 tonight?

>> Mayor Adler: Well, I think the areas that we've hit so far may be some of the tougher ones for us to do are the longer ones. But we're doing housing planning now and then we have the public safety issues, ems and APD. Animal services I don't think will be that long. The dacc I don't think will be that long.

[4:35:58 PM]

There are obviously questions in both of those. EdD, I could be wrong but I'm not sure that that is that long either. The Austin code has real important questions but again I'm not sure that it's a long period of time. So yes, my belief is we could do this if we kept going here for second, we might be able to do it before dinner. What I would suggest is it's 4:36 now. Let's see how far we get and at 5:00 let's stop and try to map out the rest of the evening.

>> Pool: Okay, thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: You're in luck, my questions were answered by staff. Thank you. I'm good to go.

>> Mayor Adler: Cool. Council member? You don't have any questions?

[4:36:59 PM]

Housing folks, we have them here. Does anybody have questions for housing or have they already been answered?

>> Tovo: Very quickly, I assumed -- with regard to the item that councilmember kitchen is bringing forward to provide staff for the area planning, I had asked a question about what capacity existed within our urban design group. Do you have -- I guess the answer is no or she wouldn't be bringing this forward, but I just wanted you to confirm that there is not existing capacity within the department including like individuals who had worked on neighborhood planning and some of the other areas. Do you have the staff -- could you take on that work without additional staff or do you need additional staff and do you need this number?

>> Hi, Rosie truelove, director of housing and planning. We did in preparation for this request look at the staffing need across the department. In order for us to really fully implement a new district planning initiative

[4:38:00 PM]

at a rate of more than may be one additional plan per year, this new team would be what staff would need. And we did structure it so that we would be able to bring on an additional two to three plans per year. All within the context and the guidelines of the district planning initiative that we are still framing out, which is why you sees that a half funding for ftes this am coulding year.

>> Tovo: Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: I guess my question is there was a council resolution that said we really want to think about doing district planning and staffed was asked to go back and ask how to do that and what we would expect and how that would happen. So this seems to be coming a little quicker than getting the report that we asked for as a council on how to approach it and how to do it.

>> Kitchen: If I could explain, the resolution that we all passed initially had language in it that asked for dollars to be put in this budget to implement and

[4:39:01 PM]

that's why it's a half year. But this is not outside of the original resolution that we passed unanimously. It's what we passed unanimously. And in working with the director here, as she just said, this was -- that's going to be her recommendations in order to implement. And it's half year. We did not put a full year because that gives them time to, you know, they'll be thinking us back the framework in the fall and be ready to implement in the spring.

>> I remember we did ask for it. Our hope was to survey a and put it as part of the budget. We hoped to get the report back on what the plan was prior to the budget.

>> Kitchen: No, we didn't. We said the timeline in that resolution we passed was September to get the framework back. We never anticipated getting the framework back before we put it in this budget. So this is following the timeline that was in that resolution.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[4:40:02 PM]

I'll take a look at that. Anybody have any other questions? Yes, councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Not a question. I just appreciate this item being brought forward and had asked to be added as a co-sponsor so I know as we're working with multiple sheets and amendments I appreciate you letting me come on as a co-sponsor.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member vela.

>> Vela: Would this be the appropriate time to ask questions for Austin public health?

>> Mayor Adler: We just had them and they left. But we can bring them back?

>> Vela: I'll hold off for now.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want them to come back for questions for you?

>> They were questions for the fayette power plant project and the design of any potential study that folks on homelessness kind of threw me off there. And they left before I got my wits about me. But honestly whatever is convenient for the dais.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll get an answer to that question.

[4:41:02 PM]

All right. Anything else for housing folks? All right. We'll let them go. Thank you so much.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Do we have both ems and APD here? Is APD here? Let's -- councilmember tovo has asked to do APD first before ems. She's going to have to be leaving here in a second. I think from a scheduling standpoint if we can do APD that would be helpful.

>> Tovo: I would really appreciate it, thank you. I will have to do some driving and it will be challenging for me to look at all these sheets. So I'm asking questions that relate to the following budget question items, 125, 137, 140 and 216. And these are primarily dealing with the asset forfeiture fund. So 125 details the amounts, the balances, just confirming my understanding about what the with balances are in those. I did have a couple of quick questions about them. It looks like in 2018 -- well, let me not go backwards. We'll go forwards on that.

[4:42:05 PM]

One -- in 216 I had asked the question -- I had asked the department to prepare a list of any items in the fy'23 budget that would be appropriate to pay for with asset forfeiture funds. And the staff came back

with a list of four items totaling \$709,000. That could qualify. Chief, I wasn't clear on the response whether you were recommending funding those through the asset forfeiture rather than the general fund as I think was proposed.

>> Good afternoon, mayor, council. Joe chukko, chief of police. I wanted to make sure, councilmember tovo, when you asked which ones we're saying -- could you repeat that real quick, please?

>> In the answer to 216, budget question 216, I had asked what would be -- what within the current budget

[4:43:07 PM]

would be eligible for asset -- for spending through the asset forfeiture? And your department returned the following items. 237,500 to reengage a third-party vendor to perform a one year follow-up audit related to APD's response to reported sexual assaults. 120,000 for the helicopter FAA inspection. 177k for maintenance contracts and 175,000 for the Joyce James groundwater analysis contract. So your department has said those would be eligible. Do you intend to fund them that way?

>> No. We did not intend to fund them. We were responding to the question about what would be eligible, but we had not planned on funding those used for forfeited funds.

>> Tovo: Could you sort of talk us through what the reasoning is there, if there are assets for the

[4:44:07 PM]

expenditures. And by my count I think -- boy, I'm just not able to add this up in my head really quickly right now. At least \$10 million in asset forfeiture funds. Can you help us understand why you're proposing to take -- to have these funded through the general fund rather than through asset forfeiture if they do fit the relatively narrow restrictions of the asset forfeiture funds.

>> So APD has been working on increasing that asset forfeiture fund for a number of years in order to be able to fund some of our longer term needs that would be more expensive and really are unbudgeted right now from the city general fund. \$1.5 million to -- we had planned on coming out of those funds as a partial

[4:45:09 PM]

payment for our new helicopter, \$2.1 million to replace an aging and really now at this point defunct the emergency demand vehicle, really equipment and other vehicles that typically are not purchased out of the general fund. We have \$125,000 for technology related to the safer sixth street initiative. \$100,000

for training. \$115,000 for the automatic license plate reader program were that to be approved by council. And then approximately \$6.5 million to increase our training capacity at the academy by building out the structures and the resources that are needed out there. Which would eat up the

[4:46:12 PM]

majority of those funds.

>> Tovo: Can you help me? I think that is in a budget response to a question I asked, but I'm forgetting at the moment what question that was.

>> 216.

>> Tovo: That is 216. So the answer to the question of why you're proposing not using asset forfeiture for these items below is because you're saving is for some other needs later, but this year -- but this budget cycle you would be spending on -- you would be using it for some of those items identified above? That wasn't clear to me in reading through it.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Tovo: So when I explored the idea of where the funding would come from the halo camera, I thought I was receiving the information that those were going to be funded through

[4:47:13 PM]

existing dollars in the fiscal year '22 budget, so I was surprised to see now they're being proposed to be funded through asset forfeiture in the upcoming budget.

>> With regard to which one? I missed that.

>> The halo cameras.

>> That is actually not part of the halo camera initiative itself. It would be an overlay over the halo camera system that would be able to bring in some private cameras to increase the numbers.

>> Tovo: I see, gotcha. Okay. I had -- a reference and I will have to find the question. I think it might have been in 137. To a quote, unquote, special fund. What is the -- can somebody help me find the question? The response in the q&a that talks about the helicopter, not the one that you just mentioned in 216.

[4:48:13 PM]

There was an answer that talked about that some piece of the helicopter funding was coming from here, some piece was coming from here and some piece was coming from somewhere else. What budget question --

>> So council member, I have semi assistant director Michelle Schmidt that is virtual that -- I am familiar with the funding you're talking about and I would like for her to go ahead and come on, and she's on and be able to explain a little bit further.

>> Tovo: Sure. If you could also point us to that budget question that would be really helpful.

>> I'll see if I can locate that.

>> Good afternoon, mayor and council members. I believe that council budget question might be cbq number 108 possibly. The funding source that that's referring to is a fund that's cash that an APD officer comes into possession of which is deposited into evidence and then processed under the guidelines of the code of criminal procedures chapter

[4:49:13 PM]

18. Under that statute, once the evidence division follows the certain criteria in the statute, the cash is deposited into the trust and agency fund. It's then considered abandoned or unclaimed property under that statute. And that's the fund that's referring to.

>> Tovo: Thank you. So it is budget question 108 and just for my colleagues' reference there's a line talking about the proposed budget includes an APD helicopter, which will be debt funded for 1.5, matched by APD asset forfeiture for 1.5, and from a special revenue fund for 1 million. So I didn't -- is this special revenue fund identified within the different funds in our budget? Because I don't recall seeing any information about this special revenue fund in our budget documents but I sure may be missing it.

>> I believe it's classified as a trust in agency fund under an other funds category for budget purposes.

>> Tovo: Could someone point us to where that exists in our budget book,

[4:50:15 PM]

please. And what is the existing balance of that special fund.

>> I believe the approximate balance in that is 1.6 million and for this purpose we were proposing to use one million.

>> Tovo: So I think that -- I guess that kind of closes out my questions, but how much remaining, chief, will you have in the asset forfeiture funds? It seems like you will still have quite a bit remaining after the

contemplated purchases of the helicopter -- well, maybe not. Do you have a sense of what the balance will be on those funds?

>> I apologize. The balance that we were anticipating was going to be approximately \$200,000 to be held in reserve in case some of these funds that were going to be -- those estimates actually came in higher than what we're estimating right now to help offset that. It's approximately 200,000.

>> Tovo: And that's across

[4:51:18 PM]

all fourish of those funds?

>> That's correct.

>> Tovo: All right, thank you so much. Mayor, thanks for letting me ask those questions. That was challenging.

>> Mayor Adler: No problem. Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I just have a couple of questions related to license plate reader programs since we have the chief here. It was my intention to postpone that item, but if I could just ask real quickly.

>> Mayor Adler: If you could do it fast so he could get out by five.

>> Kelly: I guess the biggest question I have is in regards to the data retention program that we have currently. I have resolution that 30 days would be sufficient. One of our colleagues has put forward an amendment to limit that to three minutes. Can you explain if that would be enough time why or why not? And what are the limitations regarding what a short timeline that might be?

>> Thank you, council member. Three minutes is an insufficient amount of time to be able to store that data. I realize that maybe there are other jurisdictions in

[4:52:20 PM]

other states that maybe do it for that period of time, but that does not necessarily make it a best practice. It would severely limit our ability to use that type of data for more serious types of crimes because -- many times when that data is captured APD is not aware that a crime -- is not yet aware that a crime has been committed. And therefore would not know to key in on that data and be able to save that data within a three-minute time period. The purpose of the 30 minutes -- excuse me, the 30 days is really to make sure that we have some historical data to be able to go back and see if we have a crime that is committed with the vehicles that are in any particular given area and use that as an investigative lead. So it would be very, very limiting.

>> Kelly: Thank you. One final thought here that

[4:53:20 PM]

actually applies to someone who lives in my district. Their vehicle was stolen a day or two ago and they let me know it took about three and a half hours before officers could get there. Would a three minute amount of time for data retention allow for officers to possibly find that vehicle in a timely manner and solve that crime?

>> No, it would not.

>> Kelly: Okay. Thank you very much. That's all I have.

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

>> Tovo: My apologies. I did have another question about vacancies. 137 talks about vacancies that -- well, stepping back to the forfeiture fund, there's some years, and maybe we'll need to go back and answer this later, but there were some years like 2018 where services other and services other were -- well, in both categories, both the federal forfeitures and dot and the federal forfeitures doj, they were pretty large expenditures of 400 and \$900,000 that were

[4:54:20 PM]

services others and I wonder fire department that was overtime. We don't need to answer that now, but I'm just curious about it. In budget question 137 that talks about overtime expenses for fiscal year 2021 to 2022, it refers to the sworn overtime expenditures as being 18 millionish, and the sworn overtime budget was -- then budget question 140 talks about -- so it was 18 million. As I understand it, 18 million in sworn overtime, the vacancy savings were 34 million and so here's where I -- here's where the language sort of led me to ask the question before about vacancy. And this may be a question for Mr. Van eenoo and Kerri. The language at the end of question 140 says the excess vacancy savings of 26.5 million is being allocated to terminal pay,

[4:55:23 PM]

overtime expenditures and employee retention. So just to kind of recap there's vacancy savings of 34 million instead of what had been budgeted at 7.9. Some of that probably went toward the overtime expenses of 18 million, but that last line sounds like some of that vacancy savings is going into this year's budget to be put aside for overtime expenditures in the next year. Is that how I should read that?

Because I know we talked earlier, vacancy savings don't roll over. So they're not rolling, but in essence these are rolling over to be applied to fiscal year '23.

>> I think I need to look at that question. I'm not fume with that one. The only funds that will roll over from one budget to the next is if they're lawfully encumbered into a contract that we're already into and we encumber the funds for payment next year. But personnel costs should

[4:56:24 PM]

not roll over from one year to the next.

>> Tovo: The juxtaposition of questions 137 and 140 and I may just be --

>> It may be worded confusingly. So let's get to the bottom of it T.

>> Tovo: Thank you very much. Thank you, chief.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Thank you. Good afternoon, chief. I wanted to just confirm you said that the expenses that were listed in budget question 216 as possible forfeiture were not being funded through forfeiture funds? So that was the money to reengage a third-party vendor to do the -- APD's response audit, the helicopter inspection, the software maintenance and the James Joyce, those are in your budget, but they're not being covered for forfeitures.

>> That's correct. We had not planned on spending the forfeiture funds on those particular ones.

>> Alter: Okay.

[4:57:24 PM]

And then this is something I've been thinking about, but haven't acted on yet. Seeing the importance of the work that we initiated last year for the 911 operators and for victim services with respect to the market studies, I wanted to ask if -- my guess is that \$20 an hour is not going to help a huge amount for your crime analysts or your data scientists. Can you tell me a little bit about what you're experiencing with respect to vacancies in those departments and whether market studies for those areas would be useful?

>> Well, I think that I would want to talk with the manager, if we're making a recommendation about whether a market study would be -- would be good or not. But I can tell you that both those areas we are experiencing vacancies like we are in other parts of the department. And many times upon exit

[4:58:25 PM]

surveys and asking why, it is compensation is one of the reasons and probably right now I would say the leading reason for many of our departures, but I don't have the numbers right now to be able to tell you percentagewise on those two areas what we're carrying right now.

>> Alter: Okay. So what I think I'll do is I'll sort of table that for budget season and maybe we could bring that forward as an ifc if you want to -- if you could have your staff pull together some information and we could have a conversation about whether that would be a useful next step. I think that we are making progress, you know, for our victim services and for our 911 operators. It takes time. We're being mindful of that time but I want to initiate that sooner rather than later if we need to do that. I know that our hr has a lot on their plate so I also would want to get in their queue for that. So if we could have that conversation, that would be great.

>> Yes, ma'am.

[4:59:25 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Chief, we're trying to get as many of our police officers as we can out of the field and -- out in the field and unfunded but unfilled positions. And you have asked us to help assist you in increasing the number of officers that are doing I have two questions associated with that. The first one is I filed a rider after talking about civilianizing six positions in the real time crime center, which would free up then six sworn officers, increasing our number of patrol officers by that same six. Something I understand you can find within your budget. My understanding is that does not increase the APD budget. It doesn't run into a legislative-type question.

[5:00:27 PM]

Is really just furthers the reimagining public safety goal of trying to look at functions and seeing which can be civilianized and out. You understand anything about that rider?

>> Thank you, mayor. We would support that recommendation and that rider. Because that does free up six sworn positions to return to the field and we know that we are going to have to put three of those positions out at the airport. So it is based on the analysis that's been provided to me by our budget officer cost neutral recommendation. In that we would be able to offset that with the vacancy savings and so we would support that recommendation.

>> Mayor Adler: The last question I have relates to the cadet classes and maybe coming back to you. I think I saw you filed a rider

[5:01:31 PM]

or something. Trying to make sure that we do cadet classes so that we can fill the funded but unfilled positions. But wanting to make sure that we do it in a way that's consistent with all the work that you've done and your staff has done and the faculty has done and the community has done to improve the curriculum and how it's taught. There was going to be something passed unanimously by council saying that at the point which you're going to come back and expand these classes, do more classes, come back with a proposal for the council to be able to within your budget do the -- continue its third-party independent involvement in those classes to make sure we're still progressing, doing the things we want to do in a way to come back to report to council and to you and to the community. Do you need anything -- I

[5:02:31 PM]

understand that that's underway. I understand there's a scope that's been prepared that's now being vetted. It's vetted with some of the community groups and at some point it comes back to the manager not as part of this budget but relatively soon, like in September. Is there anything else you need from us in order to move forward with cadet classes?

>> No. I would say that from a funding or budget perspective, we have what we need in order to increase our capacity. There is a plan in place to increase the number of classes and we're hoping that our recruiting efforts will be able to fill those classes to the greatest capacity possible to increase the numbers per year. But again, these are to fill vacant positions that are already funded and, therefore, would be -- would not incur an additional cost to the city.

[5:03:32 PM]

With regard to the audit, I'm familiar with it and certainly we've been working with that particular vendor and would welcome the audit.

>> Mayor Adler: Did you want to say anything about --

>> The reason I brought this forward is because we are all aware during a regular cadet academy, there is attrition that occurs. And there were eight officers, I believe, that are in the transitional officer academy now. Started halfway through an already existing academy and so my thought behind this is the same as it was last year. The funds are available, we can backfill some of those positions that we lost through the normal course of the academy and get officers on the streets faster.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Again, if the funding is available.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mayor pro tem. Councilmember Fuentes

>> Fuentes: You mentioned a rider you were bringing forward. Where can we find that?

[5:04:33 PM]

>> It's Adler amendment 6. Because it requires a budget amendment to have happen. But it's a zero cost. It creates six ftes, I think.

>> Fuentes: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: If it hasn't already been distributed, it's about to be.

>> Fuentes: Okay. My question for the chief, you mentioned you're planning on putting three police officers at the airport. Can you share a little bit more about that.

>> That is in the budget. To be able to place those officers at the airport with the airport expansion, there's an additional need. Those positions are actually funded by the airport and come back to APD, so we have to fill them. And that's why I'm making the reference that, you know, I still have a finite amount of officers that are actually at work which I would have to move them from patrol or different area if I don't move them from the real-time crime center.

[5:05:33 PM]

In any event, we're going to have to fill those positions and so it would be good to have some positions that were civilianized and transition those officers to another role.

>> Fuentes: That makes total sense. Will our police -- will be funded by the airport and I have an amendment that seeks to have ems also funded by the airport. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else?

>> I just wanted to say that I asked -- [indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Okay. Chief, thank you very much.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's move to ems. Or -- vela had his question -- we have agent stirrup back on the line

>> Mayor Adler: Director stirrup, are you with us?

[5:06:36 PM]

Good to see you again. Councilmember vela.

>> Vela: Thank you for joining us again. We are looking at the possibility of funding a study of the potential contamination at the fayette powerpoint and I was wondering if you had any thoughts on the outlines of what a study for environmental pollutants in the groundwater would kind ever look like? Any thoughts about kind of its framework, you know, the -- what we would want to do if we wanted to get better data about the situation with the groundwater in fayette county?

>> Good morning or good afternoon again. Thanks for the opportunity. I'm going to start and then I'm

[5:07:37 PM]

going to let my expert epidemiologist follow-up. We have had several conversations with your office as well as the team at Austin energy to try to get an initial assessment of the situation and where we are now is that we believe we have enough information to guide a proposal process that might be more exploratory. So to pinpoint the problem we're trying to assess. Because from what I understand, there's just not enough data to say what the problem is without, in the absence of disease outbreak, wouldn't know what we were looking for. And with that, I'll pass it over to Janet Pichette who can add more of the detail behind that thought.

>> Good afternoon. Yes. We have been working with Austin

[5:08:37 PM]

energy. We have also been working with some of my colleagues with the state health department and also the state commission on environmental quality. Just inquiring about this particular situation. But -- so some of the things that we have done thus far is we have evaluated or done a quick review of some of the lcra data that -- lcra is required to do for regulatory purposes, as far as collecting information on groundwater and other types of emissions at that particular plant. One of the things that would probably need to be required we were going to propose additional monitoring. The proposal would have to have a pretty detailed scope of work and detailed plan as far as what

[5:09:37 PM]

their justification is for any off property impacts. Based on some cursory data that I've looked at, I haven't seen exceed -- of metal. There's been a few historically but not anything of late related to releases from that facility that I could tell. But there would need to be some justification for what locations they would sample, what constituents they were concerned with. Because I have also looked at another proposal that was presented that includes a lot of chemical contaminants that I don't think may be appropriate for what they're trying to capture. But they do need to talk in more detail about some analysis and just what their proposed assessment methodology would be.

[5:10:40 PM]

Those are some of the initial cursory things that would be required of the study if one was to be done.

>> Vela: Thank you. I posted some of the background material that we're working on, on the message board. Some of the information that we've compiled. Some of it -- some reports from the environmental integrity project and environment Texas looking at some of the past studies and the past concerns. And my -- you know, my concern is kind of like a lack of data. I don't think that we have the detailed information that we would need to really identify what the extent of any contamination would be. And, again, so tough with such a small population, too. Again, from that --

>> Exactly.

>> Vela: The data sample size, you know, it's hard to tell. Even if there are a handful of

[5:11:41 PM]

cases, it's hard to tell I think from epidemiological point of view that that's a valid information. Any sense of what the cost of a good groundwater study would be?

>> Right now, it would be hard for me to predict what -- I would think it would be somewhat costly. You know, but it will depend on how many sampling points they have and the scope of the analytics that they're going to do. You know, if they -- if they're doing extensive groundwater monitoring outside of the plant to determine property impacts to the community at large, that could be a lot more costly. But they may have to do some hydrogeological studies to make

[5:12:41 PM]

sure they're collecting an appropriate place. Because contaminants and water tend to move -- to the lowest point. So you want to make sure that you're also sampling in the right location. I think there's a lot of those types of factors that play into the cost of it.

>> Vela: Yes.

>> It's really hard for me to predict. I don't have that background as far as pricing what that would look like.

>> Vela: I appreciate that. I know that there are some kind of information that has to be separated. There are other -- I believe there's some oil drilling in and around the area and also some naturally

occurring chemicals that are present. So I would have to be -- it would have to be kind of an accurate sample and survey. In general, Coe lash storage has

[5:13:44 PM]

been problematic. Just to the broader point, it is our facility. It has provided us with inexpensive electricity for decades. And I do feel an obligation to make sure that those closest to the plant are not being negatively impacted by it. Just to my colleagues, I'd really like to get a sense of the scope of what we need to do at this point. I just -- I'm not sure how much it would cost. I'm not sure what the scope would need to be and I would really like as kind of step one to have Austin public health potentially in combination with the water department and watershed, I know there was some conversations to basically what would a study look like and the other important factor, how much would it cost.

>> Thank you mayor, councilmember. It sounds like an item from council not related to the

[5:14:44 PM]

budget since we don't know what the budget would be. Perhaps we can come back later and do this study.

>> Vela: Possibly. But it could also be a rider with an item to develop the rfp and then we can take it from there.

>> Our suggestion would certainly be since it's not related to a budget item now, it would come back later. I understand your concern.

>> Mayor Adler: Maybe we can do it in the rider and find out if it relates to the budget. Let's work on that.

>> Vela: Look forward to having that conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? So I think direction -- any further questions for director stirrup on this? Councilmember tovo?

>> I see Mr. Riley. He's the attorney. Could we just get a sense of what legal authorities or jurisdictions would be in play here

>> Mayor Adler: Do we want to have this conversation with an attorney on the dais?

>> Well, good afternoon

[5:15:46 PM]

councilmembers. I'm Stewart Riley. I'm actually not in the law department now. I'm currently serving as Austin energy's deputy general manager and chief operating officer. I'm happy to answer any questions about what's currently going on in terms of groundwater analysis.

>> Mayor Adler: She's suggesting we pull this back.

>> Mr. Riley, we'll see you in executive session.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else while we're here had with stirrup on this question?

>> Thank you. I did talk to Ms. Thomas about getting an executes tiff session on this item. I too have legal questions which would be good to hear out. If memory serves me correctly, the council previously provided direction to Austin energy and aph to do something similar on this. Director stirrup, could you let us know if that's still in process and kind of where we're at in regards to that direction?

[5:16:46 PM]

>> So as my colleague mentioned, we did have the conversations with Austin energy. They provided the information or the data that they had from the advocates. She did have the conversations with her colleagues at tcq and trying to figure out. But because this will be a multijurisdictional type response that, as she said, could be very costly, that's kind of where we are. At the crux of it, because there is no - Janet, help me out with this. Because there is no disease outbreak for us to trace back to, it's kind of where do we begin? So that goes to can councilmember vela's point about doing some additional work to figure out what the scope of a project could be. We're not there yet.

>> I guess from what you said, there would need to be some sort of documented exposure typically in a case like this before there was testing that was done?

[5:17:48 PM]

Is that correct?

>> I think -- this is Janet again. So typically in these types of situations, usually there's a documented off-property exposure somewhere and someone is making an allegation of adverse health effects. I always like to remind people, if there's not a completed exposure pathway with and we haven't done the research -- we haven't had the opportunity to evaluate that at this point, you can't really have disease without having an exposure. So if there's not a documented exposure -- if you did look at health, there's no way you could pinpoint it back to that facility if that makes sense.

>> Yes.

>> It could be attributed to a number of different other factors. It could be due to access to health care. It could be a whole number of things. What we like to do is to make sure that if there are concerns and there are allegations of

[5:18:48 PM]

exposure that, you know, we do what we need to do to recommend that environmental monitoring plan or proposal, make sure that it's covering those constituents that are truly -- what would cause an issue, especially if it's a contaminant off property. And part of that assessment is -- and justification is to determine whether or not there is a completed exposure pathway so that somebody has exposure to something and that there's the potential for exposure to disease as well. So all of that needs to happen and be part of this detailed monitoring plan that needs to be submitted. Based on my experience.

>> Thank you very much for explaining that. I think it helps the community at large more of what a process typically looks like versus what we're doing now. Thank you very much.

[5:19:48 PM]

>> You're welcome.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anything else for director stirrup or -- Mr. Riley? Thank you all very much. We'll try again to let you go. Thank you, Dr. Pichette. Then the -- I guess we're taking an -- chief? Anybody have any questions for the chief? Ems? Yes mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Can you just clarify what the simulation equipment and training would allow ems to do? The goal of that?

>> Sure. So when we look at what some of the biggest issues we're having in ems, obviously, it's the need to improve our staffing, there's really two significant buckets of vacancies.

[5:20:49 PM]

We have 151 vacancies at this time. Of those, they're at the medic level, which is the entry level position that we push through the academy to start. But 76 of those are at the clinical specialist role, which are the paramedics. At our current structure, that's a promotion. An emt to a paramedic. There are discussions around potential, negotiations about bringing them in directly from the outside. Regardless of how they join our department, they have to go through a process in order to be cleared. The paramedics are a much higher level of training. They are much more sophisticated. They're very familiar with the advanced practice work we're doing, the chief medical officer has done things to raise the care.

As we look at how we're going to fill those vacancies, one part of that is through the recruiting piece, which we've discussed in the past, which is bringing folks into the academy. The second piece is how do we make this clinical specialist? With the bulk of the vacancies

[5:21:50 PM]

at the clinical specialist level, we need to look at training and expediting that through put of individuals that are going to transition from the medic level to the clinical specialist. One of the challenges that we have in making that transition is that as part of being an advanced clinician, you need to have exposure to all sorts of different emergencies and different situations that you might be put in that might not happen on a regular basis. P our training takes a significant amount of time as we put folks on busy ambulances and try to get them to see the experiences firsthand in person. What we'd like to do or what the purpose of simulation is, is to look at how can we use high fidelity simulation, which is mannequins, equipment that we can use to provide them with that experience without having to be in the ambulance. And with today's state-of-the-art equipment that we have, we have mannequins that can breathe, that can sweat, that can talk, have blood pressure. We can simulate any type of emergency with the right type of

[5:22:51 PM]

equipment. By building a simulation lab like proposed in the amendment here, we would have the ability to expedite that process in order to fill that gap more quickly on the vacancies at the clinical specialist level, which is our highest number of vacancies.

>> Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that. I'm glad to be on an amendment related to that. Can you also speak to whole blood and how that pilot expansion would benefit Austin and how it relates to what's going on as the standard of Care across Texas and the country?

>> Yes. This was alluded to earlier in the session. The whole blood project is a pilot that we started in Austin last year to be able to bring whole blood and put them on resources in the field. At this time it's limited to just a few units. But it's already proven to be successful. We've administered whole blood 32 times over the course of this pilot period.

[5:23:52 PM]

Of those 24 have had extremely successful results from a clinical standpoint, as recently as yesterday, I believe. We administered whole blood to a person who experienced some significant trauma. So as we look towards how it is that we're going to improve the overall standard of care in Austin, it really is the next step. It's really continuing to be on the cutting-edge but also being on the cutting-edge with other

organizations. There's several other entities within Texas, San Antonio is known for their whole blood program, Williamson county has a whole blood program. What this would do is allow us to expand to more units so it's more distributed equally across the county.

>> Thank you. A third amendment that I -- councilmember Fuentes' with respect to the airport. We heard earlier from the APD chief because they would have the three officers at the airport, had to reduce staff elsewhere, can you explain how that is not the case, if we were

[5:24:53 PM]

to put these three positions during the peak hours at the airport?

>> Sure. If we were to be allocated positions for the airport, we would have to identify different ways that we would work through that from a recruiting standpoint and retention standpoint. What we anticipate is using it as a relief valve for individuals on ambulances that could work somewhere where it's not as busy to -- we would be utilizing overtime for those individuals and also, I guess, realistically, that would be the bulk of it. Would be using it as a relief valve for existing staff and funding some of the overtime to begin with and tensionally using it as a recruiting tool over the years.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: With respect to some of the ems issues, chief, have you talked -- one of them involves -- all sound great and important. One of them is to -- is to build out a facility that's necessary

[5:25:54 PM]

for training?

>> Yes. So the amendment that we that was proposed would be primarily for the actual equipment that would be required. So those would be the mannequins and the upkeep and the setup that would require a little bit of construction in the existing training facilities to set up the simulations, if you will, the installation of cameras, two-way mirrors and things like that. It is not envisioned at this time as part of a broader move towards a larger training center which has been envisioned citywide through the city manager's office. Certainly if there was a movement towards that or a movement towards a centralized public safety headquarters, we would relocate that. This equipment is primarily, although large and somewhat fixed, it is transportable. So we could relocate it relatively easily if we were to change locations or facilities

>> Mayor Adler: Just wanted to make sure of that. Then, Ms. -- The role as manager here, on the airport issue, I'm

[5:26:55 PM]

not sure that the airport froex in the same place that ems is with respect to that. What I would really like is if you talk to each other, have that at the ready and then to get some recommendation from you on that issue.

>> Sure, mayor. I think that our airport folks are actually on the line virtually and can address the issue about ems at the airport. I think Tracy Thompson is available.

>> I am here. May I answer any questions or would you like for me to make a statement?

>> I think the question is whether or not that is something you all have an opportunity to talk about and necessary?

>> Thank you. Hello mayor and council. I am Tracy Thompson, the chief administrative officer for the department of aviation at the airport. And I want to thank councilmember Fuentes for bringing this issue to our attention and connecting us with both fire department and ems to

[5:27:55 PM]

discuss our passenger safety at the airport. So as I understand the amendment is that we have 90 days to continue to trade data and come up with a location and operating and staffing plan and report back to council on that. We would look forward to continuing those conversations. P

>> Mayor Adler: I think it was beyond that a little bit. It creates fte positions and it places them out at the airport.

>> That's right. It allocates funding and it's critical that we allocate this funding at this time because the airport will need to engage with the airlines on the funding. And so the way -- the originally, I brought it for a direct allocation. In conversations, in recognizing and compromising with the airport staff knowing they would like a little bit more time to get comfortable with this idea. This is proposed as a pilot project for one year. I will say this funding is

[5:28:59 PM]

necessary and after hearing from chief Chacon, I think it makes a lot of sense, if our airlines are funding police and fire, that it would also make sense for them to fund paramedics. So at this point, it's proposed as a one-time allocation pilot program that allows airport and ems to work together on the staffing and figure out a model that works for everyone.

>> Mayor Adler: Does the funding as proposed for the budget, come from the airport and the airlines or does it come from gr?

>> Comes from aviation enterprise.

>> Mayor Adler: Aviation enterprise. So it doesn't have a gr impact?

>> That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: Are we okay with that?

>> We understand that's what's proposed. We do understand we want to come up with a solution. We support the rider. But I think there is more discussion that needs to happen as to exactly what it looks like, the space, making sure we

[5:29:59 PM]

accommodate terminal passengers as was mentioned earlier today. I think we had initial conversations. We'd like to continue the conversation and bring the report back. So we understand about the funding, the ftes and the impact to the aviation budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Sound likes everybody supports it so I support it, too. All right. Does anybody have any --

>> Mayor I have -- this is -- I have a quick question regarding simulation for ems.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> I'm wondering, have you explored any opportunities to partner with anyone else in the city? I guess what prompts my question is just being over there and seeing some of the equipment that they're using to educate their students in the medical profession. I'm wondering if there are any opportunities to partner with ACC or share this equipment or just -- either to share our equipment or to share with any

[5:31:00 PM]

other entities in the area that may have this equipment?

>> Yes. I believe that there are certainly opportunities for synergy amongst the other partners here. As we grow and if the program moves forward, our goal would be to be a local hub for other agencies or other entities that might not have the same resources around simulation and to be able to assist them based on our availability. I think right now it's in the same position that ACC and others are in. There is a shortage of available space, if you will, or time for simulation in general and the amount that we require in order to adequately get our staff to where they need to be would be challenging for us out of the gate to be able to share those resources. But over time, I do believe we can move towards that.

>> Tovo: That's helpful. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Councilmember -- mayor pro tem.

>> One of the things I really like about the mannequins and the technology I brought forward in this is the ability for all

[5:32:02 PM]

the public safety agencies to use it. That is a value add. I went out and did one of the scenarios through the active attack shooter training where it's multiagency response. It came out of councilmember Tovo's resolution that we passed here and so I think that's great. What I'd like to ask is something that some of my colleagues alluded to earlier. When we were talking with Selena. The scope of the whole blood program, if we were to perhaps cut that in half, would we still be able to make reasonable goals and help people in the community in that same way and maybe scale it up next year?

>> Yes, I do believe we could scale the whole blood program, particularly on the one-time costs. We've costed out that one-time cost. We wanted to build in a significant number of redundancies. This is the equipment and the coolers we're utilizing are sensitive, they're expensive. The heat -- given the heat in Austin, the need to be able to

[5:33:02 PM]

do that, we had put in some additional costs in there that perhaps we could defer on the recurring side, I think we wouldn't necessarily be able to cut it in half. If we wanted to flush it out, we could reduce it slightly. I could work with your office. Our goal would be that if we reduced it and we slowed the roll-out and tried to get it on as many vehicles as possible, even without the backup and redundancy and had to have flexibility there.

>> I think it would be really great if you could work with my office. I could come back tomorrow perhaps with an amended proposal in case that's a way we wanted to go to offer to my colleagues. There's so much value in administering that whole blood in the field. It's life-saving. So I would hate to not have the program but with our limited availability to extend funds this year, maybe phasing it out over the next couple of years is a better approach to that. Thank you very much.

>> Yes. If I could just speak to your other point you brought up around the simulation training and working with other entities. It's a point I failed to mention

[5:34:05 PM]

earlier when we were talking through this. These types of equipment, it's also supplemented in the way we've worked through this with immersion training. The ability to create a scenario where you feel like you're in the environment. Through audio visually and others. It's been proven successful elsewhere in

doing it through disciplinary training. It's a great approach for us to do whether it's the rescue task training, which ties back to the whole blood program or AFD to feel like you're in that environment and invest in not just mannequins around medical care, but also how can we work with our SWAT team and others to simulate what might happen in certain situations.

>> I would add also, mannequins and technology has come a long way since I was a senior in high school in 2005 in my EMT class. I really believe these would be great for all of public safety. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. With us right now, about \$7 million over what we had to

[5:35:06 PM]

spend, you're offering to take a look at whether there's a phase in for that is greatly appreciated as well. I think Mayor Pro Tem was next.

>> Alter: Thank you. I had a question about -- this may be for the airport or for EMS. We send an entire ambulance over to the airport right now. Who is paying for that? Like, who pays for the trips?

>> So that's somewhat of a complicated question. The costs are coming out of the general fund for that response. And as you're aware, we do not recoup all of our expenses even if we transport. If we don't transport, then it is simply coming out of the general fund. That represents about 65% of our trips to the airport.

>> Alter: So maybe we can look at assessing a fee to the airlines for those services if we're not going to be having the services on site and paid for. So as you're doing this process,

[5:36:09 PM]

perhaps we can add that into the discussion. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Had councilmember

>> Pool: Pool I was just curious in these training techniques and the equipment and stuff. Is this something we could do a cost share with Travis County?

>> I certainly would be willing to look into that. I'm not really prepared to answer that.

>> Pool: I'm thinking that we wouldn't be the only law enforcement entities that would use the equipment. Right? And so what might it look like if we could partner on the cost.

>> Thank you.

>> Pool: Somebody could answer that later.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anything else for EMS? Chief, thank you very much for being with us.

>> Thank you very much for your time.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else for aviation while we have aviation people go? All right. Aviation can go as well. Who is next?

[5:37:13 PM]

Animal services. Is that who is next? Does anyone have questions for animal services? Councilmember Kelly

>> Kelly: I'll just say that I had took the feedback from my co-sponsors on this item and, because the efficiency audit is now tied into it and also we put in a place at the end of 2023 which ever comes first, I was able to cut this -- the cost of this item in half. So there was some savings there if y'all haven't seen the updated amendment. I'll just say that. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor, I do have a quick question.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the right number for the animal -- this is the animal behavior specialist.

>> Kelly amendment 1.

>> Mayor Adler: Is the 71882

[5:38:15 PM]

the correct number now.

>> Yes, it is.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo, did you have a question?

>> Tovo: Yes, I do. Thank you, mayor. I did submit some questions into the Q and a. I want to be clear. I sent those last night. I apologize for taking so long. I understand those likely won't be -- you won't have full responses to all of those before we conclude the budget process. I think it's important information as we move forward. Some of it does relate to the budget direction. Just one very quick question. Proposed additional ftes in this budget. Can you help us understand what the -- what you hope to be able to achieve or what gaps you hope to close with those specific ftes? And in particular, I was interested in knowing whether or not those additional ftes would allow you to reopen the center on Sundays as I think you've heard from lots of members of the community would be a real goal to try to make sure our animal center is open again on that second weekend day.

[5:39:22 PM]

>> I think director bland is on the line virtually. Can you hear us director bland? We can't hear you. As we're working on that, councilmember harper-madison, did you have a question for animal services?

>> Harper-madison: I don't know that the question was for animal services so much as it was about this position and some of the implications of it. After hearing councilmember Kelly say that the cost was changed, that changes the nature of my question. So no, thank you.

>> I do some about the position since I put it together if you have specific positions about what it's supposed to be as far as the goal and intention.

>> I don't, necessarily. I'll lay it out super quick. I don't think they're related. Ultimately, we get a lot of -- a lot of back and forth about

[5:40:23 PM]

concerns at the shelter. So ultimately, I was just trying to figure out what adjacent to this additional position could get us to a place where it doesn't feel like our shelter has become untenable. So that -- it's neither here nor there as it pertains to the budget. Thank you. I appreciate it, though.

>> I would just add, several colleagues have worked very hard in order to try to get those concerns addressed. They might be helpful to reach out to. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Mayor, I'll say, I did submit a similar question about the ftes in the Q and a. That's probably -- if the staff could just get us an answer to that question and then we may not have to have this conversation here on the dais if director bland is unable to talk. We can just move on if that works for everybody else and hope to get that question about the specific ftes through the Q and a.

>> Mayor Adler: Works for me. Councilmember kitchen --

[5:41:24 PM]

>> Kitchen: Prematurely raised my hand. I have a question. It may be for councilmember tovo, it may be for aph. I need to ask a question first. It relates to the social service contract. When you're ready, I'll go back to that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We're going to need service contracts -- I think that will probably be director stirrup potentially or --

>> Yes. I think we were ready to move over to the dacc.

>> Mayor Adler: Now the dacc first.

>> Then we can go back to them.

>> Are you able to hear us?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we hear you now.

>> For some reason it's not working visually. But you can hear us. Don bland, animal services and Jason - is also here. To answer councilmember tovo's question. The positions that were in the city manager's budget would allow us to open back up on

[5:42:24 PM]

Sundays. I think that was her question. Yes, we would be able to if we receive those positions.

>> Director bland, that's great to hear. I think that's a high priority. I hope they'll be able to come on quickly. Thank you for that information and look forward to getting the rest of the information through the Q and a. I'm not sure if you heard this part. If it's not, before we finish the etdg, I think it's relevant information and informs kind of what we do next.

>> We will did this morning submit answers to all your questions that you asked last night.

>> Tovo: My goodness, thank you so much. That was a quick turn around time. Thank you again

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go to the downtown Austin community court. Does anybody have any questions for da C. C?

-- Dacc?

>> If no one else does, I do.

[5:43:25 PM]

>> Tovo: Two questions. Mr. Valdez, assistant director Valdez, there were a couple things I hoped you could address. One is if you could very quickly explain what's happened with the homeless well necessary center funding with the daa pulling back on their contribution to this program. I know I and others -- I'll speak for myself. I had concerns about whether we'd be able to continue to provide this really necessary resource to our individuals who are experiencing homelessness who are in need of mental health resources and have requested and are on the wait list for those. That's the first question. Then the second is I did hand out -- I think councilmember kitchen was about to ask the question about this. I did hand out an amended version of the social service living wage item and added the downtown Austin community court which have been inadvertently pulled off. If you could just help explain

[5:44:26 PM]

why the dacc should be included within that if the council is in a position to be able to raise the minimum wage through our social service contract. My colleagues may not be aware but our social service contracts are not subject to our living wage requirement and so as we think about wages and the importance of making sure that those who are doing the hard work of really working with members of our community who are struggling, we want to make sure that those -- those at those agencies are not in a position where they're struggling financially as well. You know, if we are able to come up with the funds to make that wage adjustment for our social services, I want to be able to do so. Two questions. Homeless wellness center and the inclusion of the dacc on the social service contract living wage item. If you could address both of those, please.

>> Thank you councilmember tovo and hello council and mayor. To the first question about the homeless health and wellness

[5:45:27 PM]

center program, our understanding is that the daa, the downtown Austin alliance had only intended to pilot the program and support it through the pilot years and then phase out their portion of the funding. And so this year they decreased funding to \$80,000 and then informed integral care and us that they would be -- that this year would be the last year that they would be funding it. To the question about the social service contracts --

>> Before you move on, could I just ask about that for just a minute.

>> Sure.

>> Tovo: This is the first year. They contributed one year of funding and then they reduced it substantially for the upcoming year and their intent is not to fund it at all next year, is that what --

>> Yes, that is correct.

>> Tovo: So I'd asked you the

[5:46:28 PM]

question whether we'd be able to operate the homeless wellness services and you explained to my staff that you are going to redirect some money that would otherwise have gone toward an upcoming solicitation to help fund this gap that we now have, is that correct and could you provide a few details about that?

>> Yes, that is correct. We do have an item coming to council on September 1st, I believe. I'll ask Robert to give you the details of that item. Robert?

>> Sure. Robert gingham here with the downtown Austin community court. We were planning to conduct a competitive solicitation for services here at the community court to support the individuals that are being served for homeless services unit. When we were notified of the decrease in funding for the homeless health and wellness center with the daa, we decided

[5:47:28 PM]

this health and wellness program is a critical component and individuals who are currently being served would no longer be receiving that service if the funding went away. So we decided to redirect funding from the solicitation to directly fund -- to make up the difference in the funding from the loss of the daa funding as well as to provide some ongoing funding to provide some sustainability for that program, both for the clients being served through that program and the staff who are working or employed by integral care supporting that work to create sustainability there and so we are like Pete mentioned, bringing an rca to council for consideration for \$1.3 million specific for this program. Again, that was redirected from

[5:48:28 PM]

a solicitation that was intended for support services and transitional housing or bridge shelter operation for the clients here served through the community court.

>> Tovo: Thank you very much. I wish we could do both. I think that would have been ideal. I understand the choice that you made. And it makes sense to me to continue that health and wellness. So I appreciate your ability to pivot on that. And if we can continue to look for ways to meet both of those important -- the needs for both of those important programs.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else?

>> I'm sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> To the question about the cost of living increase to the social service contracts, it is important because some of the service providers that are included in the public health --

[5:49:29 PM]

through the public health social service contracts are also providers for us. So if you only increase those contracts, you're creating an inequity if we don't increase ours as well.

>> Tovo: Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: I think my last question is really -- mayor, I don't want to jump in front of somebody.

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't you hold up. We'll come back to you, councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: My question related to the cost of living for the social service contracts. Some of that is for Mr. Valdez and some of it is for Ms. Stirrup. Part of my question has to do with the timing. I wasn't quite understanding councilmember tovo your amendments. When I originally read them, I thought you were suggesting that this would be for future contracts. But it appears from the dollar

[5:50:30 PM]

amounts that you've included that you're talking about right away. Is that correct?

>> Tovo: So in the staff -- this is a response to a budget rider I brought last year. Again, just to address the issue I raised earlier, which is that our social service contracts are not subject to our city's living wage. Which is unfortunate. I think we want to address it. The staff came back in the memo and gave us a couple options for how to address it. I think probably our aph would be in the best position to be able to explain those two options. One option would be to address it in future contracts to allow those who are, as I understand it, responding to future rpfs to kind of revise their -- revise their proposals based on including a living wage. The second would be to give all of our existing social service contracts additional money to allow them to address it now. There are two different options that we can consider. I really just needed to hear

[5:51:33 PM]

the -- at the dais and to get a sense of what funding we have available. It's a pretty high dollar amount of \$900,000. I think it's a really important and necessary investment. But those are the two options before us. To address it in the future or address it now.

>> Kitchen: I would like to understand the cost of addressing it in the future from a timing standpoint.

>> Mayor Adler: So we'll get to the director stirrup question. Before we do, do we have anything left on dacc?

>> Kitchen: For dacc, if that was for your future contracts, what would be the timing for that?

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Robert Kingham again. So our we do not have is a timeline to resolicit our contracts that we are currently under. None of them are coming to the end of their contractual life

[5:52:36 PM]

cycle for the next two or up to three years. So there's not an opportunity for the programs that are funded here through the community court to kind of reset and re-establish their budget. So the funding that is in those contracts as of right now depending on the will of the council would be flat funding to see them through the next two or three years until it's closer to the end and we do a solicitation.

>> Okay. Thank you. That answers my question.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else for dacc? Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: This is a procedure AI to bring us back to our timing. It's 6:00 now I think. Yeah. 5:53. So I think there's a dinner. We have what, three or four more departments

>> Mayor Adler: Two more. General questions. I was trying to get us through those last two. I wasn't sure how long those

[5:53:38 PM]

would be. We can certainly stop if that was the will of the council or try to push through, which I think is the staff's desire.

>> Pool: It would be great if we could push through, really, really push through.

>> Can we push through?

>> Mayor Adler: All the way through, through? But we have to break for executive session.

>> Right.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we try to push through economic development Austin code. We identify any stray questions. I think we do the executive session tonight. I think it's about as far as we'll be able to go tonight. So tomorrow we would start back, be able to play with spreadsheets and tomorrow come back with limited question. The question is do you want to take a break and we'll do some of those things. They seem relatively small to me. Maybe we can push through and then break for the night and then everybody could grab dinner.

>> Push through, break for executive session with dinner.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

[5:54:39 PM]

>> While all of the staff not involved in executive session gets to go home. We'll take as long as it needs for executive session.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. Do I understand that we can't -- I understand we can't do the bond stuff or hsc or Mueller until other things. Those are pushed back as the last thing that we do. Let's continue to push through.

>> I just request the executive session conversation. I just want to let you know that if we're hitting that between 6:00 and 7:00, I'm unfortunately, not going to be a part of it.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll make it for you to be a part of it. Let's keep pushing and see how quickly we get through the next three. It may be that we grab our dinner and start -- you should plan on executive session starting at 7:00 in case you need to jump off. Okay?

>> Tovo: Sounds good. Thank you. I do have economic development questions. I'm probably going to miss that

[5:55:39 PM]

portion. But they relate to the different funds and -- they relate to the economic development corporation and can be transferred over there to -- for them to be there. Also to do the -- to fulfill the scope we outlined. I'm probably going to miss that portion. I think councilmember kitchen and you are going to ask the questions that I would have asked

>> Mayor Adler: If we don't, we can raise those in the morning as well. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I don't request need director stirrup to come back. I'll ask her off line. My question just had to do with the timing for those.

>> Mayor Adler: That's kind of a -- it's an important issue for us to pay providers so they can pay a living wage. It's just over a million dollars to be able to go back. Gave us two options. One is to prepare for the future, zero cost impact. One was to intercede in these

[5:56:39 PM]

contracts that was a million dollars. I wasn't sure if that million dollars was assuming a living wage was 18 or it was assuming it was 20 or whether it made any difference. That was a question I have. I don't know if there's any insight other than it's another tough budget choice to be made. Yes. And I think -- let's ask that question. The other thing we want to do tonight is postpone the park land dedication until September 1st. And the license -- the license plate reader until September 1st. I want to understand the

logistics of how do we handle fees with respect to the parkland dedication in the meantime. The question I had asked earlier, can we just put a blank in those, approve the budget and come back September 1st and

[5:57:41 PM]

approve both -- or consider both programs for approval and set the fees at that time? Does that work? Is there any prejudice to the city or anybody if we do that?

>> I just want to make sure I understand the proposal. Are you proposing to essentially zero out all the existing -- we have existing parkland dedication fees. I know there's a proposal to increase them

>> Mayor Adler: I think we'd be saying we're not going to adopt that fee at all. We're going to adopt it on September 1st. It's still before the end of the year. It's still going to be part of the schedule at the end of the year. I guess we could -- there would be no fee -- I think what we need to do is keep the existing fee as existing fee and then we would meet on September 1st, we would not be adding the commercial element at this point.

>> We could quickly and easily

[5:58:43 PM]

make than amendment to not increase the pld fees. Are they already in at the existing levels? We can verify. But we can definitely do that. Leave them at the fy '22 levels.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have any objection to that?

>> I do. That was not what we agreed to.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> My understanding is we were not making a decision. I understand you have to have a fee and a placeholder. We have determined what that fee he will be. I mean, I'm fine if we make no agreement. Then it's that fee

>> Mayor Adler: So it's --

>> That sort of changes the dynamic and is

>> Mayor Adler: Let's do this. My understanding is we can postpone the consideration of commercial parkland dedication element. We're going to consider on September 1st both the commercial element as well as residential and we're going to put that on the agenda so that it is something that we can discuss on the first. That will enable us to talk

[5:59:44 PM]

about the fee when it accrues, when it's paid, whether or not there's stakeholder process to consider further. That's all going to be done on the first. The only thing we're going to do as part of our budget compensation for staff is to set the parkland dedication fee for residential which will be in place probably until we decide what we're going to do a September first, is that right?

>> No, because it doesn't start until October 1st. So we don't have -- if we set it on September 1st for October 1st we're fine. So we are postponing -- my understanding from when I talked about it with Adam. I'm trying to find the email, is that we are postponing the decision about the residential fees until September 1st.

>> And the commercial fee until September 1st.

>> With the assumption that we will set a fee on September 1st which would be in effect October 1st.

>> Which is something I support and we're going to then talk about whether to

[6:00:44 PM]

a-- [inaudible]. We don't have to do any of those things today. The only thing we have to do as part of the budget process is set a residential parkland fee and we'll do that when we get to the fee part of the schedule and we can decide at that point whether it is the appropriate -- what is the appropriate number to put in at that point pending the meeting on September 1st.

>> If I could just say, I think that as a dais we are working to address both affordable care act and parks - affordability and parks access and I think we have the ability to do both. It will require some difficult decisions and some ability to pull people together to think about next steps, but the basic idea is we would adopt the commercial parkland dedication ordinance with very few tweaks and then we would adopt the residential fee somewhere between zero and 25% increase, and we would think about an

[6:01:45 PM]

appropriate stakeholder process before moving forward as we go. But there's some details since we just got the planning commission on the 9th and some things that we think that if we get that extra time we would be able to get to a place that is a win-win for both parks and for housing, but we need a little bit more time and with the craziness of the budget it seems like we can do that with a little bit more time. But there will be a parkland dedication fee adopted in plenty of time for October 1st. And that is sort of the range that I'm thinking that it might be. Obviously we could go higher if that's where the dais would want to go. But that's how I'm thinking.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been suggested to me that we may want to adopt parkland dedication fee as part of our process here as a placeholder so we have something that we're adopting here. We're going to have to adopt something here as part of this conversation. We'll do that when we get to

[6:02:46 PM]

the fee part. All the conversations as you point out on the residential commercial we'll put off until the first when we have time to be able to really figure out all the elements that we can do. But that's what we're going to do. For that purpose, anybody from staff standpoint who is here in consideration of the license plate issue, the parkland dedication can go. And I think we can act as a body to postpone those two items to September 1st. Yes.

>> Kelly: I wanted to make sure that there weren't any unintended consequences of not approving the resolution or considering that resolution for the license plate readers during the budget adoption and pushing it to September 1st. So perhaps if Ed could speak to that, Mr. Van eenoo. What would the process be for people who are watching at home for the council to allocate funding after the budget has been adopted?

[6:03:52 PM]

>> This was -- we just need council direction to reinstate the license plate readers. The police department has informed me that they can cover the 114,000-dollar post in their existing budget allocation, but in the prior budget cycle this body directed for that contract to be ended. It has been ended. So until this body tells us we can reinstate the contract the police department will do that.

>> Mayor Adler: The question is if we meet again on September 1st in order to approve the resolution allowing for the program to continue --

>> It's totally fine.

>> Mayor Adler: That's all we need to do.

>> Kelly: Okay, thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to postpone items number 2 and item number 12 until September 1st. Motion by councilmember Kelly. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember Renteria seconds that motion. Any discussion? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed to the postponement? I hear none.

[6:04:53 PM]

Off the dais is --

>> Tovo: I'm actually here, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: And I see you too. So council member Fuentes is off the dais. Everybody else is here. So on a 10-0-1 vote, those two items are postponed. Thank you.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I wanted to clarify something you said about the social service. Just to be clear the amendment I was bringing forward is to provide a cost of living increase, but not to get -- not to get those employees up to a living wage.

>> Mayor Adler: I got you. Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's continue on and see if we can push through here. We've now done dacc so now is the economic development department. Poised and ready.

>> Poised and ready.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anybody have any questions for the economic development department? Kathie, are you with us? Do you want to start us off?

[6:06:04 PM]

We also knew we would lose Kathie from six to seven.

[Echo on the line].

>> Mayor Adler: Can everybody who is not talking mute themselves? Do you have the capacity to mute people that may have not muted?

>> Sylnovia, we're getting an echo from your computer.

>> Okay, sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Are we set? Got it. All right, economic development, do we have any questions for economic development department?

>> Tovo: Mayor, I am going to have some, but I'm afraid I will have to get off and I will have to ask them in the context of my amendment for the economic development corporation. I apologize about that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Other questions on the dais? I think that there's a real desire among some people on the council to fund the economic development corporation with some administrative money this year.

[6:07:04 PM]

People are trying to figure out how to -- how to best do that. There's also a desire among some on the dais to move a program that's right now in economic development to the economic development corporation. That would not be for the purposes of funding the administrative fee. The whole program would just move over, which has both programmatic money and administrative money associated with it. There wouldn'ting any changes. It would just move. I think those are those two issues and the things probably that councilmember tovo was talking about. Ms. Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Sure. I do want to which clarify and I thank my colleagues for bringing to may my attention. I think that mayor pro tem did and perhaps others. The wording of the -- the wording of the amendment that council member tovo brought forward and I worked on with her is about

[6:08:06 PM]

transferring the cap program to the Austin economic development corporation. The intent there was not to take dollars away from that program or change how that program is run, but rather just to transfer it to aedc. So that money would include both programmatic money and the current money that's included that's included for administration of that program. And that's about 1.5 million. I think I see Mr. Colligan, who is here with aedc. So if people with questions for him he could come down. But it makes sense to me to transfer that program and I think it's -- it's in line with what council has already done in the past in terms of transferring the other cultural trust and other cultural types of programs to the aedc. So that's what that's about.

[6:09:08 PM]

But also I would like to highlight that there is a need for some additional administrative dollars to operate aedc so mayor, if it's appropriate perhaps we could ask Mr. Colligan to speak to us about that?

>> Mayor Adler: I'll ask both a aedc and EdD if they want to comment on that amendment or rider of councilmember tovo's.

>> Good afternoon, mayor and council. Sylnovia holt-rabb. We do see the cap program is a rich program between cultural contractors that would like to be part of that trust but it would be our preference to hire the aedc and get up to speed. They already have the guidelines. So maybe not this year but in future years to transfer the program.

[6:10:08 PM]

But we are poised and ready to go for cap.

>> Kitchen: Could I ask a question, mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead and then we'll hear from Mr. Colligan.

>> Kitchen: Ms. Holt-rabb I understand that that is outsourced so you have contracted with an entity that's going to manage those solicitations this year?

>> We are in the process of working with our purchasing department and we will be soliciting with entities that have already worked with us during our covid relief programs who already have experience working with us around leases, etcetera. So it's not a new vendors, but we're soliciting vendors that we already have experience and that have experience in this area.

>> Kitchen: When do you expect to issue the -- I think by solicitation you probably mean rfp? When do you expect to issue that?

[6:11:08 PM]

>> We hope to be back by, I believe -- for September -- early October, early November.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry.

>> The rca is scheduled right now for October 27th.

>> Kitchen: Okay. But when are you going to -- have you issued the rfp yet?

>> Yes.

>> Kitchen: So you have issued it. When is it due?

>> We bring the rca back to council on October 27th right now. That's the tentative date.

>> Kitchen: Yes, I appreciate that. That wasn't my question, though. My question is so I understand you've issued an rfp to -- to a vendor to manage this program. If I heard you right. I apologize if I didn't hear you right. So I'm asking when that rfp closes. It's been issued but I'm

[6:12:08 PM]

asking when it closes.

>> It's closed already.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> I'm sorry about the feedback I'm not sure what's going on.

>> Kitchen: That's okay. I can hear you. So you're in the process of-- so it's closed and you're in the process right now of selecting a vendor, is that what you're saying?

>> That is exactly correct. We're in the process of interviewing and we have two finalists at this point.

>> And what's the administrative cost for that vendor?

>> We are budgeting around \$200,000. That hasn't been finalized.

>> Kitchen: Okay. And then the program itself, the programmatic dollars, what's the amount there.

>> The programmatic dollars are \$1.5 million and the last two years that we have administered this program it has been oversubscribed. The last year we had

[6:13:17 PM]

3.37 million in requests and only a million available so we anticipate that we will be oversubscribed.

>> Kitchen: So 1.5 million is what will be available to give out awards, is that right?

>> That is correct.

>> Kitchen: And then the 200,000 that will pay the vendor, where are those dollars coming from?

>> That is currently budgeted in our economic incentive reserve fund.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Then I would just ask if aedc wants to make any comment on the cap program. But I also wonder if you could talk with us about the need for administrative dollars for the aedc.

>> Absolutely, thank you, mayor and council. David Colligan. Earlier last week we issued a memo to mayor and council with several backup items

[6:14:17 PM]

including resolution from our board which demonstrated the request for consideration for additional resources. Because of the unable to realize a really ambitious budget that was realized by council and budget at a time that we created the economic development corporation. We created a copy of that initial budget within a series of attachments to that memo. So so you would have it available to you and you can access that information. There you will see that we weren't able to capture a series of dollars from last fiscal year from some of the projects that we had initially outlined in the scope or those priority projects that we spoke about with mayor and council at the time that we created the entity. A key project there being south central waterfront. Although we have made investments to date in some of those priority projects we aren't yet realizing some of those revenues. So what we tried our best to do is capture what that business model looks like in the discussions that we had with mayor and council back

[6:15:17 PM]

in 2020 and how it is we have not yet been able to realize some of those revenues but we have been making the investments to date setting up the cultural trust, being one of those major cost drivers. We're now at the point where we need to continue our investments within the cultural trust, especially to be able to realize more of those revenues and have a self-sustaining organization in the future.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I have more questions, but did you have any questions, mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Those were the questions. Other questions on the aedc?

>> Kitchen: I have one quick follow-up question for director holt-rabb. If I could ask you, so I think you said that it might make sense to transfer in the future -- cap in the future. Did I hear that?

>> Correct.

>> Kitchen: This program you're in right now is that a one year award that you are in the middle of soliciting right now?

[6:16:18 PM]

>> It will be a one-year award, that is correct.

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

>> Mayor Adler: So while we have aedc here -- you can leave, but I have an aedc question. As we're trying to find funding for that it's about a million dollars that people are trying to find, we're trying to look in several different places to find it. There's one option I think to consider which is to make use of the tirz in the south central waterfront area, which is one of the properties or programs that might be handled. So I just have some questions for you on that just by way of getting kind of an education on that topic. If we're to do a tirz in the city, the money that's generated with the tirz that can be spent for capital projects or for whatever it is that tirz dollars are spent for, if it comes out

[6:17:19 PM]

of the tirz it's not money that comes out of the general fund, is that correct? There's no impact to the general -- assuming we're going to continue getting revenue with the three and a half percent that the legislature allows, if we take revenue out of the tirz that doesn't diminish the general fund dollars, is that correct?

>> It somewhat depends upon when you set your recapture rate. In general the short answer again is you're correct. Then there's just nuances having to do with --

>> I'll get to those in a second because we'll talk about timing. But just as a general rule because some people have been talking about money that comes from a tirz as coming out of general fund, but it doesn't, it happens outside of that independent of that. You still drive the same amount of tirz dollars but potentially will tax rate

[6:18:19 PM]

could be higher and drive the same amount of money, is that correct?

>> That's correct. The only nuance I would put on there is there's two kinds of value growth. There's value in the existing tax base. We have 100-million-dollar tax base for some tirz area and it goes up 10% to 110 million on the same properties. 100% correct, there's no impact to the general fund there. New construction is different. New construction is over and above the three and a half percent. So to the extent we do our job and have a rigorous but for analysis and that new construction could not come but for the new investment there's no harm to the general fund. But if the new construction would have come then it is kind of a diversion.

>> Mayor Adler: For the purposes of the question, do we do the but for the way we're supposed to?

>> Right.

>> Mayor Adler: But in order to be able to do that, in order to be able to draw the money from the tirz and not impact the general fund, you have to do it early enough prior to the budget season in order to set the tax rates as you're coming

[6:19:20 PM]

into it in a way that allows for that.

>> That's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: So we couldn't do that this year, but if we or the council does and sets a tirz some time after budget but well before budget next year, that would be the case, is that right?

>> That's correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So one potential option would be, and I believe everybody is trying to find ways to come up with a million dollars for administrative expenses for aedc, but one way to get some administrative dollars might be to take the money out of reserves, put it into the aedc with the caveat that we would then do some minimal amount of tirz that would immediately pay back that reserve dollars. And then if the council wanted to continue on financing that way we could do that. Wouldn't have to do that, but it would be a way if we took money out of reserves to know that we could pay the reserves back so long as we set the numbers

[6:20:21 PM]

consistent with our policy, is that correct?

>> I'm not sure about the paying back. I think there might be some legal analysis that needs to happen on that. Budgetarily you're correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Budgetarily. And there was some talk about making sure that -- the question that was raised that we can talk about is if money comes from one project in an aedc is that okay, and those kinds of questions which we can deal with later. So I just point that out to council. We'll probably take a look at that if there's not money we can find otherwise. The impact to the tax rate I think is .0006, to it's a negligible amount that you wouldn't really see it, but I wanted to get those answers to the questions. By the way, this will be a longer conversation about tirz. I've asked staff to really dig into that for us. When we have the conversation about the south central waterfront, which is

[6:21:22 PM]

right now scheduled for our work session on the Tuesday before September 1st. August 29th.

>> Just one other consideration on the funding model for the aedc is the tirz is one source, but the south central waterfront tirz is not the only thing that the Austin economic development corporation is going to be working on. So even if there was a million dollars from the tirz to support that, that would be an appropriate expense if they were spending all of their time working on the south central waterfront tirz. If they're working on cultural arts, the cultural trust and other things, we're still going to need to find some other funding sources for the corporation.

>> Mayor Adler: And I think that's true. It doesn't have to be in any given year the exact relationship that the revenue is coming in on and I think that's the question we were saying to explore and then let our manager explain to us from year to year the percentage of fees may or may not relate to the

[6:22:23 PM]

work that's being done that overtime fees are going to come in not necessarily in exactly that proportion. So it's not a one for one legal requirement but we could discuss that in a different setting. I just wanted to highlight that. Any other questions for EdD while we have EdD here or aedc? All right. So we'll let you guys go. Thank you very much. Thank you for the time. Thank you. That gets us then one left before we have kind of the general questions. Austin code. We may have to do this again tomorrow because I think this is in part councilmember tovo is proposing that we don't fund a certain number of code positions. Councilmember Renteria, do you have questions too?

>> Yes, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't

[6:23:25 PM]

you go ahead.

>> Renteria: What I really want to know and learn is those administrative positions that you're asking for, what is going to be their job responsibility and why do we need those exterior administrative personnel?

>> So good evening mayor, mayor pro tem, council members. Thank you for that question, councilmember Renteria. We are asking for about 13 positions as you see here and most of those in these four services. Many of those positions are there to relieve some of the work that inspectors are doing now. We're trying to use the time more effectively, trying to get the time that they actually use, for example, to prepare cases for the legal escalation, which is very complicated and it requires a lot of administrative time from inspectors. We're trying to alleviate some of that work, as well as all the administrative functions that we have in the department.

[6:24:26 PM]

As part of the cdq93 from councilmember tovo we provided a list of the positions that we have with the specific duties that they have and the timing on the time that they actually work in the department. But those are specific needs that we have identified this year to continue to provide the support not only for the code enforcement staff, but also for the community.

>> Renteria: I see that a lot of the positions are going to be funded through the revenue that you generate through these -- is it revenue coming from the fines that are issued for the str's violation or the code violation? How is that going to work?

>> So we have different funding in the department. About 89 percents of the department is through the clean community fee and that's why we have a 15-cent increase.

[6:25:26 PM]

But we also have funding through licensing and registration and we also get penalties and collections from BAC cases and administrative hearings. So we have other funding. The main source is the clean community fee.

>> Renteria: Could you tell me if -- obviously the problems -- the problem that you're having is the administrative part of it and it's tying up your employees, your code inspectors out there. And you need some additional help. Will that also -- what are their responsibility going to be and what's the goal, the end goal that's going to be able to improve your operation?

>> The end goal here is actually provide many services that we have identified that we have gaps in the community. On those 13 positions. We understand that there's many challenges that have been brought up to council. One of them being the

[6:26:28 PM]

short-term rental administration and enforcement. The code department is more than just str. We have other programs mostly in the neighborhood. Enforcement. And we also have the repeat offender program and we also do licensing for hotels and motels. These positions would actually add that element of administration that we have been missing and we've been trying to fill the gaps with the positions that come and go and are not sustainable many times. That's why we're actually asking for these positions. We've been lagging for a long time. By adding enforcement staff without adding the support staff. And for example the code department even though it's a small department we are one of the largest producers of media, birds and other requests because we are basically always in the community and always bringing some attention to the work that we do. So we do understand the challenges that we have right now.

[6:27:28 PM]

I believe we have been in conversations with other council members about the short-term rental situation. One of the issues that was brought up last year was about enforcement late hours at night. So we took the direction last year instead of coming back midyear we actually went out and evaluated the staffing. So we don't -- we have different programs and how do we use the staff in the best way without compromising the services that we provide in other areas. So we look at that. We have of the challenges that we have is looking at all the cities, best practices, and the code department enforcement is not really the appropriate staff to be out there, 2:30, 2:00 in the morning when we're dealing with disorderly conduct, noise complaints, but we have been analyzing the data. We realize that when we get the complaints for short-term rentals we are staffed 85% of the time to respond to those complaints.

[6:28:28 PM]

So we realize that we have a challenge, right, with the short-term rental ordinance. And we've been dealing with the stakeholderring trying to get ideas. Unfortunately some of the ideas that are coming

through we are kind of in a situation where we have some legal challenges in the court right now so we cannot really move forward with some of that. But we are working towards looking at all the tools that we have in the ordinance code enforcement. And that's why we need to kind of relieve some of the is staff. We're also adding a position for some did additions that we're finding out in the community now dealing with mental illness. We're asking [indiscernible] As lead counsel. Lately the code department has been facing many challenges dealing with homeless encampments on private properties and we're trying to find of provide those services in addition

[6:29:28 PM]

to the code enforcement side of it but also make sure that we have that in place for those situations.

>> Renteria: Mayor, I'm going to let someone else, if anyone has any questions.

>> I think there was a question that was asked and you may have answered it again. The suggestion that some of the complaints are coming in at night and we don't have actual field folks on staff able to respond to those calls at night. Is that an issue?

>> I'm going to gray in Denny ward the director over strs and he's been working hard on this issue so let's talk about it.

>> Good evening, Daniel ward, assistant director at

[6:30:30 PM]

Austin code. Specific to short-term rentals we did some analysis on the calls that come in. Given our current work hours with that short-term rental enforcement FEMA we have a member on staff 85% of the time that a complaint comes in.

>> Mayor Adler: Are the 15%, are those always night calls? Is that the issue?

>> Correct, correct. The latest we work on any night of the week is 11:00 P.M. Currently.

>> Mayor Adler: So 15% of the calls are coming in some time after 11.

>> Between 11:00 P.M. And seven A.M. Typically.

>> Mayor Adler: Are the number of the calls, 85% or something, does it justify having someone on duty to be able to respond between 11 and seven?

>> I can look to get you the actual unit amounts in terms of the number of calls, but in my opinion it won't support the cost of a shift.

>> I would like to add to that conversation that we look at that working late

[6:31:30 PM]

hours and we look at some of the situations that we'd be facing in the field. The Austin code inspectors are not the person -- the proper person to actually go there. This type of complaints that we see late hours we're looking at disorderly contact, people who are maybe drunk. We're not -- we're code inspectors. We deal with property maintenance, land use and so on. Some of the conduct is more appropriate for police officers to respond to. We're not trained, authorized or even equipped to actually deal with those type of situations. And we have been structured in a way that we're not a 24 hour department. We have hired the staff for specific hours. The short-term rental team is a specific team and they do work late. When they hire they have to work late Friday and

[6:32:31 PM]

Saturday. We have the pilots on Sunday mornings so we do offer overtime on that. But they know that they are hired for those specific hours. When we have a special event like south by southwest, acl, we develop special teams to deal with those, and be more available during the week. But that is a situation that we have right now in terms of responding to like 2:30 in the morning, 3:00 in the morning kind of complaint. We have extensively had conversations with the law department on these and it's really a job for a police officer to respond to those.

>> Okay, thank you. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just a quick question. I saw the response to one of the questions, but I'm still -- I'm not entirely clear. We have fees and fines

[6:33:31 PM]

related to str's. And I'm just wondering if those cover the cost of enforcement for str's?

>> So the answer is the fees that we have for the licensing, they cover the cost of the administration for the review and the issuance of the licenses. The enforcement of the str is actually supported by the clean community fee. So we do cover the cost of all the administrative staff that deals with reviewing the applications, denying or issuing the licenses, that's actually supported by the str licensing fee.

>> Kitchen: So the fees for the licensing don't cover enforcement.

>> No they don't.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else for code? Thank you all for being with us. Thank you. All right. Those are all the departments that we had identified. There were some questions

[6:34:32 PM]

that I had raised -- there's a question about the Austin energy tax rate and how it's shown on the impact statement that goes to taxpayers, but let's hold off on that question. Councilmember Tovo I think thought how it was handled at some point in the past, 2011, 2012. She had questions about those. I don't know if she's submitted them or not. You might want to reach out to her, but I think that's the question and whether that tells us anything about what we should be doing. I'm not sure she was recommending it as much as asking that question. Just real fast, on the fee schedule that came out today, the revised, were there new fees that had been above the 10% that were not in the fee schedule that had been generally available prior to this most recent add up?

>> There were no new fees.

[6:35:33 PM]

What the fee schedule changes primarily shows is so as, for example, in the office of chief medical office we removed the fees from there but did not put them in the EMS department so it's correcting that mistake, as well as in APD, the alarm fees that we removed from APD to put in DSD is just correcting the move over to DSD. So those are corrections. There was a correction with the CCF, the residential rate for Austin resource recovery. It was put in as the commercial rate so we're making that correction as well. Those are the changes you will see primarily in the fees. That's the bulk of it. And then there was some -- in the fee schedule there was some language that was kind of cut off in the document so we were just cleaning that up. It was mostly administrative cleanup. But because of the nature of the fee schedule we have to do it as an amendment to make sure it's all captured

[6:36:34 PM]

correctly.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it sounds good, but nothing beyond that that we have to give notice to in the community where people would later say wait a second, there was a change and I just wasn't aware of it.

>> No.

>> Mayor Adler: Good. In the staff powerpoint which we'll do tomorrow when we tee that up, is there anything in there in the powerpoint other than items that we've already discussed?

>> The only new thing that is added is in the building services department we are adding eight new positions, but with zero costs. They are insourcing the pdc management, the property management. And so you will see eight new positions, zero dollars because they will show a reduction in the contract over the course of fiscal year '23.

>> Mayor Adler: That sounds good. Colleagues, anybody have any general questions? Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Thank you. Just on the point that you just raised. It seems to me that the arr fees are new there's a return trip fee for trash

[6:37:34 PM]

collection, a return trip fee for recycling collection and a return trip fee for compost collection? And I got some clarification from director snipes on those, but I do want to clarify that these are not fees that are like may if a messed up and you didn't have your collection out that day, or you really want them to come or you need an extra collection which was written in what he explained to me, but I would like to clarify that. And I don't know if he's around.

>> Those fees are new in fiscal year '23 but they're replacing existing fees.

>> Alter: They're replacing existing fees?

>> Yes.

>> Alter: It just says that they're new fees on the schedule.

>> And I'll be able to get you that detail, but they're

[6:38:34 PM]

replacing existing ones. Let me get with the team and get you that detail to clarify.

>> Alter: Okay. So I have that. Okay. So the current fee nomenclature are previously set out were used interchangeably. The late cycle set up fees are replaced by the new more transparent fees. Okay. So that's the same fees that there were with a name change, is that what we're talking about? If you could just confirm that? Because the way I read the fee schedule change there were new fees.

>> My understanding is they're changes but I will get with arr as well as my team to make sure we clarify that.

>> Alter: Okay. I missed a section of this. I was reading down below. It does seem to say that it was the change, but thank you. If you could clarify that.

[6:39:36 PM]

>> Ellis: Ms. Lange, could you also explain the clean community fee? It's in that section that the mayor pro tem was referencing. It looks like it was proposed to go to 1715 but now it's 4:85. I wanted to make sure I understood that line.

>> Give me one second. So what the change that was -- that you're seeing is the commercial rate which it should have been the residential rate so that's why you're seeing that change.

>> Ellis: Thanks for that clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other questions? Any other -- okay. So with that then what we're going to do is we're going

[6:40:37 PM]

to go into executive session remotely. We're going to start that meeting at 7:00. While we're in closed session we'll take up potentially three items. Pursuant to 551 --

>> [Inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: One item about the budget. We don't have to identify subissues. Okay. So pursuant to 551.071 and 551.133 of the government code council will discuss legal issues and certain public utility competitive matters related to agenda item 4, which is all of our budget items. I think there are three things we'll probably end up talking about. We can discuss them when we're there. Is there any objection to going into executive session at 7:00 nrd to address these? Hearing none, our time out here is 6:41. And let me just check one

[6:41:39 PM]

last thing here real fast. And at 7:00 we'll do executive session. I'll see you all then.

>> For clarity we're not coming back out.

>> Mayor Adler: I will come out and close the meeting. I thought we would do it tonight, but I think it will be tomorrow. I will be the only one who comes back out after 7:00 to close the meeting. And we will start tomorrow at 10:00 A.M. Okay? I'll see you at 7:00 on executive session remote.

[7:55:01 PM]

[Music]. >>

[8:27:59 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I am going to recess this council meeting and carry it over to tomorrow morning. So we are going to reconvene this meeting, coming out of recess, tomorrow August 18th of 2022, and we're going to reconvene at 10:00 A.M. Here in city council chambers, 301 west second street in Austin. Thank you very much.

[Pt. 2 – August 18, 2022 portion of meeting]

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 6 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 8/18/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 8/18/2022

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

[10:14:51 AM]

>> Mayor

Adler: I'm going to reconvene this recessed meeting. It was the meeting that initiated as noticed yesterday on August 17th, 2022. This meeting continues now. It's August 18th, 2022. It is 10:15, and we're in the city council chambers. Continuing the discussion about budget. I think we have people here -- this is what I would propose this morning. We don't have Natasha, council member harper-madison with us. Right now, she has a sick child, but I think she'll be trying to join us remotely. I think that -- my suggestion --

>> Harper-madison: Mayor, I'm here. I'm just here via audio only, but I'm here.

>> Mayor Adler: Gotcha. Thank you.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that there are some big things that we can try to take care of, but I think a lot of the budget

[10:15:51 AM]

process is not necessarily, you know, considering things one at a time and voting yes and no, because I think that a lot of times, things are dependent on other choices in the budget, and I'm trying to think of a process that might move us forward. What we had talked about yesterday was doing when council member harper-madison had asked for it, I think two or three times, was that we handle the big things, and then we take a recess, and I'm going to recommend that we do that. So that this morning together we consider the question of living wage, to see if we can get a feel of where people are on that. See if there are any other changes to big numbers. I think we were looking potentially for a bigger change on the whole blood issue. I don't know if we have numbers for that, but any numbers that we have changed on things, so that we have those things. If people have big kind of conceptual changes or things that we might want to consider later on, that would be a time to air that.

[10:16:51 AM]

And then I'm going to recommend that we recess, so that we have a chance to kind of gather where we are and see where we are with that big decision that was made, and I think this is kind of -- this is what we said we were going to do yesterday in the questions that council member harper-madison had asked. So, questions right now or comments on process? Council member tovo, and then council member kitchen.

>> Tovo: Thanks, mayor. I actually awakened today thinking that maybe we could knock out -- maybe there were some basic things that would, in a regular council member, be on a consent agenda, like non-financial items that we could knock out to create a climate of productivity, just to knock out things about which there's agreement. But I think your plan sounds fine. I would suggest that that might be something we shift into at some point, if we need a change of pace. I mean, I have a few that no budgetary impact. Probably others do, too. Things we don't need to discuss or that there's not a lot of discussion around, we can shift to. But anyway, I think your plan sounds good.

[10:17:53 AM]

I have a question, in the spirit of yesterday's, would just help me sort something else through, and I just haven't gotten an answer. So, could I just go ahead and ask?

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't you hold off. We'll start with questions. Let's make sure everybody's onboard with this kind of general direction for process here, at least starting. And the goal in all this, colleagues, and some of us have not been through a budget together with each other, the budget's not finalized until the budget is done. So there is a vote taken at the end of all the changes where we vote on, collectively, the changes that we want to make to the base budget. So even as we go through the process and we take indications where we think that we are, that does not stop someone from being able to double back and say, okay, now that I see where we are at the end, I want to tweak that second decision that we made, so as to open up a possibility here at the end. So, everything is open and fair game until we take that very last vote. I just want to make that clear. Council member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think the

[10:18:54 AM]

process you're laying out sounds good to me. I have one thought on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Sure.

>> Kitchen: When we break up, wherever that is, when we break to go think about things, if we at that point in time could have access to the spreadsheet that our staff is -- they've got a running spreadsheet, so that they could update it for anything we do up until that time. We may not do anything, but if we do anything up until that time, if they could update that, then we could access it.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that sounds good, if you guys could continue to update that. You want to talk to us about how that sheet works?

>> Carrie Lang, budget officer. The spreadsheet that we provided the link to, it will be updated as the decisions and amendments are made. So it will be in realtime.

[10:19:55 AM]

And so if you just go to that link, the staff is working to follow and update as you all make those changes.

>> Tovo: Where is that?

>> In the email that I sent on Wednesday -- Tuesday. On Tuesday evening. My days are being mixed up. On Tuesday evening. And we can resend the link out.

>> Tovo: I wonder if any of us have it up, maybe you could just post it on the message board. That might be the fastest, just for all -- no?

>> Mayor Adler: If you get the thing, put it on the message board post on the same thread

-->> Alter: Isn't there a limited number of people who can access the sheet?

>> Mayor Adler: That's right. It's not really public facing. Okay, never mind. But keep it current. Thank you. Yes.

>> I have a quick question. I see the available ongoing funds. And the one-time funds. Could there be one next to it to

[10:20:57 AM]

show us all the amendments as you've posted them, so we can see where the delta is and make sure we know if we're close or not? Maybe I can try to say that another way. I see the yellow boxes that show available ongoing and one-time funds, but there's nothing summing all of the requests that we've put in.

[Off mic]

>> Maybe I need to refresh mine.

>> So that available and one-time, it will refresh as we change the numbers. And so you'll see what's available after those items -- action are taken on those items. So that's going to change each time.

>> Ellis: Okay, that's helpful. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. All right. So, let's begin first with questions we need to air before we get to a discussion about living wage. Kathie, I'm going to come back to you. Did you have a question?

[10:21:57 AM]

>> Tovo: Oh, yes. Thank you. My question is -- could you help me know, how is building services funded? I have looked through the fund summaries in some of the other pages, but I can't see where the transfers in are coming from, if it's all capital, all city hall fund, or if some of it's, I assume, general fund, if some is support services. But is there a page in that -- I think I shared with you this morning the pages I was looking at, but I'm not sure if I'm missing the transfer of some document in the budget that shows the transfer is in.

>> Let me look at your email, because I haven't seen it yet. I apologize. Been a lot going on this morning.

>> Tovo: Sure.

>> And I'll respond to that. But generally, building services is one of our support services departments. Hr, financial services, mayor and council, city clerk, they all go into the support services fund bucket, and that total dollar amount gets allocated out to the departments that charge

[10:22:58 AM]

fees, or to the funds that charge fees or collect tax revenues, like the general fund. And so there's a complicated allocation process we go through to allocate those costs out in an equitable, fair manner. And so the building services funding is part of that transfer to the support services fund that you'll see on the general fund fund summary. You'll see it on Austin energy and Austin water, all the enterprise funds, you'll see a transfer to support services, building services.

>> Tovo: Okay, thank you. I appreciate that. So there's then no direct general fund dollars going into building services. It's coming through the supports.

>> Yeah, I mean -- it would be \$100 million. A large amount. Maybe \$100 million to the support services fund from the general fund. That's the revenue into the support services fund, and with that revenue, we fund all of those support functions, building services being one of them.

>> Tovo: Yeah, but it's not a

[10:23:58 AM]

straight --

>> Mayor Adler: The follow-up question to that would be, could we -- if we were able to find a funding source for some of the general fund dollars, as it comes in the general fund, before it actually gets spent, would we free up general fund dollars we could spend somewhere else?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: And I think the suggestion that my colleague makes, council member tovo made, was to say -- garage fees. Is that something -- I mean, it appears as if there might be some dollars there that we could substitute into general fund dollars.

>> Yes. And that's why we increased the parking revenues of this facility that provides more funding to support the maintenance and operations of this facility, so there's less money that would need to be transferred from the general fund to the support services fund to make up the gap in building services.

>> Mayor Adler: And have you had a chance to quantify that question?

>> Well, I believe that the council member had worked with

[10:24:59 AM]

the facility people and estimated \$200,000 of additional revenue.

>> Tovo: We did our own calculations, and I think it would probably be a good idea to have some staff input on that. If you do a straight calculation based on last year's parking garage revenues, I mean, we're doubling -- we're suggesting doubling the parking. If we doubled the revenue, it would be closer to about 500,000, and some piece of that, some piece of the data we had included pandemic time, so it could be higher. 200,000 would be way lower.

>> We're working on that.

>> Tovo: It would be good to get staff's look at that, and if there's any -- yeah, I think it's somewhere in that neighborhood, between 200 and 500, which is a huge range, so maybe we settle on 400 as a pretty conservative number.

[10:25:59 AM]

>> That work is already in process. I just misunderstood. I thought the 200,000 was a staff number, but I've already asked for that to be verified, so we should have the staff recommended number.

>> Tovo: Yeah, thanks. I put in a low number I think on the sheet, but I really intended to raise it once I figured out how we were allocating it. So, anyway, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: That would be great. Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Is there a similar action we can do with the convention center parking? Can they pay for a south by southwest -- like, that money goes in there and they pay for more of the south by southwest security?

>> I've not looked into any of that yet, so I don't want to say off the cuff what the answer might be, but if you can maybe lay out the concept, we can certainly --

>> Alter: My concept would be that they're coming out of another pot that could be funded

[10:27:00 AM]

instead by the parking revenue, and then we could have the convention center pay for some of what the general fund is covering for south by southwest security.

>> Tovo: However, if I may, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Tovo: I think I mentioned yesterday that we were looking at the convention center garage as well, based on the information that we got back in question 97, and my staff is right now looking at what that increase should be based on the rates of other downtown parking garages and they're working on staff with that. I will consider your suggestion, too, but one of the -- you know, I have two amendments before us that are trying to fund -- increase security on some renovations to the convention center used property. And so I'm also hoping -- that

[10:28:02 AM]

is also one of the things that I think needs to be considered, is whether or not the increased parking can help support either one of those. I understand what you're saying about the spring festival security, and I'll keep that in mind. But right now, I think based on our conversation yesterday, it looks like pard is paying for the security. So that does, in fact, free up some additional general funds. But I think it should be some consideration whether the increased parking garage fee should support some of the other

sources. There may be an opportunity to do both, because as the convention center points out, it's now the cheapest parking garage in all of downtown, and it's significantly underpriced to an extent that we're not covering our fees.

>> Alter: I'm open to the conversation. I'm not sure why they can't fund. Both.

>> We'll look into that. I did say I wouldn't do an

[10:29:03 AM]

off-the-cuff response, but I think what we're going to find is that the convention center garage was funded with debt and that the parking fees are going to need to go towards the debt. But I'll do that work and verify it and we'll get back to you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Council member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I wanted to go back and ask a process question, if it's timely.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: So I'm going back to council member Ellis's question, and I'm now confused. I thought I understood your answer.

>> Mayor Adler: Here's a better answer. We can print --

>> Kitchen: But my question is I want to see an ongoing tally. And I don't see it added up like council member Ellis.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, two different questions.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, I don't see it added up. So, maybe at the right time you can pull it up and show us.

[10:30:04 AM]

But there's no -- you've got at the top the total that's available, but there's no adding up what we've got so far, what's been proposed. So I don't see how we're going to do a running tally.

>> Ellis: And I do see there's a couple of hidden rows. I'm not sure if they're just not visible, but they are pulling the information in.

>> Kitchen: Can you tell me what they are?

>> I don't want the council to get hung up on this. We'll see if we can accommodate it.

>> Kitchen: My only point is you're going to have to show us how to do it later.

>> I understand what you guys are trying to do. We're trying to do it on the fly and we'll get it done if we can.

>> Kitchen: Okay, that's fine. And you'll show us how to --

>> We're going to try to.

>> Kitchen: Okay, thanks.

[10:31:04 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: And is there any problem with us printing the PDF and putting it up on the message board? No? Okay. So we'll do that and we'll put the time that we pulled it off and printed it. Yes.

>> Thank you. This was related to the conversation on parking fees. Just wanted to express my appreciation to council member tovo for all of her hard work in identifying this as an area where we can increase fees. It makes total sense. I just really appreciate your ability to identify that during our budget process. That expertise is so appreciated and needed.

>> Mayor Adler: Any other questions?

>> Renteria: Mayor, I wondered if, on the procedure, are we going to hit the big items first and then go down?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, I think we're going to hit the very biggest item, and then we'll probably take a break.

>> Renteria: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to hit the living wage here first in just a moment.

[10:32:05 AM]

Any other questions for staff before we get started doing stuff? All right, staff, do you want to take us through the presentation? You've asked to go through the presentation of your budget amendments. Recognize that everybody on council already knows about the budget amendments, so more than anything else, you're trying to touch them real fast so the community can see. Go as rapidly as you could go through that presentation. We'll let you do that because we're ready to move on to the next one.

>> Yes, sir.

[10:33:14 AM]

Good morning, again. Carrie Lang. Budget officer. Next slide, please. So these are the staff budget amendments, and I'll start with revenue as we discussed last week, there will be an increase in the property tax revenue for fiscal year '23. We are showing an increase in our estimates for fiscal year 22 for sales tax revenue as well as increases for fiscal year 23 for sales tax revenue based on the increased revenue we've received to date. Next slide, please. When we look at staff amendments for general fund expenditures, there is one new position in the housing and planning department for our community land trust program. At \$74,000. Then when we look at support services, as I mentioned yesterday, there are eight new positions in the building services department at a net zero cost for fiscal year 23. That is going to be based on reduction in contract services at the permanent development center. Next slide, please.

[10:34:17 AM]

This slide talks about the amendments that we're making to the general fund, to the reserve funds, and you'll see the estimate that has been reduced for the unspent parks and recreation and police department as well as amendments for fiscal year 23, showing the reimbursements for covid-related expenses as well as re-instituting the parks and recreation department for accc, and the transfer to the emergency reserve -- and then this is just an amendment to the grants based on the housing and planning department. They are showing an increased grant to the Austin transportation partnership grant. Next slide. And there are a number of fee schedule changes that's in backup as we discussed on yesterday's corrections in ocmo, the office of chief medical officer, moving to the emergency

[10:35:18 AM]

medical services as well as APD alarm permitting, moving to development services department, and corrections with the Austin resource recovery fees that they

-- we discussed on yesterday, regarding their collection pickup. Next slide. Any questions? Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Colleagues, any questions about that? I think that's already been incorporated into the sheets that we're working off of. I think the first thing for us to figure out is where people are with respect to the living wage. You want to just kind of set out what it is that you're proposing, council member Fuentes?

>> Fuentes: Thank you, yes. Thank you, mayor. I woke up today and I saw one of the headlines is that Travis county is considering increasing their minimum wage to \$20. So, already we're seeing impact throughout our city and especially in having another public sector considering a raise to \$20, it's pretty

[10:36:19 AM]

amazing, because we here have an opportunity to do that today in raising our minimum wage to \$20 for city employees. I want to thank my co-sponsors, council member kitchen, vela, tovo, and Renteria for joining me. I have version 3, and it's on the dais. There's a minor tweak based on the amendment that we had yesterday. This seeks to appropriate 7 million in general fund revenue to raise the minimum wage, and with the direction that should additional revenue be needed for us to get to \$20, that staff prepare a mid-year budget amendment for consideration. And for us to have that conversation at that time. And so that really, again, is rooted in building off of the resolution we passed unanimously as a council a few months ago, and seeks to raise our lowest wage workers up to \$20 minimum wage to help our employees with the rising costs, to ensure that

[10:37:19 AM]

folks are able to live in the city that they serve.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So at this point, if there were people that needed to express concerns or questions about it, I think that would be the appropriate thing to do. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify. I think what is written in the amendment covers this, but what you just said might not. So I just want to clarify that in terms of the mid-year budget amendment, when we talk about the need for costs, that's also covering compression, it's not just what it takes to get up to \$20, because I think we have a pretty good idea that the 7 million will cover getting people up to \$20 who are below that. Where the question comes is whether we've fully anticipated compression and the complexity of achieving what we need to address the compression that happens as we move those who are at the lower end of our wage

[10:38:20 AM]

scale up. So can you just confirm that your intention is that the mid-year budget amendment for council approval is also, you know, to come back to us, if there's compression challenges that we're not able to fund with the 7 million.

>> Fuentes: You know, I'm open to that. I mean, certainly, this is really rooted on getting to \$20, and so that's the direction and how we wanted to focus is, is getting our lowest wage workers up to a \$20 minimum wage. And to the extent that staff has recommendations on how we can address compression, I definitely think council should consider that. We might have different philosophies to the extent of how we address compression. And I do want to point out that there is a 4% across-the-board increase included in this budget proposal, in addition to \$1,500 stipend for workers. And so, this to me is focused on getting folks to the \$20 minimum wage, and then should additional cost be needed to address

[10:39:20 AM]

compression at whatever extent that staff recommends, then we would want them to come back for that discussion.

>> Alter: And to be clear, it's the latter that I was checking on. There's no question that we have enough money to get people up to the \$20. The question in terms of the estimates that we have at this point is how we address the people who were at or above \$20. So, I just want to be clear, there's not an uncertainty about whether this is enough money to get up to \$20. It's well past that. I just want to be clear that in saying that we need this mid-year amendment, we're not introducing any uncertainty about reaching \$20. It's the compression problems.

>> Fuentes: I see what you're saying. And I'm happy to even tweak the language here to say -- to cover the costs of this wage increase

[10:40:22 AM]

--

>> Alter: And maybe associated compression.

>> Fuentes: And associated compression.

>> Alter: And obviously staff would need to be providing recommendations on what is appropriate and what is problematic from that.

>> Fuentes: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: And I think that language does that, associated compression. Council member pool.

>> Pool: That was the point that I wanted to drive home as well, and I had prepared direction in order to mitigate for the compression in some of the areas of the workforce, and my direction would be for director Hayes to analyze and make recommendations to mitigate any compression issues in anticipation of a mid-year budget amendment. Which incorporates the edits that you all just made, but it also sets it forth in order to give the direction it would come back to us for -- in anticipation of a mid-year budget amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: I would suggest

[10:41:22 AM]

that the two of you visit about that language. We're at a much higher level than that in this part of the conversation. But I also support this \$7 million to get to the \$20. Is there anybody on the dais that at this point in the process is not supportive of this element?

>> Kitchen: I just have a clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: Uh-huh.

>> Kitchen: So this is all sounding good. I'm just clarifying that what we're -- and I think you all said this. I just want to clarify so there's no misunderstanding, but that the -- that we're not going to change the wages at mid-year. We're going to start that October 1st, okay? So it's just that the associated compression is to consider where we might need to be at mid-year related to that. So I didn't want to leave the impression for anyone that we're not going to change the wages to

[10:42:24 AM]

mid-year.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's everyone's intention.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Alter: But there may be wages that change mid-year that were not -- where compression was not addressed to meet that. So we're not -- we are changing everybody who is supposed to get 20 October 1st, but if there's a problem with compression, we may not know that until we do the mid-year budget, and there will be additional people that would get wage increases after that mid-year budget. It's additional people who are higher up in the pay scale who are impacted by compression, who might need their wages changed at a later date, if we don't get it all right October 1st.

>> Kitchen: I hear that. I just want to be clear that we're starting October 1st.

>> Alter: Absolutely.

>> Mayor Adler: We are. I understood that we were told by director Hayes yesterday -- if we find it. It's going to happen at 20. This is a mid-year chance to see if there are any issues that

[10:43:25 AM]

resulted from that, that will come back in the form of a budget amendment when it's appropriate already. Okay? So, I think that everybody is there on that.

>> Kitchen: So, mayor, you're taking this as a consensus on that one?

>> Mayor Adler: This process has to be consensus right up to the very end.

>> Kitchen: This one I'd like to vote on so that it's clear.

>> Mayor Adler: Everybody in favor of this, raise your hand. That's good to see. Noting that council member -- because it was -- was that no? Kelly was a no. And we don't have council member harper-madison here. I don't see her on the screen. But we're not voting each time. We're just going to be --

>> Kitchen: I know, I just thought for clarification. Because this is one I don't want to come back and revisit. Other things we may want to revisit.

>> Mayor Adler: But we're not going to decide which things are

[10:44:27 AM]

inviolable and things that are not. I don't anticipate any change, but I don't want to start going down that road. I don't think there will be any changes. I think we'll be fine.

>> Tovo: I totally agree with that approach. I just want to suggest that if there are items -- that we always ask in case there are items that people are voting against.

>> Mayor Adler: I should ask. I wasn't anticipating it. It's not like taking a vote because it's not really a vote. But it was a public indication that should have enabled everybody to give that public indication. Council member pool.

>> Pool: I said independently that I would love if she would just incorporate it in her motion, if we formalize a motion.

>> Mayor Adler: So we'll get there, and at that time, hopefully that will all be worked out. Okay?

>> Fuentes: Happy to do so. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I just wanted to get a question out there, so that as we're going through this process, we can get an answer. Council member Ellis has

[10:45:31 AM]

amendment 3 with respect to the service incentive pay that covers both general fund and enterprise fund. It's currently listed as 566,000 of ongoing. Can we get a breakdown of what is general fund and what is enterprise fund and whether there would be any associated fee increases to cover the enterprise funds, please, when you have a chance. So that potentially frees up a little bit of ongoing money, but then we have to balance if there are any fee increases.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you understand that? Okay. So the possibility, may not be all general fund dollars. It might be part enterprise funds. And the question is does that implicate fees associated with enterprise funds. Job, thank you. Council member Kelly, do you

[10:46:32 AM]

have new numbers yet on the whole blood issue?

>> Kelly: That is what I am looking at right now. My staff sent it over, but I'm going to need like two seconds to find it, because it got buried. Oh, I found it. Sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kelly: So, it looks like for the whole blood, if we were to phase in a program over the next two years or so, the one-time cost would come down to \$500,000 for coolers, temperature monitoring, and training, ongoing supply cost is 200,000 per year. And that would still be out of the general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. 500 one time, and 200 ongoing.

>> Kelly: And that is for the whole blood program. Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you for that work on that item.

>> Kelly: Absolutely. We've got to be a team when it comes to this kind of stuff.

>> Mayor Adler: 500 and 200. 500 one time. 200 ongoing. Council member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just a question

[10:47:34 AM]

about that. On the ongoing, the 200 ongoing, I don't know -- I'm not familiar with what all is in that. So, is it possible to move any of that to one-time?

>> Kelly: I believe this is what we talked about with staff yesterday, that's not a possibility.

>> It's the actual blood you have to buy.

>> Kitchen: I'm just checking, because the challenge for us is ongoing.

>> Kelly: Yes, we worked really hard with financial services and the ems on that.

>> Kitchen: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Other questions.

>> Could you just restate the numbers -- the changes that you'd be making?

>> Kelly: Yes. Hold on just a moment. Sorry. I just had it up, I promise.

[10:48:35 AM]

It is 500,000 for the one-time cost, and 200,000 for ongoing supply costs. And my staff can provide you with that information.

>> I did talk to one of your staff this morning and the numbers were a little different than this.

>> Kelly: We'll follow up with you in just a moment. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other big items or big questions? Or thoughts? Ann, did you want to -- did you want to raise the question of the fte issue now or later?

[Off mic]

>> Kitchen: I wanted to clarify something on the wage. I think I misspoke my question. What I was trying to say was

[10:49:37 AM]

that we're going to -- that the mid-year review will not be about compression, per se. It will be about whether we need additional funding to finish out the second half of the year. So in other words, October 1st, we will raise people to 20, and then we will address that compression that's within the pay levels, and we will do all that, and then -- it's not a two-part. It's not, we're only going to give up to 20 on October 1st, and then, you know, maybe we won't have enough for the people that are above that. We're going to do everybody October 1st, and then the mid-year is about -- the mid-year is about if we didn't

-- if we don't have enough money to finish out the year.

>> Pool: Mayor, that's what my direction intends and states.

>> Kitchen: Okay, I just want to make that clear.

>> Mayor Adler: Is director --

[10:50:37 AM]

is she here? Okay, can you come and join us? Oh, there you are.

>> Yes, thank you so much. Hi. Good morning. Joya Hayes, hr director. Council member kitchen is correct. When we execute the budget for October 1st, we will do all pay raises. We will immediately then go work with departments to address any unknown consequences due to this change and address those compression issues, not peer-to-peer, but based on the payroll systems and authority. And if there is a need for additional funds, as council member kitchen articulated, that would be a part of a mid-year amendment. But hrd does have the authority to address any compression issues without having to come back to council for that review.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, so I'm a little confused now. So, my understanding was that we were taking everybody to \$20, and that's the easy part. And then there was a certain level of compression that you were going to take care of and

[10:51:38 AM]

you had a formula for being able to take care of that -- I'm going to call that the first level of compression.

>> Yes, sir.

>> Mayor Adler: And then it was my understanding that after you implemented the first level of compression, that there still might be additional compression-like issues that have to be -- that directors or supervisors would be coming up and saying, you took everybody to 20, which was great. You handled that first level of compression and you explained to us in detail how you're going to handle that first level of compression. And I understood that that's what we were funding. And that if there were additional compression elements that came up this the supervisors or directors recognizing that, and if there wasn't enough money to do those things, that second level of compression, that you would be coming back to the council and saying, we did the 20, we did the first level of compression, as you've explained it to us, but you also think that it's raised these additional

[10:52:38 AM]

compression issues, which you told us might arise. You'll either take care of them, if you can, within the seven million, and if you can't, you'll be coming back to council at that point and saying, as concerns the second level of compression, if you want us to continue doing it, it's going to be X additional dollars and the council at that point can decide whether it wants to approve or is able to approve a budget amendment at that point. Is that right?

>> To a degree. I think the only part that needs clarification is that we will execute all issues of compression based on the actions of council today. I won't wait to take those actions. Council -- we will come back, if additional funds are needed, to carry out those actions to the end of the budget. But we will do all of the work to address compression and we will address it as is identified, and if departments

need additional funds or if the city needs more funds to cover that, they can come back for the mid-year.

[10:53:38 AM]

But I think the only clarity I'm making is that I will take all action to address all compression as is identified based on the \$20 an hour decision.

>> Kitchen: So mayor, that answers my question.

>> Mayor Adler: It doesn't answer mine, though. Because my concern is -- as you explained it to us first, director Hayes, as I recall, you said that you can do the 20, and then this is the compression-related work that you would initially implement. But you pointed out to us that that level of action related to compression might not be everything that would be indicated that we would need for compression. At this point, you didn't know how extensive that would be, or exactly what that would cost. So I was comfortable thinking you'll do the first level of compression, and then you'll come back and spend the 7 million, but if there are still further refinements that you want to make on compression, you would come back to council and ask for the dollars.

[10:54:39 AM]

What I'm concerned about is trying to do all of the levels of compression before you know what the final cost is going to be, and then put the council in a position next year where it can't finish the year because there's insufficient funds to do that, or potentially going back to employees and saying we gave you a certain amount of money associated with this second or third level of compression, and there's not money to make it through the rest of the year. So without knowing what that number was, and knowing that we were committing to \$7 million, we know that that will get us \$20 million, we know that will get us the first level of compression, but we don't know how refined a compression it would get. And my recommendation, colleagues, would be that you don't commit to employees to do that until you know that you can

[10:55:39 AM]

do that. But what we can commit is we're going to the 20. Everybody gets that. And we're going to tell director Hayes to do that first level of compression as she had explained to us. And then work with the supervisors and the directors and then come back and say whenever it's appropriate for budget amendment to say, if you want to do this as it shakes out through the whole system, this is what it would cost. I'm just concerned about you guys being caught mid-year in something that you can't finish.

>> Renteria: Mayor, I think you said 20 million.

>> Mayor Adler: I meant \$20 an hour. Thank you.

>> Pool: I think what director Hayes and what our budget officer and our cfo would tell us is she can't spend money that hasn't been allocated to her, appropriated to her. So there is a natural stopping point at the amount that you're talking about, the 7 million. She would have to come back. And I didn't hear her promising that these additional changes

[10:56:40 AM]

would be made because that would be a decision of the sitting council at the time. So I think your concern that we not predict whether we can or cannot do it is appropriate, because we don't know.

>> Mayor Adler: Well, this would be my question on that. If director Hayes thinks that she can do the \$20 an hour, which I understand she does, and she thinks she can do a first level of compression, which I understand is most likely, she can execute those things right away, and starting in October, everybody has those. But what I am unclear of is whether she can do the third level of compression or the fourth level of compression. Now, she could do those things with the \$7 million, but she might be coming back to you to say, I did these things. But they're only going to last until March. Because there's no money to do it past March. At which point, the council is going to have a choice to make. It's either going to have to find the money to make it last past March, or it's going to

[10:57:40 AM]

have to tell people in March, those things that you got in October in the third and fourth level of compression, we can't sustain, and what I thought we were doing is the first level and the second level, and she would be coming back, either doing the other things, if she knew within the \$7 million the ability to carry through the year, but if she was doing anything that she wasn't sure in the 7 that she could carry through the year, those would be the things she would be coming back to council with before she implemented them. What I heard this morning is different.

>> Kitchen: So, mayor, let me just say, I agree with you.

>> Pool: I do think that director Hayes is trying to say that.

>> If I could bring some clarity. We gave you a 5.5 to \$10.7 million range as to how much this could potentially cost. You provided us \$7 million. In the next coming weeks, as we committed, we will work with departments to ensure we have a good understanding as to what the compression cost will be, so

[10:58:41 AM]

that we would be able to give you a more exact amount as we've done with the \$18. As we talked about yesterday also, though, there are other factors considering the fact that many of our temps are not coming back until next summer, we may have a lot more information by that time. We also have vacancy savings. We don't know how quickly these positions will be filled, and so there may be a capacity to cover this cost this year based on where we are with vacancy savings. But in addressing your concern of cost, if we don't have the funds, we will not come back and we won't spend what we don't have authority to spend, but we also have the controls of holding positions vacant longer and doing other things within the departments to adjust until we can get that information to you. So we're really just looking at giving us enough time to determine if 7.7 will meet the needs with the \$20 an hour since we've given you a range. And so we will have the capacity to come back and departments have the capacity to manage some of this within their departments

[10:59:43 AM]

with their vacancy savings and with their positions as we prepare to come back to council.

>> Mayor Adler: So, one last question, and then we'll go to council member kitchen. You're not going to give anybody a compression related pay increase, that when you give it, anything you do you know that you're going to be able to sustain through the year, even without a budget amendment. And if you can't sustain it through the year, you're not going to do it. That's what I wanted to make sure. Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kelly: I apologize sphwror deucing confusion. What you just said and what sh just said is what I meant. So the first level-compression and then we'll go from there.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. We need to write anything else out in that direction, or -- director Hayes, let us know. Okay. Yes.

>> I'm being told there's an update to the numbers for the whole blood program. My staff is working through that right now. The numbers may change slightly.

[11:00:46 AM]

Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Before we take recess, any big ideas or questions?

>> Mayor, bringing forward, an amendment should be just a moment to reduce the \$5 million on rental assistance to \$3 million, again, just in the spirit of trying to make some room and get the budget to balance. I should have that momentarily. I just wanted to give the dais a heads up.

>> Mayor Adler: That's good to know.

>> The guidance was also to give housing more flexibility and -- or, for example, homeless prevention, but just to give them flexibility and to be able to adjust to the need as it develops.

>> Mayor Adler: Will those uses allow for it to be used for

[11:01:47 AM]

in climate weather, shelter?

>> That's a good question. We left -- we put the language in as broad as possible and are asking them to come back and report to us, I believe before the end of the year in terms of where they want to direct the money.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: It sounds like there would be flexibility to use it for legal assistance, right?

>> That would also be one of the -- not really knowing what the needs are. And there are some programs that are being started. Others that are being wound down. Covid-type programs that are being wound down, so staff just wanted flexibility in terms of programming a certain number into a certain program, but larger bucket would be for emergency rental assistance, would be for tenant relocation, would be for legal assistance in eviction proceedings and also for homeless prevention -- homelessness prevention. So that would be the -- I should

[11:02:48 AM]

have the language for y'all here in just a little bit.

>> Mayor Adler: That sounds good. Councilmember Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I have another idea or thought to suggest. Is this the time?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, sure.

>> Kitchen: I wanted to ask that we consider -- you know, we have -- in the ongoing pot we have a number of proposals, quite a few of the proposals that have additional ftes. So I wanted to suggest that we put all the ftes in at half a year instead of a full year. And that we take a look at what that would do to help us with the ongoing bucket. The reason I'm suggesting that is just to take into account that it takes a while to hire people. And unless there was some specific reason that we could -- should put it for the whole year, I think it makes more sense to put it at a half year. And I think that would help us significantly with our ongoing pot of funds. And the ones that I identified

[11:03:49 AM]

that are that way, if I'm understanding people's proposals, I'm not suggesting that we cut any of it. I'm just suggesting that we keep all these ftes. We just look at them at half a year. So that would be the permanent lifeguards, the dual language summer camp has an fte in it, the sexual assault response has ftes, the district level planning is already in at half a year for the ftes. The -- the disease -- the disease response would be at half -- ftes there that could be at half a year. There's the facilities security and access which has an fte that could be at half a year. The grants for innovation program manager has an fte that could be at half a year. Age-friendly fte could be cut to half a year. The pard signage and wage signing would be cut to half a year. And I think the pard facilities maintenance has cut to half a

[11:04:50 AM]

year. So that would just be a suggestion for people to think about. I think it could be helpful to us in getting to a number for ongoing that balances.

>> Ed, can you take a look at those and see what that would be? Thank you.

>> We may not agree with that.

>> I was just going to comment.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand. Do people want to comment on that? That would be appropriate. Go ahead, council tovo and then mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: I appreciate that suggestion and understand that's probably the appropriate action given the hiring. I do think though that we need to look really closely at that because obviously if they're going, they're going to all need to be funded in next year's budget and it does really make next year even tighter. My approach for these ft E6789s, I'm going to be

[11:05:52 AM]

looking at them closely. Among my budget changes, I've only suggested one new fte and that's something we can talk about. Some of what I'm proposing within that can be done without an fte and that may be a conversation we need to have. I'm just very mindful that in the next couple of years it's going to be a really tight budget. And making a commitment to bring on a new staff member is something we should think about carefully and look at all of those ftes and determine which are the areas are the highest priority and then look at maybe reducing to those costs but not to add additional ftes just to make true-up what I think is more likely, which is, as councilmember kitchen said, they would be hired half year. Among the different budget items in front of us I think we should in particular really scrutinize all the ftes but we are suggesting adding a good number. We don't ever want to see the

[11:06:53 AM]

city manager in a position where they need to consider laying folks off.

>> Mayor Adler: I couldn't tell if your hand was raised or not.

>> I agree with councilmember tovo, I think a half year is too far. I'll take a look and see which ones we could move to nine months but not all of them can be. And we are in the process of getting some numbers from health, for instance, and going beyond that would mean we wouldn't have epidemiologists at the period that we need them. For instance. And they triple C'ed the people in position. They're relatively easy to hire and I don't think that assumption is true for all of those. I think there may be an opportunity for the signage to do something and certainly in some other cases, I don't think

[11:07:55 AM]

a blanket six-month is appropriate and leaves us in a lurch for next year. I would not be comfortable with that. I think we should be looking at it very specifically and while there are some -- there are also some ftes, that I think too many ftes for us to be having, we already have, you know, your proposal, you know, you made it look low for the -- for the district by having it half and then next year we're going have to pay the full amount, which is fine and they may not be able to get them on for the half year so that was probably appropriate. But if we do that over and over again, we create challenges for next year for those of us who are doing the budget next year to have to deal with. And I don't want to create those kinds of challenges.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just a question for Ed. When -- in looking at -- first off, you know, if it's appropriate to look at nine months versus half year, that's fine. I'm just -- I just suggested

[11:08:55 AM]

this as a way to consider. And people know their own proposals better so I'm just asking people to look at their own proposals. I would also ask Ed, I don't want assume this will create problems for next year. Ed, I don't know if it's possible given the time frame. If as you look at -- as the mayor asked you to look at what it would be to reduce these, if it's possible, maybe you could look on the impact next year. Because I don't want to -- I don't -- I hear what people are saying but I don't want to not do something because we're assuming it's going to have a huge impact next year. Again, I don't know if you can look --

I don't know if it's possible to give us any read on that or not. And so just invite you to look at it if you can.

>> I can just tell you generally what we do is for positions, the budget, when staff recommends a position, we fund them for nine months because we know it's going to take time from the day the fiscal year begins to

[11:09:58 AM]

recruitment and get them onboard, you're not going to have the person for a full year. What we try to avoid though doing is saying, well, we'll just wait until June or July or August or September to staff the person, just because that allows us to get more positions in and kicks the can down the road on the funding until the next fiscal year. But we do try to recognize that, yeah, these positions are going to be vacant for a while as we work to get them filled. We use nine months on the staff side.

>> Kitchen: Then maybe the appropriate thing to do is look at nine months. So mayor pro tem, I don't put mine in there to make it look lower. I put it in there --

>> Alter: I didn't mean that but it looks lower for the ongoing costs.

>> Kitchen: I put it in there just recognizing it would take a while to -- you know, to fill it, so if the example is nine months, you know, if that's our practice. So if our practice is nine months, maybe we just go back and look at these ftes at nine

[11:10:58 AM]

months for all of them and see what that would do because I know some of these are in here at full year. Maybe that would be helpful to see what that looks like.

>> That recognizing it's not going to be appropriate for us to apply that in all cases we can have those conversations later. Just to have the data to tell us what nine month at the placement would be, except for the one where the proposal was to start it at six months.

>> Kitchen: No, mayor, if we -- I would like mine to look at nine months also.

>> Mayor Adler: Nine months for them. Okay. Colleagues, I heard director Hayes say if we went to the \$20 an hour we probably did not do the stipend fund. So unless people felt differently about that, that's probably a million dollars we could take out of the one-time list.

[11:11:59 AM]

>> Mayor --

>> Mayor Adler: By the way, I think that balances us in the one-time fund category with those changes, people have just said, not that it's going to stay that way. Relatively close to that. I think there's still going to be perhaps movements to go back and forth and we haven't finalized anything. I would also point out on the ongoing number, I think our asks total a little over \$12 million. We've just talked about doing \$7 million for the \$20 an hour. That means there's about -- pardon me. About 15 disz million -- just over \$15 million in total asks in ongoing. If we take out the 7, that means we have about \$8 million in asks still represented by what people have suggested. And we only have about \$5 million available. So there's probably about \$3 million in the ongoing right

[11:13:01 AM]

now that we're over what the allotment is. Okay. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Which item? Which amendment number was the million dollars in stipend?

>> Mayor Adler: It was Adler 2.

>> The strategic stipend fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> May, you I have a question.

>> I'd like to clarify earlier. So the amendment that I have with the implementation of funds for simulation training and whole blood program, the numbers I gave was just for reducing the whole blood component on that. So we still have the mannequins at a million for the one time out of the general fund and ongoing of 20,000. That's for a subscription.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the total for Kelly 2, what is the total one time?

>> Kelly: It would be 15 -- \$1.5 million.

>> Thank you very much.

[11:14:01 AM]

>> And.

>> 220 in ongoing, 1.5 in one time.

>> Mayor Adler: Ongoing did not change. Stayed at 220?

>> Yes. That's for both the simulation training and whole blood program because they are together on the amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And separately what would they be?

>> Separately we have 500,000 one-time for the whole blood and -- I'm so sorry.

>> 200 for the whole blood.

>> Yes.

>> And 20 for the simulation for ongoing.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: And 1 million for the one-time simulation.

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Forget what I said about balancing on one time. Okay.

>> I have a --

>> Mayor Adler: Any other thoughts -- questions? Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I was unclear. Just a question, really here.

[11:15:03 AM]

Not a suggestion or anything but just a question. On the -- on the one-time, there was some back and forth about the social service cost of living increase. I don't know if councilmember tovo intended to include that or not? She may need to think about it.

>> Tovo: Sure. Well, that was a conversation I wanted to have on this dais, but, yes, certainly I intended for us to discuss whether to include it, which is why I brought about that amendment and phrased it the way I did, that we have those two options before us. It is a big ticket, a large cost, but it is also I think very much in line with what we're trying to do, which is to make sure that the people who are serving this community are also compensated at a level where they can meet their own basic needs. So I -- I guess I just open it up to you all. We had a little conversation about this yesterday late in the

[11:16:05 AM]

afternoon about the purpose of those. And, you know, I guess I would welcome our Austin public health director's thoughts on it as well. But just know again, as we discussed yesterday, our contracts are not subject to the living wage. And many of the people who are part of some -- some of these contracts are not making a living wage. And so this is an attempt to help -- you know, we had, again, they had analyzed -- we had asked our staff last year to analyze this issue and they came back with these different

options for us to consider. But I would welcome our public health director talking about -- talking to us about that, if that's of interest. Colleagues, what's your thoughts on this issue at the moment?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool and then mayor pro tem.

[11:17:07 AM]

>> Pool: I was looking at that. That was one of the amendments I had a question on. I was curious, two options. One is renegotiate with an increase. Which would be kind of -- be a standard approach. And the other is simply to add 2% to the contracts. And what I don't know is.

[No audio] Potentially equally if not all important what are the fund-raising activities of these different nonprofits that we're contracting with because we're not the sole source of their revenues and I would really like to see how robust they are available to -- I mean, the reason they're a nonprofit is because they are able to raise monies. And I don't know what that matches. I don't know what that share is. So those were the questions that I was raising about the two different options that were part of the amendment that you had. And of the two, I preferred negotiating the increases because there's more information provided and it gives the city

[11:18:07 AM]

an opportunity to focus on encouraging additional fund-raising, which I think is necessary, as opposed to simply awarding a 2% across the board because we don't have as much control over it and we don't know where it would be spent.

>> It would be a good question. Thank you for those questions. It would be a good question to our Austin public health whether we could control it. Whether we could tie that 2% increase to salaries. I mean, if we're asking them, if we go with the first option of just asking them affording them to opportunity to restructure their contract, you know, there's got to be -- the money has to come from somewhere, right? It just means they're going to be able to do less in terms of the people they're serving, quite possibly. Where else would the money come from? I think most of the nonprofits who we have contracts with are also engaged in fund-raising.

>> Pool: That's the piece I'm

[11:19:08 AM]

focusing on. I don't have information about what their fupped fund-raising muscle is like but I would hope it's very good here in Austin because it's a generous community. We have been talk for many years

now about the participation of the private sector with our nonprofits and helping with these social services. And it's essential that they step up and help us with the funding across the board. And it has been difficult. It is not made easier if we continue simply to add our increase hour contributions when nobody else is increasing theirs. So without issuing the indictments across it, I don't know what it would accomplish with the nonprofits we're contracting with and I think that's an essential piece of information in knowing how to evaluate this particular amendment.

>> Tovo: I think -- and I would expect -- that those are

[11:20:08 AM]

considerations that our staff take into account when they're evaluating which organizations to award contracts to. You know, these are organizations that have already gone through that vetting process and if all is working as it should, those should be very important criteria for our staff to consider as they're determining which organizations are most responsive and are in the strongest financial position to carry out the services we've requested. So you know, again, that is probably a question to ask our staff. But I would absolutely hope that we're awarding contracts to groups that are also making good faith attempts to raise money and to increase that. I think we all probably know that it's -- it is not an easy -- it is not an easy feat. And that Austin actually, I would ask mayor pro tem alter to talk about this because this is closer to her area, but Austin compared to other cities is not as generous as other places who

[11:21:08 AM]

have longer and more robust histories of philanthropy. But I'm out of my wheelhouse on that one.

>> Alter: Thank you. Councilmember tovo, I appreciate you bringing this forward and I have been -- as we're going through this amendment process I was planning to bring an ifc that was brought in I think 2016 by councilmember Garza to be upgrading our investments in our social service contracts. I still may do something like that. So I appreciate you bringing this forward. I favor the first option because I don't think 2% is enough. And I think if we are going to have money available for ongoing funds next year, we should be prioritizing this area, and that the increase needs to be more than 2% woo going to make a meaningful difference in the ability to employ folks and

[11:22:09 AM]

certainly would welcome, if we end up much more flush than we are anticipating at this point, doing that mid year if necessary for the timing of the contracts. But I -- I think the first option is a better option and you and I can maybe work on an ifc that fleshes out more direction on this if we have time, you know, to do that before December. I think that would probably be a better path for our social service

agencies because they would have more money and we could ask the -- the aph to be looking at that when they're doing their contracts in the first place to anticipate how we might do that.

>> Thanks. I think that's an interesting direction and just as a point of history, actually councilmember

[11:23:10 AM]

Morrison was the one who sort of set us on this path with her ifc to look at social service contracts that are executed through public health and really work to get our social service contracts and to invest in that area at a level that our community needed. And then the 10-1 council and councilmember Garza picked that up. As we were talking about yesterday, I think important to recognize that's often it takes multiple people to really get something to focus.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. I appreciate what everyone is saying. I really appreciate you bringing this up, councilmember tovo. I think it's really important for our social service agencies. And I think that the -- I'm liking the suggestion that the mayor pro tem made because that might let us get to the point where, you know, where we're really aligning the amount with

[11:24:12 AM]

the particular entities and across the board 2% is probably not going to be enough and it might not make sense for all of them. So I like the idea that the mayor pro tem is addressing. This needs to be addressed and I appreciate you bringing it forward. But that would be my suggestion if I understood what both of you just said.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: One more thing I just need to mention before we make it a decision on this. A couple of years ago we had a conversation about front steps. I think we were able to put some additional funding into the contract for the arch to address it. The front steps employees serving at the arch is doing a difficult job were not making a living wage. That is probably true for some of our other organizations, too. And with all of these organizations, I know councilmember pool, just back to the fund-raising conversation, I'm not aware, maybe public health is, but I'm not aware of

[11:25:13 AM]

any of these organizations that for which we are the sole source. They are, again, even front steps who in their height were doing kind of an annual fund-raising were not able to pay their employees a living

wage. One concern I have about the approach -- I appreciate what you're saying, mayor pro tem about doing a more full analysis that might yield better investments in our social service contracts but I do think we need to recognize that at the same time thinking about paying our city employees a living wage, which is absolutely essential, this would delay for some of those employees at our social service agencies that are doing really important work in the community as well, in partnership with the city, it will delay that quite a bit. So I don't -- I don't know how we square that. I do think you said -- what I guess I would be comfortable with in your approach, if that's the way the city wants to go, is

[11:26:16 AM]

making sure we get that done soon enough to be able to have the information back from mid-year budget amendment. If that's possible. I don't know if it is. Perhaps if we did budget direction today, I don't know.

>> Mayor Adler: This is a hard one for me for the reasons that you brought it. And I think it's really important. We have a group of workers in our community that are doing work associated with our highest priority, which was dealing with homelessness. And they're not being paid what they need to be paid to be able to survive. I think that impacts the ability to provide the services. And I think at a time right now where we're trying to significantly expand our capacity with the money that we have invested and the community response, the finding home, we're trying to increase capacity. I don't want any organization to lose people, so coming to them even with a 2% at this point I

[11:27:18 AM]

think may -- may help provide for people. So I would want to think about this one because this one, as I look through this list and I try to relate it back to our priorities, I think keeping this this one in some way and hoping to have the conversation, but I think that this is one that hits really directly with what our highest priority is at a time when it's going to be important to expand the people. And I think -- obviously we're going to have to cut \$3 million from some places so we so have a lot of work to do. But just by way of expressing kind of relative position, there's almost \$700,000 here for the school programs. I know we've had this discussion each time about what is the responsibility or commitment of the city with respect to the school programs, with the aid and that's always hard because every one of the programs are

[11:28:19 AM]

really good. And past years what we've said is we'll do part of it but we're not going to do all of it. And that's how we progressed. Councilmember Tovo has been a champion on this. And is coming back and

asking us, let's fund the part that we have not agreed to fund in the past. But for me, I would probably stay with the decisions that we've made in the past. I would keep the aid levels constant where they are in the base budget. I wouldn't add additional money for aid because my preference would be to help get a living -- closer to a higher wage for people that are doing the work with people in our community that are experiencing need as expressed in our social service contracts. Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: I agree with you, mayor. We also have a committee that -- that overlooks a lot of these

[11:29:20 AM]

funding for these nonprofits. The community development commission, I think we should task them because they overlook all the federal money that comes for housing, health, and homes. And so I think that they're the ones that listens to all the nonprofit that come through there and are requesting funding. It would be great to have that commission look into that and see what kind of recommendation they can come up with.

>> Mayor Adler: We're not going resolve this one as we sit at the Dais but it's a good conversation.

>> Tovo: Couple of thoughts. First, we talked about -- mayor, I meant to make this point so I'm glad you did. I attended some of the workshops that were part of the homelessness summit. And I heard again and again from

[11:30:20 AM]

different organizations this challenge of having enough people on their staff to meet this need. And that as a system in the city we don't have enough capacity in terms of people who are doing this work from case management to other kinds of things. So you know, we have invested red, as you said, we have invested in building tax in our homelessness response system and we can't do that if we're not willing to pay people a living wage. So I agree with you. I think it supports our other investments. I do not agree, however, with the place that you chose to go in terms of looking for funding but I would like to say, and councilmember vela, I wish we had an opportunity to talk that off the table and not reveal it now but I would ask you during the break to consider paying the employees who work for these agencies not a living wage but -- because they, again, are not -- this is not intended oh

[11:31:22 AM]

an anti-displacement measure and if perhaps we could look to the \$3 million, I know you reduced it from 5, but if we could look to that \$3 million and use it for this purpose, I think it is aimed at assisting the same folks. I throw that out there for consideration. In regard to aid funding, this is not keeping

them constant, this is restoring them to where they were. Let me make sure I have it right because I don't want to mislead -- to fiscal year '21 levels. So it is -- it is actually in fiscal year -- this would set them at the same amount they had in fiscal year '21. I do agree with a point that councilmember pool mentioned earlier. We do need other -- we do need other organizations to step up and do more in all of these areas. I would suggest we continue to encourage our partners over at Travis county to invest in some of these areas as well. They were at one point -- they

[11:32:24 AM]

were providing some funding for the aid parent/teacher support specialists who serve whole families, not just the students, they no longer do. There are some other things like that where I think our other public partners would be encouraged to invest. I feel strongly that investing in -- investing in these programs is one way we ensure an educated, thriving workforce for the future, so I think these are not just programs that benefit those students and these families but it also benefits our economy, to make sure that people are -- that our students across the district, across the city are well educated, that they have healthy, productive activities to go to after school. Those are anti-crime prevention measures, frankly, to have productive things after school. And these are serving some of our highest need students in the city. And I believe it's extremely important. And having mentioned at least

[11:33:24 AM]

one item where I would look in terms of my priorities, I would -- I have a couple others in mind but I'm going to save them for later. I do think, too, mayor, as we look to funding this, I know you brought forward some ongoing funding for echo that I would like to ask you to consider as well. This is another -- this is an area where, as we all know, we have invested strongly in. Additional investments in the homeless response system I would put my weight on -- it's a hard choice but I would -- we haven't had an opportunity really to talk about that amendment for echo and it just came in, I think, this week or last week. But that is a group that we have asked to -- who has indicated that they would assist in raising funding and have been certainly an active partner. And I appreciate -- I appreciate all of their work. But if I had to invest in one or another here, which we are now at the point where we're going

[11:34:25 AM]

to have to make those choices, I would suggest that we get that \$500,000 from that measure and put it toward the social service contracts. And I think -- I'm hopeful the staff's estimates of that \$500 now from the parking garage makes up some of the rest of it. Is that something you would consider? Let's think about it over the break.

>> Mayor Adler: This was a priority of hers, also, in the system that we're trying to set up. But I understand that and again, we're going to have to find dollars from somewhere to be able to cut. The school stuff, I mean, all of it, you know, just really, really important. The school stuff, we also raised the question should we be spending money in Del Valley and other school districts. I know this gets them back to '21. I know it gets back to the '21 levels we considered as a

[11:35:26 AM]

council to -- every year we talk about getting money for aid. Every year we say do it one more year but you have to cover it in next year's. And they set priorities. They know better than we do, I think, where their priorities are with respect to school programs. I think it's perfectly appropriate for aid to compete with our social service contracts and say we think that this program is -- should be the priority. But I would rather have aid compete for the social service contracts and have their proposals make it or not on the merits in that kind of competitive situation with other people who are also doing really good and important things in the community. But I also take a look at the question that you raised and talk to some of our staff on that as well. Let's give other people a chance to talk and we'll make sure we

[11:36:26 AM]

come back to you to do that. Councilmember pool and then mayor pro tem.

>> Pool: Mayor, the suggestion that you're making about aid, you're saying to continue them at the level they were in the budget for last year and simply not increasing it?

>> Mayor Adler: Staying with the base budget which I think has funding for aid.

>> Pool: Right. Listeners might have missed that piece. I would be supportive of continuing what we have in the base budget. I, too, have been very much a proponent of the expanded tutorial and after-school care for aid, recognizing the particular difficulties that that unique school district has with recapture that is not visited by any other school district in the state, in my understanding. I'm intrigued by the idea of having aid come in through the contracting with the negotiations. That is also of interest to me. Maybe that would be a direction

[11:37:29 AM]

for next year. But I support leaving the budget for aid after-school care the way it is in the proposed draft.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Pool: With no increases.

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

>> Alter: Thank you. I just want to chime in here because I think it's important that we have an understanding of what happened. So they went through the contract process this year. The amount they could get was lower than their past funding because their funding was reduced during covid and during covid they couldn't spend it all because the kids were not in school. So they were limited for how much they could even ask for in the process because of all the rules that were around the contracting process. So it was determined from to get-go that they had to be lower than what they needed and they couldn't actually even sort of apply for it. So at a time post-covid when they need these services the most, and when you have inflation, we're giving them less. So this amendment is trying to

[11:38:30 AM]

help our children to be able to transition in this period post-covid. And there are a lot of kids who need these tutoring, they need the after-school programs. The parents need the support. And even title I schools that I think don't have these kinds of supports. So I think that's really important. I'm intrigued by your suggestion to pull a million of one-time funding to provide that to the social service contracts. Maybe 2% in the interim to increase that through a more thorough process to figure out how over time we can provide more resources to them for their staff in particular. And then this question of whether aid should compete, then we should probably be asking the question should echo be competing for that. And I know it's not written to give it to echo but it's being talked about as if it's for

[11:39:32 AM]

echo. So there's -- we need to be consistent how we're thinking and talking about things.

>> Mayor Adler: I agree. I think they should compete and that's why it was drafted that way. I think that's an example of the use, just take school program would be an example of a use. But I agree with you they should compete, as should, I believe, everybody, that's going -- when we try to move to non-competitive processes or award people moneys to people we already know, it creates issues. I agree with that.

>> Alter: I just want to point out for the sexual response amendment, those people are already in the positions. The grant is out. So if you don't provide the funding then we're -- there's real people that would not be funded. So that's why I think this really has to be looked at by the people who are proposing it to see what's doable and how that works. So I think that's also important.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[11:40:34 AM]

Councilmember Kelly, then councilmember Renteria and then kitchen.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I may have missed this. Cost of living increases for social service agreements. I was just wondering, is there a mechanism or something the city can do to guarantee that that cost of living increase actually goes directly to the person who we want to have paid more? Because I'm not sure that once we, as a city, expend the funds we're able to put controls on that in that way. I didn't know if you knew or if staff knows.

>> Good morning mp Adrian centerrupp, Austin public health. Through the negotiation process we could stipulate where we would want the funding to go. I do want to point out oorg though

[11:41:35 AM]

that we fund programs not not agencies. So a 2% increase might not automatically correlate to a cost of living increase for a staff person.

>> That's helpful to know. Is there any way to ensure that they comply with it?

>> Through the contract management process and the way they submit invoices, that would be checked on a monthly basis. And then through our monitoring processes, we make sure that agencies are keeping in compliance with the terms and conditions of their contract.

>> Okay. Thank you. That's all I have on that. And then, mayor Adler, with amendment number -- yeah, amendment number 2, for the human resources department, to do targeted recruiting and retention efforts for specific departments, I would like to understand if that includes our sworn positions, if they would have access to that recruiting and retention specifically because we have such high

[11:42:37 AM]

vacancy rates in public safety. I want to ensure that they are able to utilize that as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Adler two --

>> It got taken off. Sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay. Is councilmember harper-madison with us? Hang on one second. Is councilmember harper-madison with us? Earlier -- earlier. We haven't taken any record votes on anything yet. And that includes the \$7 million. But what we did do was the councilmember asked for an ability to express their support or interest in that. There will be a vote later on. Did you also want to be able to speak to that?

>> Councilmember

hear-madison: I would like to. I was operating on assumptions. I can remain out of view but it's such an important vote I want for folks who didn't see me

[11:43:40 AM]

on camera, it's not a matter of -- it's a matter of circumstance and not a matter of support. I appreciate you allowing me the opportunity to weigh in. I'll go back off-camera.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: I want to ask a question on your amendment, which I signed on to support on the homeless crisis response system capacity development of \$406,000. Is that on top of heal?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Renteria: Another comment I want to make about funding Austin, it's very concerning that, you know, we -- the city has to go out and fund these after-school programs when we have ptas in the west side that are sitting on hundreds of

[11:44:40 AM]

thousands of dollars. I mean, Austin high school pta raises more than \$100,000 a year for their after-school program while we got east side memorial who are lucky to raise \$100 for their after-school program. So that's the inequity that we have in this city, is that we do have a lot of these fundraisers but not on the east side. And I had really hoped that Austin ISD can address that issue. I think they have tried and I think the state got involved and told us -- told the schools they couldn't do that. But it's very unfortunate that here we are one of the richest cities in the state and we can't adequately fund our schools and

[11:45:40 AM]

our after school program for our kids, especially on the east side, because we're a rich school district and robin hood takes all of our money away from us and leave us as the poorest school district on the east side but not on the west side.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Councilmember kitchen was next and then councilmember tovo.

>> Kitchen: I just had a follow-up question. Mayor pro tem, I want to make sure I understood. So on the sexual assault response amendment -- let me start by saying, thank you for bringing this. I fully support

it. I may have been reading it wrong. I was thinking that it said the dedicated crime analyst was a new fte and that was the only fte in the proposal and that was the only one I was looking at to see if less than a full year would be appropriate. Is that not right?

>> That is correct. The other positions are grant

[11:46:41 AM]

funded positions that are -- they are currently at -- obviously they would have to compete with those, however that would work because it would be an extension because that was a grant. I don't know how that would work but they're actual people in those roles at safe who if we don't have funding, safe will not be able to fund. They're not ftes in our 3wud budget.

>> Kitchen: Okay. The only one I was looking at that might potentially make sense for not a full year was the one dedicated crime analyst. Not the other position.

>> I think we can certainly do the crime analyst for nine months. We're checking on the epidemiologist. We don't want to go below nine months but I think -- we're trying to understand if they can -- if they're able to hire right away, given monkeypox, etcetera, that we would need to get in there right away. We're trying to figure out that

[11:47:42 AM]

one.

>> Kitchen: Okay. That answers my question.

>> Alter: And for accc it doesn't help because there are people there and they have to do the others. I don't think you can reduce that. We can reduce it for the wayfinding.

>> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Thank you.

>> Alter: At least in terms of the amount of money because they may choose to find money. They may choose to find money to do it sooner, but in terms of the amount of money, we can. And it's not so much that it would on an ongoing basis like the bank but it would contribute to our ability to get things done.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: I appreciate that. Would you go through that one more time?

>> Alter: So I think within the per there's a crime analyst that could go down to nine months. You have to be careful, I don't know how you figure out the amount because we have retirement and other stuff in there and I don't know if it just scales down. That one is the only one within

[11:48:43 AM]

per. Within the signage and wayfinding you could go down to nine months. But I think part could decide if they have the fte if they want to do sooner. And then for accc it doesn't work because the people are already there and they would be able to hire. And then for public health, I'm trying to figure out if -- can't go below nine months but I think two of them -- I'm trying to figure out if we can do two at full time but two at nine, nine months, but I'm figuring that out because that's such a pressing need with monkeypox, et cetera, right now. So we're working on that.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I had some comments I needed to make about aid. My colleague, councilmember Renteria is off the dais now and

[11:49:44 AM]

I think it's really important for him to hear the information I was about to provide. About where students are who are served by this. So how soon are we breaking?

>> Mayor Adler: I would say pretty soon.

>> Tovo: I'm going say it and then I'm going to say it again. If that's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: That will be fine.

>> Tovo: The situation councilmember Renteria, I thought the district instituted a policy about ptas, so I'm not up to date so I'm not going to discuss it. The fact of the matter is this program is serving all title I schools and it is designed to address the inequities in our educational system and other systems that I think were the substance of what councilmember Renteria were describing. So of those served in the last year, you know, in 2021 to 2022, the schools served at widen, oak

[11:50:45 AM]

springs, Lankford and martin middle school, and those are range from 90% students on free or reduced lunch. Councilmember Renteria, I'm going to backtrack. I appreciate the comments you raised and I think they were important ones. I think it is ultimately a huge problem that our state funds education at the rate it does. We have a terribly broken school financing system. And I know that this council has joined lawsuits and expressed support for changes in a variety of ways. That's ultimately what needs to happen. In the meantime, I think it is a municipal purpose for us to do what we can to shore up some of these programs that are helping Austin families. So I'm -- that's one of the reasons I'm so passionate

about it. I was also saying I believe aid has addressed one of the issues you discussed with regard to the pta funding but I'm not educated on that at the moment so I'm not going to speak to it. But it is one of -- the

[11:51:46 AM]

situation you described is one of the reasons why I think this program is so critical because while a lot of families in this community can afford to pay for high quality after-school programming and tutoring, many families in this community cannot. And, you know, when we have that kind of disparity -- educational disparity we have to make sure that all of our students are served. So every one of these programs happens in a title I school. And I was just reading off, in 2021-2022 -- let me make sure I have the program right. This is victory tutorial. The schools that were served were Widen, Oak Springs, Lankford elementaries and Martin middle school and Widen is 90% -- 90.3% free and reduced lunch, students on free and reduced lunch, Oak Springs elementary, and I'm sure you may be familiar with these stats. Those -- of the students on free and reduced lunch, 97% of the

[11:52:49 AM]

student population, I mean, that is extraordinarily -- extraordinary situation when you have an elementary school where 97% are on free and reduced lunch. Lankford elementary, 95.5. Martin, 94% on free and reduced lunch. These programs are critical. You know, my daughter had a situation last year where she had no chemistry teacher for the first semester at Austin high. My family has the resources to hire a tutor late in the semester to get her that support. Every family in this -- and every student in this community should have access to the educational resources that they need to be successful, even when their families don't have the financial resources to help with that. And it would be great if our school system could provide this without our assistance but they're frankly not in the position to be able to do so. I have the schools that are served with primary time as well that I'm going to find here

[11:53:50 AM]

hopefully soon. Soon, just to emphasize these are needed programs. They're some of our highest needs schools. And it's frankly really critical that we do that. We'll have an opportunity to discuss the other part of my amendment, but I'm going to address it now because a couple of you have expressed a very different viewpoint about having it go through a social service contract. You know, before any of us were seated on this council, the city council passed at least one resolution, maybe two, expressing its commitment to be a strong partner to aid and to look for ways to help aid with the financial crisis they serve in. And some of that took the form of partnerships and swaps like providing warehouse space in

exchange for other things. We have -- we have a mandate before our council based on those former policy actions and those former policy statements to do what we can do to shore up what is the largest school

[11:54:51 AM]

district that falls within the city of Austin. It's not the only one but as councilmember pool said, it has an extremely unique financial stress that it's under because of the really broken state financing system. And so you know, we have the reason that we are exploring partnerships with aid is because of those multiple, multiple council actions that have said this is another public entity that is struggling. They're in a very desperate financial situation. And what happens within those schools and with those students and families matters to our city's success. So I don't think we should treat them like other organizations. They should be treated like a partner. I think we have to treat them differently. That's one of the reasons why I'm suggesting these also be added to the base budget so we're not year after year in a position of trying to determine whether these programs are going to be funded one year and some of you will remember this, you know, those after-school programs for those kids and those schools were going to be

[11:55:52 AM]

cut. Our not funding it is not -- I know nobody was suggested cutting the funding which I really appreciate. But the fact of the matter is that students will not be served if we can't -- if we can't continue this program year and year until and unless there are other solutions at the state level. So I appreciate all the past support for this. I would request you to really think about restoring the funding. Thanks, mayor pro tem, for explaining the funding situation better than I did and why they were -- how it was that they were reduced and why it is that we're requesting that increase.

>> Mayor Adler: Kowns criminal member Ellis.

>> Ellis: I appreciate councilmember tovo's comments. I was a parent at the time in elementary school when we lost our parent support specialist at plan toanl meantry.

[11:56:53 AM]

And then I was very appreciative when in that time frame the council offered funding to aid to restore the parent support specialist. It was a huge help. I will say that -- and as long as we have the money, I support continuing these programs, continuing to help aid. I understand the pressures that they're under. And again, like so many times on council, I think about the G.R.A.C.E. Act, the abortion, we're trying to fix problems that are created outside of our control. We have some of the worst funded

schools, we're under particular stress here in Austin. So here we come to help our school district. Now though we are also under fiscal pressure. We now these new 3.5% revenue caps. Looking down the road that does

[11:57:55 AM]

concern me in terms of are we going to be able to continue to maintain our support for aid, which has its own tax base, which has its own governing body. As long as we have the ability, like in this budget, I think we should do it. Long term, there's questions. Are going to be able to budget the population needs as the budget grows higher than 3 1/2%. One last comment, we should explore additional, not just that, but Round Rock, other districts within the city of us Austin. I would like -- would prefer that the -- we execute -- and again, I may be unaware that there is one out there, interlevel government agreements with aid, more formal with the time frame, with goals, with something a little bit more

[11:58:55 AM]

structured than to just kind of give one-time funding. I would like to be a little more strategic in long term in our approach to those then than just kind of doing it on an ad hoc basis every year.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Are we ready to break for lunch? Okay.

>> One last thing. I just want to call your attention to the budget rider which has additional stats about prime time and Victoria -- and victory tutorial for your -- for your reference. And you'll see that the schools -- the schools within prime time -- anyway, you can read it. But it's -- it is budget rider number 4 and it provides a lot of information about prime time whoond it's serving. There are 27 schools all designated as title I. It is primarily serving students of color over the last five

[11:59:58 AM]

years. And 74% were economically disadvantaged. 45% identified as limited English proficiency. And then there are more stats to explain more details. But I just -- before this goes much further I just want to say, we have and continue to fund programs in other school districts. We fund preschool programs in Dell valley, we have funded caregivers, meals in Dell valley during the pandemic. We also eks tended the offer of caregiver meals to several other school districts within the city of Austin during that period of time. And I think it's just an important recognition. We also have seven or eight school districts within the city of Austin but they are all in very, very different financial situations. And not all of them are subject to recapture, so they're not sending their money back to the state for redistribution. Austin independent school district, I believe now I'm going to not do the stat, but I bet mayor pro tem alter can.

[12:01:00 PM]

We send more money back to the state where we're nearly at the point sending more money back to the state than states here locally. And serving other school districts, I think it's an important thing to be considering and to be mindful of that we do have these other school districts but none of them are in the financial straits that ISD is. That's just the fact of the matter.

>> I'm just going to add the statistic because it's an important one. We'll be sending over \$800 million to the state for recapture. That's more than we spend on aid, the entire district. And it's more than we're taking in for the o&m budget for the city.

>> Mayor Adler: I would point out we talked about this, just because I think it's important, the fact that we're having to send so much back to the state and it doesn't get reinvested in

[12:02:00 PM]

education is outrageous. And the problem is with the state reinvestment and how it spends the money, not so much with the concept of a plan that makes sure that there's equal spending in schools across the state. Aisd sends back way too much money. It leaks out of the system when it gets to the state and it doesn't state and it doesn't go back to the schools because the state reduces the funding. We're fortunate though to even be a school district that's sending back money because of the hold harmless clauses we end up with more money per student for districts that are hard pressed that are not sending back money, which is also probably an inequity that is built within the school finance system, which from top to bottom needs to be done. I appreciate the folks that are willing to do that. So I don't have a problem with the equity of us sharing money. It's oh and we're still in a stronger place than most

[12:03:01 PM]

districts in a per student basis in aisd but I do agree that the state's finance system is horrific. Needs are high. Needs are high everywhere. I would argue that the measures and weights to assign need are also not equitable. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Thank you. I had a couple of questions just before we break. I was wondering if we had any updates on the building services number or for Ellis, what was the general fund. I can ask another question if you're not ready. Do you want a couple of minutes? I can ask another question of my colleagues.

[12:04:09 PM]

>> So for the general fund \$191,000 and for the enterprise funds it's broken out over the enterprise and it's -- thement as are -- would not require any wage --

>> Alter: Could you say that again?

>> Mayor Adler: Twhrorp question wees we asked this morning. One was councilmember Ellis' proposal, can it be broken out and the other one is the parking question.

>> So this Ellis amendment, services, 566, total for the general fund is 191,000. The makeout over the enterprise funds would not warrant any changes in any rates. I believe that was the other part of the question. Were there any rate increases, and not.

>> In my math is correct, that reduces by 375, the general fund?

[12:05:12 PM]

Part of that?

>> Yes.

>> Alter: So that's helpful. And then for building services, do we know... The city hall?

>> We're still working on it.

>> Alter: Thank you. For my colleagues, looking at some of the ongoing and some of the larger expenses, so we just reduced one for Ellis, you know, down -- trying to look at the ones that are kind of larger in size. Are there any of these that might be able to be one time? So you know, there's potentially an option to provide the homeless services on a one-time basis as we figure out a solution for social services? Wasn't sure, you know, for heal how that would work. Did you want to speak to that so

[12:06:12 PM]

that we have that information?

>> Yeah, we can't move the heal to one time because it's for shelter operations. There will be a contract for shelter operations. It's going to have to be ongoing. Now, there is a possibility. We could talk about -- you got it down to 1.8, right? Yeah.

>> Alter: I have it at 1.85.

>> We could put the fee out of that potentially. I could talk to Diane about that. That could bring it down to 1.7 or so. But it has -- it's for a contract for shelter operations. So it doesn't make any sense to do it one time.

>> Alter: Is that for the full year or half year?

>> This is for the half year because we already have funding for the half year. So --

>> Alter: Ongoing, do we have funding for the other half? Because I mean, if this is really another \$3 million then that --

[12:07:13 PM]

>> Well, this is a shelter operation. If we don't fund this shelter for the rest of this year, that's -- this is for the rest of the year.

>> Alter: I understand that. I'm trying to understand the ongoing consequences. You're saying we have half the year but does that mean if we're committing to do this then we've got to find the other half?

>> We are committed.

>> Alter: For next year, it's not one time?

>> It's not one time.

>> Alter: Is the half we have for half of this year ongoing?

>> Yes. The half we have -- the amount that's ongoing is for half the year.

>> Alter: I know. I'm asking in our budget is the amount that covers the other half year ongoing or is it one time?

>> I would have to ask Diana. I don't know.

>> Alter: Okay. And then for the lifeguards, councilmember vela, I think you suggested you were looking at a reduction. I was wondering, I know we've had some lifeguards who are temporary who work 30 hours. Is it possible to make them not

[12:08:14 PM]

temporary but full time and then that has less of a -- that has less of a budget impact but it provides them the benefits and the other stuff of being full time? I don't know how that works with the set-up with the lifeguards and how many people we have that might already be working 30 or 40 and being temporary that we're making permanent. I know you factored some of that in but I'm not sure where we landed on that.

>> Vela: Those are -- if I may, mayor. Those are the -- by 200,000 of that item is coming from the temporary, which -- from my conversations with staff, was what they thought was appropriate and reasonable. And then we're working on a revised amendment to drop the number a bit also from the ongoing to make a little bit of additional room in the ongoing. I should -- again, that's an amendment that I should be revising in -- hopefully I'll get it to y'all over lunch.

[12:09:17 PM]

>> Alter: There was a budget question about the staffing shortages and housing and planning. And I'm just wondering if a consultant version of the district level planning is an option that was considered.

>> I can speak to that. It is not preferred. I can go back and talk to rosy about that. If we do that then it means that we're going to be another one of those we will have to look at for next year because we don't want -- the district level planning function is an ongoing function. So if you put it over in one time for -- if you put it over in one time and do a consultant, then you're just going to have to come back next year. It's the same issue. That's why it's in ongoing at the moment.

>> Alter: Broadly support district level planning. I was just trying to understand, given I saw that -- since we had the other conversation, I saw that q&a and so I'm just trying to get some other -- some other

[12:10:21 PM]

information. Is there another one?

>> I do think on that item, mayor pro tem, you know, I had said a few minutes ago, let's look at it for nine months. I think we could keep that one at the six months because the amount of time it's going to take them, you know, hiring staff, I think that one is okay with the six months.

>> Mayor Adler: One second. Councilmember Kelly and then councilmember Renteria. Councilmember harper-madison did --

>> Councilmember

harper-madison: Did you have a question?

>> We did not have a question for her. I think we answered the question.

>> Mayor Adler: Did you want to say something? You were just available?

>> Councilmember Harper-mad

southern: I was just available if you needed me to interject to that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Earlier you said

[12:11:22 PM]

there were no record votes we had taken. I was under the impression we took a vote for the livable wage.

>> Mayor Adler: We did by letting people see people on the dais. There was no real motion or formal process. That's why we talked about it.

>> Kelly: I was thinking since our colleague was back with us virtually, if we needed to reconsider it, we would afford her the opportunity.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Harper can also express her support for that.

>> Kitchen: Mayor pro tem, I appreciate the questions you're asking. I have a question, too. I'm wondering if the -- the summer youth program, although that's councilmember tovo, so councilmember tovo, I was wondering if the summer youth program, the \$13 an hour could be moved to one time.

>> Tovo: Councilmember, no, I would not support that. I think this is something that we should do on an ongoing -- we

[12:12:24 PM]

should recognize that this will be an ongoing need. And -- yeah. And just as a reminder, Travis county -- well, yeah. I think that I'm committed to make sure that that goes forward as ongoing if at all possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Since you're with us, can you answer the question that the mayor pro tem asked about positions versus consultant?

>> So let me speak to what.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. You had a chance to. I was going to let staff speak to it.

>> Kitchen: I don't know if she heard what I said.

>> Councilmember Harper-mad

harper-madison: I did. The staff is at capacity and to bring in consultants that require staff to actually manage those contracts and work through that solicitation process. We just went through that for the northeast Austin district plan and we got no viable

[12:13:25 PM]

responses to our solicitation so we're having to go back and either do a new solicitation or figure out that particular problem out. So staffing within the department is the preferred solution for this new initiative.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. All right. Anything else before we break for lunch? All right. So it is now 12:13. Do we want to come back at 1:15?

>> Chair Travillion: Could I

>> Kitchen: Could I ask a little longer?

>> Mayor Adler: If you could send us a note and let us know. Councilmember kitchen was suggesting a little bit longer than 1:15g. 1:15. do we want to break for longer today, 1:45?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: All these things are good. I certainly didn't want to suggest when I mentioned schools that that was the one I was

[12:14:25 PM]

picking out on the list because we're going to have to make cuts and changes up and down that list. I was just doing that by way of illustration because we were talking really about a different topic at the time. But everybody should be taking hard looks at this. I think everybody should be looking at their own things also as they're looking at others. The hardest things to do are going to make changes to your own but yet we need people that are willing to step up and say this is something I wanted, this is something I championed. You can come to me and say, no, I'm going to make it easier for the dais and suggest the changes. I urge everybody to think about it that way to see if we can bridge the 3 plus million that we're going to have to try and figure out here. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I agree. I'm going to take a hard look. There are different levels of -- I mean, not -- I started out at

[12:15:28 PM]

the bare minimum and maybe some of my other colleagues did, too. There may be more room to cut in certain things than others and there were bigger asks from some than others, too. My approach is to look at all of them collectively and determine the highest priorities. I did have question for you and I apologize for not asking it sooner. Talk us through the creative con consortium and in particular if there are other sources of funding from the special funds we set up to accommodate this request.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't know about other sources for funding but what this is, is the -- we have lots of organizations in town that are doing arts and other cultural programs. Quite frankly, very few of them are able to provide insurance because they have a limited number of employees. They don't have the capacity to really set that up. They are all trying to do ticket sales and all the back of the house kind of thing. And it's just really hard to do, especially when they're small. But the lawn center has offered to step up and in essence create

[12:16:29 PM]

a universal back of house and to use that collective number for insurance and the like. What they have said is they would be willing to pick it up on an ongoing basis if we would help initiate it. I think they're also contributing to the help initiate it. If we help and dmoan straight it, then they're willing to carry it going forward. It just seemed to me to dovetail with so many other things we were doing.

>> Tovo: Sure. It's a great idea. Relatively low-cost investment and force multiplier. I'm appreciative to the lawn center and thank you for your leadership in bringing it forward. I'm wondering if some of the pockets of funding that -- the funds that we have set up in economic development department, if any of those funds that we set up, especially during the pandemic, could be tapped for this purpose. I guess it doesn't really get us to any different spot because it's still general fund funding.

>> Mayor Adler: I take hate to take money from arts funds where there's prab programmatic stuff

[12:17:29 PM]

attached to it. If staff has thoughts on that and can elevate it, great. I don't know the answer. We checked initially and only could find programmatic dollars but we did not do an exhaustive look on that.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just a question for process when we come back. When we come back, perhaps it would make sense if anybody wants to, they can share what they've learned. In other words, if anybody has learned anything that allows them to make a reduction in their particular item, maybe we could start that way. I think -- I'm hoping -- though I realize this is challenging. I'm hoping that our staff have been able to catch the various things we've said so far so that our online document will be up -- as we kind of go back and think about things, that our online document will be --

>> Mayor Adler: Do you think by 1:45 you will be perhaps have an answer to the building services question and to the fte

[12:18:32 PM]

question?

>> I believe we will be -- I know the building services department is working to come around and have that conversation. So I think we will be able to have something. And we'll work really hard with the fte question, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Because we're almost going to need those kinds of answers for us to be able to really move farther. And then councilmember tovo, you raised and I have spoken in support of the social service contract leveling up. But I heard answers that were given in terms of how we fund programs and not organizations. I'm trying to figure out, I really believe we need to do something to raise the salaries of the workers that are doing the social service work. Having heard that answer, I'm less convinced now that this is the right way to do that. I don't know the answer to that. That's why I'm just raising

[12:19:34 PM]

that.

>> Tovo: I heard that same answer, too. And I'm not sure it's answering the question about whether we could provide cost of living -- I'm not sure I can reconcile. In fact, if this is the appropriate time, director stirrup, at the time I didn't ask you to clarify but I think that's consistent with our approach, is that we're trying not to identify organizations and trying to fund programs, but I think the question was, can we specify that this 2% can only be used on salary increases? I think that's not inconsistent with what you're saying but maybe since it was your response, maybe you were saying it is.

>> No, the short answer is, yes, through the negotiation process, we could negotiate personnel salaries of a certain category, say, at the will of the council is that if we wanted to support case managers, we could do that. I gave the caution at the frontend of the answer because, for example, at front steps where we fully fund the arts

[12:20:36 PM]

they have other staff that are funded by other sources. So by us raising the contract that was support an increase for that staff creating an inequity within the organization because the other grant-funded staff, however their other staff are funded, would not benefit from that increase.

>> Tovo: I see. So that's -- I see now why you provided the answer you did.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Tovo: However, I think the answer to whether or not we have the ability to restrict our funding in that way is still a yes.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Tovo: What that does for the organization, I suppose they could always say we don't want the increase because we would then provide inequity across. I guess none would say that. But I think the answer is, yes, we can restrict it and so if that's our purpose, it may have

[12:21:36 PM]

consequences for those organizations that they will have to deal with but it's not -- it's not a reason -- in my mind, it's not necessarily a reason -- it is not a reason not to proceed forward. It means they're going to have to figure out how to -- how to deal with it if they're in the situation you described.

>> Mayor Adler: What happens in the situation where the case worker works on three different projects or two different projects? Do they get higher pay when they're working on this project and potentially lower pay when they're working on other projects?

>> It's not dissimilar from the conversation we had though about prevailing wage and living wage for third-party contracts. Threab sphwhun it was the same one we had with contracting firm where's they were concerned that if they -- if this goes into effect at the city, and the city is requiring that think use prevailing wage for trades and a ceiling -- I mean, a floor for others, that -- I mean, they were saying they opposed it for those same reasons. And somehow they managed to sort

[12:22:36 PM]

it out. So I don't know if answer to that, but I know when we've required that of the other -- that industry, it seems to have worked. They seem to have figured it ou out.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Kowns criminal member kitchen.

Councilmember kitchen.>> Kelly: I.

>> Kitchen: I was thinking about what the dollar amount might be when we put this in place when we re-up contracts. I have a sense of what our -- you know, what our contract terms are or when that would be. Do you know what it would be -- what the impact would be this year if we just said from this point forward when we re-up these contracts we're going to address it?

>> And before I ask assistant director louder opportunity they to answer that question for clarifying purposes, when you say re-up, do you mean execute

[12:23:37 PM]

an extension or do you mean when the contracts are recompeted?

>> No, I mean, execute an extension.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Good morning. Austin public health. So we are contracts renewed on an annual basis. Bulk of our contracts are October 1 agreements. We're currently in the process now of renewing all of those October agreements right now.

>> Okay. When you do that, is there some negotiation involved?

>> Yes. Typically for October contracts that negotiation starts in May to make sure we have new contracts in place by October 1.

>> Okay. All right. And our contracts are a mix perhaps of FTEs and other -- and other services if in other words, are they all wage?

>> Correct. There is a mix between funding personnel, general operations, kind of client assistance so there is a mix. We do have contracts that start at different points. We have contracts that typically start on different quarters. Some October, some April, some in July but the bulk are October 1.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Does the dollar amount we're

[12:24:37 PM]

looking at right now reflect putting this in place at the point where we -- we extend the contracts?

>> Yes. Yes. But that would require for all of our October 1 agreements for us to renegotiate a 2% increase for all of those.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Does it -- does that dollar amount only account for -- I assume it only accounts for the wages that are part of a contract?

>> Currently it does not. That would be additional direction that we would have to take to ensure that the funding -- the additional 2% is only for wages.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So in other words, those -- I think it's around a million or 920 or something. I'm unclear on what the amount is that we have in front of us.

>> \$920,000.

>> Kitchen: That \$920,000 covers more than wages.

>> Potentially it could. We don't typically direct the agency of how that 2% could be. But given council direction, we

[12:25:38 PM]

could direct that it's only to be used for wages.

>> Kitchen: Well, then we would need analysis of what the real number is, you know, whether it's 920 or whether it's some amount. It would be some amount less than that. We just don't know what that amount would be. Is that possible to understand what that amount would be or is it just too difficult?

>> I think it would be staff time intensive in order to come up with that number.

>> Kitchen: Okay. All right. But it would be -- do you have a sense or most of our contracts for wages? I mean, if we just took it down --

>> I can try to get some analysis and tell you kind of what percentage but I would say the bulk of our agreements probably do include some version of staffing.

>> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Then -- so if you can do this without, you know, if it's a back of the napkin thing, give us an idea of what you think it might be, some number less than 920, if we started with the extensions -- if it's too

[12:26:39 PM]

complex, I understand. Director, I would ask what -- do you have a recommendation about how we do this? Is your recommendation to go ahead now or is it to, you know, do some analysis and consider it later? I don't want to put you on the spot I just wanted to ask you, if you happen to have a recommendation. If you don't, that's okay.

>> Thank you for the opportunity. Taking into account all the cost drivers that we're feeling across business, I think to provide a cost of living allowance for the essential service contracts makes sense. Historically I also understand the agencies would prefer the freedom to apply that increase according to their individual business needs.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you say this has to go to cost of living increases?

>> It would be the direction of the council. In past years we've just added to 2% and the agencies used it

[12:27:41 PM]

as they saw fit.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you have a recommendation for -- from a policy standpoint, would you recommend we do it differently?

>> Considering the wage issues that it could cause if we made such a direction, if an agency has multiple funding streams, my recommendation would be to have them make the best estimate of how the funds could be used to support their services.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you.

>> Kitchen: And then -- well --

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo and mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Just to back up when we first embarked on it. We were looking at to inquire on having the social service contractees to pay a living wage. That is something that we have required of our third-party contractor, something we require of ourselves. That would be consistent with how we're treating other folks who are interacting with the city of Austin and using taxpayer dollars to fund their

[12:28:41 PM]

programming. I think? That is a direction the council should go in in requiring a living wage. We've moved in this direction it was potentially aph's recommendation that we do so, instead of requiring a living wage, that we instead consider providing a cost of living I imagine increase. Increase, is that accurate?

>> Perhaps it would be but I don't have the historical knowledge.

>> Tovo: It's been a while. Yeah, I just bring that up for context. I think, you know, we're ready to move forward, maybe director stirup, you and I can talk on the break.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Tovo: If we're providing it as a cost of living increase to impact wages, there are so many pressing needs within each of these organizations, I'm not sure it's going to get there if we don't restrict it.

[12:29:42 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I agree.

>> Tovo: That's still going to be my interest though I'm willing to have a longer discussion about it that's -- I would suggest we I'm propose that I'm most pose that restriction.

>> Mayor Adler: I that's what my interest would be in trying to hit as will. I think mayor pro tem was next.

>> Alter: Thank you. I think this discussion suggest that it merits further discussion because from what I know from philanthropy it is much easier for the organizations or these social service organizations to not have to nit-picky monitor every grant. Our grants are already known to be onerous. That adds levels of review that they -- that grantees have to take care of and we have to. It means we can fund less. Part of the problem is that we are talking about a paltry increase of 2%.

[12:30:43 PM]

I think if we were trying to get us up another 15%, 20% of funding, that is to recognize inflation and cost of living types of things, then we would have less worry about being nit-picky and it probably might not cost us that much difference by the time everyone put in their grant oversight cost. I don't know that we're going to get there today, but since this is also something that we could -- we could work on and if we identify savings in the general fund we could do a mid-year amendment and get it done and get it done -- and get it done right or put a pot in and say this is going to be for this but we have to figure out the process and we're going to come back and do that. But I would not try and resolve this level of detail on the dais and that is only a problem with we just go 2%. If we go 15% they're going to

[12:31:44 PM]

get it in wages. If we give them a 15% increase they would be in a much better position, or even we just increase the amount they can use on overhead they would be able to do it and it would be much cleaner.

>> Kitchen: I understand your points and they're very good ones. My guess is that if we're struggling to provide a 2% increase we're probably not going to be in a position mid year to provide a 15%, or y'all won't be in a position mid year to provide a 15% increase. That's just the reality of what I see before us.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I just had a quick question, chi had forgotten. So -- we're talking about -- never mind. If I remember it, I'll tell you.

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

>> Vela: I appreciate mayor pro tem's comments about that. In general I would say I'm much

[12:32:44 PM]

more -- I think we are in many ways providing upward pressure on wages just by virtue of going to \$20 an hour. That's going to force a lot of people in Travis county. I'm less willing, I guess, to impose those on

our nonprofit partners because I know how difficult it can be in a nonprofit organization to raise funds and to meet those kinds of requirements. I really want to leave folks as much flexibility as possible. But anyway, just wanted to put those comments out there.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. 1:30. Do you want to break until 2:00?

>> Kitchen: I remembered my question.

>> We F. We could get an updated copy of this spreadsheet with the numbers? Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes.

>> Kitchen: You mentioned in the past. Which was the last time we did that in social service contract?

>> Do we do it every time we compete?

>> 2018, the last time council directed the cost of living

[12:33:46 PM]

allowance. I believe that 2018 was the last time that council directed an increase in social service contracts.

>> Kitchen: Do we increase them every year or do they just stay static?

>> They stay static unless there's direction from council.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Take a break until 2:00. Let's all come back. We're in recess. It is now 12:30.

[1:57:32 PM]

.

[2:26:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Hi, colleagues. It is 2:26, and we will reconvene. We appreciate the indulgence and the patience of our colleagues while we were struggling to come up with something that could serve as additional information. I want to make really clear that what I'm about to hand out is intended to be a mid conversation piece, not a proposal for where it is that we end up. It's almost an exercise to see how we can preserve almost everything we had on here by moving things back and forth between ongoing, and obviously, the work that our colleagues did to find more money has paid, makes that something

that something that might be doable. Kathie, do you want to report back on what we had heard from your suggestion about the parking garage?

>> Tovo: I could, but -- and I will in a minute, but can I just understand, mayor, who is this coming forward from? Who is this the product of

[2:27:10 PM]

conversations with?

>> Mayor Adler: This is the product of conversations of council member harper-madison, council member Fuentes, me, council member kitchen, and council member vela.

>> Tovo: Okay, thank you. So, as I understand it, at the break, we did get some information from Mr. For one-time costs. So, thanks for doing that

[2:28:11 PM]

review. I appreciate it. It's not the first million dollars I found during the budget process, but at least I think it's going to be the last, at least for a short time. So I appreciate you looking into it. I think it's a really important thing. I would -- at the appropriate time, and maybe it will be now, in case I forget, I would like to provide the budget direction that that special fund be an item that's included within the budget in the future, so that we can -- so that there's transparency around it, and the council are aware of it. Had I not asked that question and had they not returned that response, we wouldn't have been aware of it, and this solution might not have emerged. I think we'll need to talk about the other. They did report back on the parking garage, which was another source I identified as an additional area of revenue. The city hall garage. I'm going to make a similar amendment for the convention center. But with regard to the city hall garage, the staff have reported back, and they are suggesting that we have that at an

[2:29:13 PM]

estimated increased revenue of \$200,000 a year, and I would assume as ongoing. Yes, as ongoing. I would like to have a conversation around that. Currently, we're receiving \$900,000 of parking revenue at that garage, and so I want to have some conversations around whether 200,000 is the right amount to estimate, or whether we could estimate higher and have the staff come back to us, if there is -- if the revenues are not as expected once those rates are doubled.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. So what that would mean --

>> Tovo: And mayor, those were the two areas I identified for increased revenue. You mentioned that our colleagues had identified areas of increased revenue. Were there other proposals that are resulting in increased revenue?

>> Mayor Adler: I think there potentially might be. So, to recap what just happened, and thank you for that work, council member tovo. I think next year's council should consider hiring you on as a consultant at budget time, and thank you for your work on this.

[2:30:15 PM]

And also you can say what's been handed out on here, just to follow how this would be built up, in case you want to look at it later. At the break, we had had like 8 million, 174 as the available funds for ongoing. You can see with the additional million dollars that takes the available funds up to just over \$9 million for available funds for ongoing. Now, the question -- I mean, for one time. And then ongoing. We had the number of 12,162,915. If we add to that the 200 that was the estimated parking number, it says 400 here, but I think it's 200. As the estimated parking number. There was also an estimated fte number, I think, that staff had come back with in response to the question that I think council member kitchen had raised. What was the number on available fte, if we did new ftes the way that you would normally do them, assuming a nine-month period of

[2:31:16 PM]

time? I think you would send us an email. Looked like it was 790 plus 413. Hm?

>> Mayor, if you're asking what the memo said that Carrie just sent right before we started up again, the number is 797,413 available in funding, if we do the nine-month funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So, colleagues, on this sheet that was laid out to you, there were three lines at the bottom. You should just cross those out. Those were estimates that were earlier. But if you look at under the ongoing cumulative column, you can see the 200,000. That is the parking garage additional ongoing revenue. And the 790,413, which is that

[2:32:20 PM]

additional revenue, that would mean if we take any of those, the 719, those total 13,150,328 as the new available dollars for ongoing.

>> Tovo: I think I would like one of the five of you to go through the items that you moved or suggested moving into one time. I see several of mine, though I identified all of the funding, additional funding that

I think we're discussing. I see two of mine that I think are really critical ongoing needs, I moved over. But if I could just go through that quickly, I think that would be a help.

>> Mayor Adler: I think so, too.

>> Kelly: Thank you for passing this out. I just want to let you know that one of the proposals that is actually in here to remove funding for is the amendment that I brought forward for the

[2:33:21 PM]

animal behavioral specialist position at the animal services center. That was an ongoing cost of \$71,882. What I did during our break is I turned that amendment into a rider to provide direction to the city manager to apply the full amount for that position in the base budget for fiscal year 23-24. Actually, it would be for fiscal year 24. So, I will make that edit and we will get this copy back out to you all. So there will be no fiscal impact on this year's budget, but we have the direction, after the audit is completed at the animal services office to have it in next year's budget, the following year.

>> Mayor Adler: Great, thank you. And again, thank you for taking a look at something that was yours, and helping us find space or room in the budget. Yes. Council member Ellis.

>> Ellis: Just wanted to flag a couple of things that I've been working on. Updating language for the conversation around the human capital management software program. I know we had talked about the continuity of service and the fact that the hr department

[2:34:23 PM]

cannot currently calculate the actual years of service, when someone leaves the city, and then returns. So we're going to update the language, just to make sure that it's identified that this software implementation was already proposed, baked into the city manager's budget, so we just wanted to make sure it was clearly identified that, you know, we're not trying to do anything additional, but we understood what the timeline of that rfp concluding and entering into a contract, that we wanted to make sure we were set up for next year's budget to be able to look at calculating that in a different way. So, we're amending the language on that, and then over the break, I had spoken with the budget office about the third personal day, and even though I had mine worded in a way that said, you know, as we fill these vacancies and we pass these recruitment and retention bonuses and policies, that we shouldn't need to dip into overtime as much as was initially calculated. We don't quite have that number yet. So they suggested that I amend that to have a fiscal impact, but we don't have those numbers yet. So I just wanted to flag that

[2:35:23 PM]

that's out there, and we're working on it. But I am still reviewing your sheet, and appreciate the work that y'all did putting into this.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, let's take then a look at this sheet, just for grins, in case it's helpful. And I'll ask the other folks to help me explain what this is. But I would start with the bottom. What you have in front of you, as best we can tell, has us with almost a half a million dollars still to spend in one-time funding, that's the number in the blue box. 477061. And we think that it probably -- or closely or generally gets close to over a half million dollars, maybe like 651,000 in ongoing dollars. That it looks like is still able to be spent. So obviously, this is not a

[2:36:23 PM]

completed thing, and it was intended just to be a point of departure for conversations. The things that we changed on -- from what people originally proposed I think are the things that are highlighted in yellow on the chart so that you can see those -- you can see those things. But to answer your question, council member tovo, just to run through this list, and I don't know if any of my other colleagues want to explain the

-- where we're moving, if we can start at the top and work down, that would be great. Yes, council member harper-madison.

>> Kelly: Mayor, can I ask one clarification?

>> Alter: Usually when it's red, it's negative. You're comparing the bottom lines versus the top line, and if we only had -- and I'm just trying to understand how you're saying that that's extra money that we could divide up. If I understood you correctly. It seems like we're -- we still have to figure out that money, if I'm reading it correctly.

>> Mayor Adler: I think the way

[2:37:24 PM]

to read this, for example, in the one-time column, the one-time dollars we have to spend are 9,174,606. The total of the elements that are in the one-time column, you can see in the highlighted section cumulative. That adds up to things that are marked there as you move down the page. To things that are listed in the one-time column total, 8,696,545. And the delta between 9,174,606 and 8,969,545 would be that 4 million delta.

>> Alter: Okay. So, what did you add to the 1 million total besides the million dollars from the --

>> Mayor Adler: 8,174,606 was what we were told was our available spend for one time. We've added 1 million to that.

[2:38:24 PM]

>> Alter: I think that already included 1 million, didn't it?

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry? Ed, are we right there that the original allotment for one-time spending was 8,174 and now we have 9 million, 174?

>> Kitchen: Yeah, the additional million is from the forfeitures. There's a memo from Ed that came out.

>> Tovo: It's not the forfeiture, it's the special fund.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, you're right. It's in the memo from Ed.

>> Alter: So we now have 9 million. Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: And that's the number that you have. So you see the delta. And the same thing for the next column.

>> Alter: Okay.

>> Kelly: It occurred to me that we're talking about this and the general public might not have a copy of it. Could you post it to the message boards so that people could see what we're referencing?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we'll do that right now. Good idea.

>> Tovo: What's our process going to be from here? I mean, I see one of my items moved over that has an fte.

[2:39:25 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think there are probably other suggestions or movements other people have. So we're not going to take a vote on any of this. We're going to go through this to answer the question you asked, and then we're going to say now let's talk. Okay? So, running through this page, to answer the question you had before, just to see what's on this page, the results in those numbers. Council member harper-madison?

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor. And you said we're starting at the bottom. I know there were two in particular that I thought could be one-time this year given -- I fully believe that we have resources that will help us make the assessment over the course of the year to determine whether or not we need that ongoing. You have to forgive me, though, I decided to wear my contacts, though, and this highlighter does not work well for my vision.

[2:40:29 PM]

Okay, so, one was tovo 2, ISD dual language summer camps. This is one that I thought could be a one-time expense, just given our limited access.

>> Mayor Adler: You're doing fine.

>> Harper-madison: Also because of conversations that I've had that led me to believe that there are private organizations and philanthropic endeavors that would be happy to help us with this moving forward, which I think was probably the best path forward given our limited resources. That was one of the two that I specifically remember. And then the grant writing and the innovation office. It's one that I absolutely believe that we desperately need. I also don't think it's to date given our limitations with having to prioritize this list. This one doesn't shake out as a priority for me. It shakes out as something that we need that we could do for this one time and over the

[2:41:30 PM]

course of the -- over the course of the year, figure out a way to sustain moving forward. I know we have the Texas grant resource library and other organizations like that that have access -- free access to all the grant resources that are available, so I just wonder if between that and mb a plus program, some of the free resources we have available where competent, capable graduate students and folks with in-depth knowledge on finding the endowments and foundations, et cetera, could help us find the grants moving forward. It's also one of those things where, I wonder if we had the opportunity with a really good competent grant writer to be able to find ongoing funding for that position.

>> Mayor Adler: So what we want to do right now, if we can, is identify the changes that were made.

>> Harper-madison: Identify them and not say why I identified them?

>> Mayor Adler: I think so, because then we'll get to a conversation.

>> Harper-madison: So I misunderstood what our colleague was asking us to do here. I thought you were asking us to give you the rationale for why

[2:42:32 PM]

we --

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay.

>> Harper-madison: In this case, I don't know that it's appropriate for all five of us to weigh in, then, mayor. Can you just go down the list?

>> Mayor Adler: Let me do that.

>> Tovo: I just asked to have the changes identified, because in many cases, we haven't had an opportunity to lay out our rationale.

>> Harper-madison: I completely understand.

>> Tovo: For bringing these amendments forward. So the rebuttal seems like it would be a later one.

>> Mayor Adler: So, the changes that we were suggesting for consideration, and we'll talk about all of these, they're highlighted in yellow as you go down the page, so they're really easy to see. It moves -- it keeps the grant writing, but it moves it from ongoing to one time. Highlighted in green are the things that we thought were in play for the fte discussion. I haven't seen the detail of what our staff did, but that's what the green ones were. Those were positions without ftes. But the changes that this group made was the grant writing.

[2:43:33 PM]

As you move down the page, the animal behavior specialist -- thank you, council member Kelly

-- something that moves this to kind of later consideration with the direction. So, thank you very much for helping us with space. But from a finance standpoint, the number goes away.

>> Kelly: Right. So we're eliminating the funding and bringing it forward as a rider, which I passed out. You have right there. That provides direction for the theal -- the following year's budget to add it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. The next change as you go down is the heal initiative one, which was filed at 1.850, that's been lowered to 1.75. It removes the fte from that. Council member kitchen, thank you very much for suggesting something that was a cost savings, making it easier for all of us. The dual language summer camp is kept in at the same amount of

[2:44:33 PM]

money, but it moves from ongoing to one time. The aid funding keeps \$150,000 in the ongoing, which we understand. We could be wrong, but we understand is the amount necessary to spend to get the funding this year to be equivalent to the funding we had last year. So we think that it makes up that \$150,000 delta. And then the balance of the money for the asd funding goes from ongoing to one-time. So we have 539,225 in one-time, and 150,000 in ongoing. The next one are the lifeguards, and it dropped from its origin Al 268,000 down to 250,000. Again, council member vela, I appreciate that you

have made such a significant cut to one of the things that you proposed to have happen. Moving it down to 250.

[2:45:35 PM]

The next item is the strategic stipend fund which was a million dollars, which I removed so we'd have more money. The aedc. Council member tovo, you and I were both talking about this. I think we both filed items. I've taken mine off the board and I've left yours on. But you had had \$1.5 million, and this hasn't moved down to \$1 million. So that's a change. The anti-hate campaign is in at 350,000. I don't know that that changed. I think that's the same. So that should not have been highlighted. That should not have been highlighted in yellow. That was some greater force weighing in there. But that should not be highlighted in yellow, because that's actually remaining the same.

[2:46:36 PM]

Council member Fuentes and council member vela have gotten together, and they're going to rework the language for the hotel -- the housing emergency program, vela number one, so that it could provide funding for inclement weather sheltering next year, if that is needed. So, Fuentes 6 comes off the board in terms of dollars. So I thank both of you, again, for making a movement that helps us with the overall budget, and that's appreciated. The gender neutral bathroom stayed in here at \$100,000. I think that's what it was originally intended to be, although there has been the suggestion that this is the kind of project that the aia has said that they would love to be able to do for us, but right now, it's right there, but we should probably have that conversation. The social service cost of living increase has been zeroed out. That's tovo 8. It's highlighted in yellow.

[2:47:38 PM]

The housing emergency program has gone down from 5 million to 3 million, and as we talked about earlier, has sought to include other things that were otherwise in a different place on the budget. And then the environmental testing is going to be replaced with a direction, as opposed to funding element, so that goes to zero. Again, council member vela, thank you again for taking something that is off the board. If those changes were made, then we have an additional almost \$500,000 to spend in one-time, and if those changes were made, we have an additional 600-some-odd thousand dollars to spend in ongoing. That's this sheet.

>> Tovo: Thanks for running through those. Does that include those amounts of available funding, does that include the million dollars

[2:48:39 PM]

identified from the special fund?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. It's included --

>> Tovo: And does it include -- you said 200,000.

>> Mayor Adler: And 74 --

>> Tovo: What's that?

>> Mayor Adler: That's the fte, following our principle, we don't use 12 months, we use 9 months and it's making it consistent with that practice.

>> Tovo: Okay, thank you.

>> Renteria: Just for my own personal permission, when can we offer directions? Like, in my district, I want to offer directions to the staff members.

>> Mayor Adler: So it's my intent to -- once we have figured out the ongoing and the one-time cumulative stuff, I think the next section for us to

-- we have -- at that point, we could approve a tax rate, we could approve a lot of motions, and then based on timing, we'll either do all of the directions tonight, or if we do everything else but tonight, we want to get together tomorrow, just for an hour or two when people have a

[2:49:39 PM]

chance to read the direction, we could always just reconvene tomorrow for an hour or two and finish the direction. So we can have that conversation. Whatever you guys want to do. Okay? So, at this point, it would be appropriate to express support for any of these things, to make completely different suggestions on things that should be moved. Or to talk about any one of these -- talk about any one of these elements. Okay? Sure, go ahead.

>> Tovo: Would it be appropriate for us to go through our amendments, and we can either go with the -- what's been proposed or bring our initial one, but just start knocking them out?

>> Mayor Adler: We could. I'm trying not to have a vote on each one. So this is kind of a discussion period. I think it would be good to gauge, as people look at this, whether this is something that all or in part they're comfortable with or changes that they would recommend being made to these. I mean, let's do something.

[2:50:39 PM]

Let's see what the kind of changes are that people would want to make. Council member pool?

>> Pool: I have one item that I'd like to fill in a blank on, and that is your Adler 4 item. We are missing an implementation date, and trueing up the cost and I am proposing putting in December 1, 2022, and that would have a total impact of 341,208, of which 264,000 is already in, so the increment is 77,313.

>> Mayor Adler: And what would the final number be?

>> Pool: 341,208. December 1, 2022.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Further general conversation

[2:51:40 PM]

discussion? Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: So, a couple things. I would like to make the whole blood program whole, so that we could fund it this whole year, and that requires a million dollars to fund one time, plus 200 of ongoing. But we've confirmed that we can do 880,000 of the one-time with debt service, and keep the 120,000 in general fund, so that would make that pilot whole, but it would reduce by 380,000 the amount in the one-time, but it would allow us to do the full program, and that I've been working on with council member Kelly.

>> Mayor Adler: So on the sheet that's in front of us, as I look at it here, Kelly is about middle of the page. Kelly 2a, and Kelly 2b, which I

[2:52:40 PM]

think is how staff identified that in their spreadsheet.

>> Alter: So the 500,000 would become 120,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Or would it become 880?

>> Alter: No, because we're going to put 880 in debt.

>> Mayor Adler: 880 in --

>> Alter: I'm saving money.

>> Mayor Adler: So the 500 becomes what?

>> Alter: The 500 becomes 120,000. The 200,000 stays in ongoing. And then debt becomes 880,000. So you can debt finance the equipment.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: And Ed, I'm just working off the email we had at 11:45.

>> Mayor Adler: So debt or other on 2a is how much, 880?

>> Alter: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: So that was the first things.

>> Mayor Adler: It was 120.

[2:53:40 PM]

>> Alter: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: And then, I think that in order to -- I'm skeptical that moving the grant writing will get you what you want, and I would like, before we make a decision, to see if the innovation office can speak to whether that would meet their needs, I'm not sure he'd be -- by the way, it's raining outside. I didn't even notice that. It's a good thing.

>> Mayor Adler: I take that as a really good sign.

>> Alter: That's a really good sign. So I would like to see if we can, at the appropriate time, have the innovation office speak to that, because if you want to get a quality person in for something like that, to build the program, and to fill the continuity and other kinds of things, I'm not sure that one time will work on that. And then I also think we should have a conversation -- so, I think other groups were also thinking about stuff. And I think, you know, you moved

[2:54:41 PM]

everything over, you moved a bunch of stuff over, and some people did agree to reductions. But I am still questioning whether the deal should be ongoing money. We haven't purchased the next hotel. And it doesn't seem like we have the other half of the year. And so it seems to me that we should be considering seriously moving that to one-time, which I think would free up a lot of opportunity to move things the other way.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, should we talk about this --

>> Alter: So let me know when is the appropriate time to have the innovation office come on, and if anyone has any questions about the whole blood, and obviously council member kitchen will want to talk about the heal.

>> Mayor Adler: So at this point, let's not discuss each one. Let's kind of figure out what the universe of things are that in front of us that we need to discuss. I think that might help us.

>> Alter: Okay, and I just want to confirm that for the whole blood, I don't have to do a

[2:55:44 PM]

whole nother amendment?

>> Kelly: My staff's working on that, just as backup. But yeah, that would be good to hear Mr. Van Enno if we need that or not.

>> The question is?

>> Alter: I just wanted to know if I needed to write up an amendment -- I'm not hearing objections to what I proposed on the whole blood to do the debt financing and get the whole program rolled out.

>> So the direction is clear that we'll move that over from a one-time expenditure to debt funded. We've checked with bond council. While I'm up here, though, I do just want to make sure staff is clear about the 2a, 2b and --

>> Alter: So that was -- the way that they did it, the whole blood program is 2a, and the simulation training is 2b because there were two parts to her.

>> So I guess my clarity is at this time, the proposal just for the whole blood program?

>> Alter: No, the stuff is still there for the simulation training at the million dollars of one time and 20,000 of

[2:56:44 PM]

ongoing.

>> Thank you.

>> Alter: Do you have a copy of this sheet?

>> Right.

>> Mayor Adler: So let's continue to surface ideas, especially ideas where people think they can turn up more money. Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: This was a question for mayor pro tem. Can you share with us the -- you said 880 in debt obligation. Is it C.O. Or K.O., and for my own edification purposes, can you explain K.O. And the permissible use of those dollars?

>> Alter: I'm going to let the budget office explain that.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, let's have budget office explain that question. Ed, can you talk to us about that?

>> Sure. That 880,000 that was allocated for the whole blood program as a debt service obligation, mayor pro tem said that it would either -- I can't remember if she said if it would be certificate of obligation or the I guess contractual obligation financing method, and I just want to know the difference with the K.O. Funding.

[2:57:44 PM]

>> Yeah, a lot of fancy debt terms. At the end of the day, it's all debt. When you buy a house, you get a 30-year mortgage, that's one kind of debt. When you buy a car, you might get a five-year car note, that's a different kind of debt. In the city of Austin, municipalities everywhere, we use certificates of obligation, which are typically long-term debt for purchasing facilities, land, things that have a long-term life span, typically 20-year notes. We can do longer periods, but typically in Austin, we do a 20-year note for certificates of obligation. A contractual obligation is the term we use, a lot of our vehicles, balances, fire trucks, new and replacement vehicles, and equipment can all be purchased with contractual obligations. Typically, those are for seven years. And so we want the asset to have at least a useful life of at least a duration of the debt, so typically looking for assets that have a useful life of seven years, when we issue those

[2:58:45 PM]

bonds. But yeah, that's what we use contractual obligations for.

>> Fuentes: Good deal. Thank you. Appreciate it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Council member tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, we haven't had a chance for the others of us on the dais to indicate what we over the break had determined we would change, and so I can talk a little bit about that. But I also want to just surface that one of the items that you all are proposing change to one-time funds has an fte in it. And that is the summer -- the ISD dual language summer camps. Also, I would like to just highlight that I would like to hear from staff about -- and have a conversation on this dais about their estimation of \$200,000 of revenue from the parking garage. I think that's conservative.

>> Mayor Adler: To your first point, you're absolutely right about the ftes. That's what I was talking about in terms of really approximate numbers as we true up which column they're in.

[2:59:47 PM]

They're obviously going to have to be revised.

>> Tovo: But I did want to say over the break, I gave some thought to the conversation that we were having with regard to social service, and so I do at the appropriate time plan to withdraw that. I also plan, though, to bring back a resolution that I hope this council will support to require living wage of our social service contractees. I think we require that of -- well, I know that we require that of our third party folks. We require that again of ourselves. And I think it's appropriate to do so with our social service contracts. As I mentioned earlier, that was where we started the conversation. Staff, our aph staff had suggested we handle it through cost of living increase and that's the reason that we're having the conversation here today, since there are complications to providing the funding the way we're doing it now. I think that we should just refer back to what was our original stance, which was that they ought to be providing a living wage. So I'm removing that.

[3:00:51 PM]

And will do so again at the appropriate time.

>> Mayor Adler: I would like to work with you when you bring that back and I support that direction as well. I appreciate you being willing to make that kind of move on this budget to help free up space for us. Ed, there was also the request to explain to the dais and the public a little bit more about the \$200,000. That was the parking garage element. Whoever it is you think should be --

>> Thank you, mayor. We have the billing services folks here, Alexander, up here.

>> Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem, councilmembers. I'm Derek Alexander from the business services department, I'm the business services officer. Your question --

>> Yeah. Thank you. As I look at the building services -- no, I've lost it. In our budget book for my

[3:01:53 PM]

colleagues who are looking... Oh, goodness. I'm going to have to do this from memory because I just put aside the one page I needed. As I recall, the actual amount of revenue received from this parking garage last year was \$900,000 and amount projected for the following year is \$900,000. Aim doing that correctly?

>> That sounds about right. 750 for this year, but approximately, yep.

>> Tovo: So if we work with the \$750,000, the amendment that I'm bringing is more or less doubling the rate. And so I am aware of a conversation that we had before

[3:02:54 PM]

that some of these are contracted spaces and there are other circumstances. But \$200,000 still seems like a very conservative figure based on the fact that we're almost doubling that you projected \$900,000 of revenue here in the next year, and we're doubling the rate. So, you know, less than 25% increase would seem too conservative, in my opinion.

>> You're right, it is conservative. And there's a couple of things that I'm looking at when we talk about this. One, this parking rate is variable. What it means by that, that is you're going to go up in that price, which is needed, but is that going to impact how many people come and park in this space, for one. And another thing that my concern is, is that because it's a variable, this can change. It may impact that cost. I'm already supple 789menting the services for the city hall at this point.

[3:03:54 PM]

Take \$200,000 from my operating budget. I may be at a deficit at the end of the time frame, right? So that's \$200,000 I can handle if there is that variable and it doesn't impact, like you say, you think it's going to double. And it may. We can look at this next year. That's what I would suggest, and see what it looks like this next year. We can look at it next year after we see what it looks like this year. I don't see it doubling where there's a \$500,000 that I'll be able to sustain. That's why I say \$200,000 is definitely manageable.

>> Mr. Alexander, help me understand what you mean by "Taking \$200,000 from your budget."

>> Right. From what I understand, the process is you're going to -- if this happens you want to take \$200 from my operating budget, correct?

>> Whatever that amount is. I would say we're not taking it. We're substituting the funding that we are now generating based

[3:04:55 PM]

on higher rates. I want to be really clear to anybody listening to this conversation, we're not suggesting reducing your budget. We offered an opportunity for you to increase the revenue in the parking garage, which is going to allow us to --

>> That's \$200,000 is something definitely we can manage if it doesn't hit the numbers you want to hit. If it does, we can look at it next year and make the changes then. I think it's a safe bet for going into this, this is a good opportunity just to see if it works. That's all.

>> Tovo: Well, I think that we're still -- from my assessment, and I'll look back at the numbers, we were given the numbers for the garages throughout downtown. We will still have -- this will still be a real bargain to some people to park here. We also have built-in audiences across the street and at some of the nearby resubsidized the parking for customers of most of the businesses who are immediately adjacent. But we still have a really ideally situated parking garage for many people.

[3:05:56 PM]

I think this will continue to be a really popular garage, especially as we just lost a parking lot across the street from the farmer's market. That parking garage is now under construction. If you're in this immediate vicinity, this is going to be an attractive parking garage. I don't believe based on the research we've done, I don't believe we're going to lose customer it is we go up a little because we're still going to be priced under where a lot of the competing garages are. So colleagues, I would like to see that. I believe there's evidence to justify having that closer to 3 or \$400 but I would be interested in what you all think. I'm also happy to provide additional direction that we would evaluate this, that there would be a proactive evaluation if it is indeed -- if the revenues are under what they're projected at mid year and a different decision has to be made. I will note there is an additional direction at the amendment to ask the staff to

[3:06:56 PM]

look at whether that increase is enough. So that's something else that will be happening after today, understanding that those rates of course have to be reflective of the cost of providing that service. What do you think? \$900,000 is what our staff projected to bring in in revenue. We're increasing the rates by about double. Can we -- do you -- are you comfortable with a level of risk of assuming that's going to be 300 or \$400,000 worth of increased revenue? Maybe 3 is the right place to set it.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't know. Can we bookmark that and see how we do on numbers? And if it looks like we're really struggling at the end we might be willing to take a bigger risk than if we don't. I'm not sure I'm ready to -- I'd like to come back to it.

>> Tovo: I think that's fair. I think councilmember Renteria had his hand up. I'm going to be thinking about

[3:07:59 PM]

bid budget direction that would allow us to capture some of that if the revenues -- quarterly reports the other way, quarterly reports that would help us see where the revenue comes in and whether some of that -- whether there are additional offsets that are possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, councilmember Renteria?

>> Renteria: I do have some concern just listening to the gentleman here talk about, you know, the concern because, you know, once you increase the price of parking, a lot of this area is very competitive. You will have people say \$10 a night and if there is a special event. But if there's not an event coming on you're not going to see anybody parking down here. I would be more comfortable if we stick to the \$200,000 and then come back with a report that -- I think you might --

[3:09:02 PM]

what's the average rate right now?

>> Deputy billing services officer, max daily rate is \$25 but there are five tiers depending on how long you park in the garage. That's part of the analysis we would do is be able to look at where the parkers are landing within those ranges to determine how much actual additional revenue we can generate based on the funding.

>> Renteria: So if you -- what's the lowest tier right now and what time is that?

>> The first 30 minutes is free. And then the lowest tier is \$5. So based on the recommendation, go up to \$35, we assume that would go to \$10, you would have a \$10, \$15, I think \$25 and daily max. I think the original budget amendment also talked about raising the nightly rate and special event rate both to \$25 but I don't have it in front of me.

>> Renteria: Do you know if the small businesses around will

[3:10:02 PM]

get discounts, are they also going to be effected?

>> If it's already been validated right now it wouldn't be in effect because validations are currently planned the stay in place. I think the nighttime rate was tied to some of the nighttime workers and stuff, that \$10. There might be a different fee for that. I know some of that played into it also.

>> Renteria: Most likely have to accept this new scale?

>> The scale would be based on the max daily that was established and then tier it down based on that.

>> Renteria: So \$25 is the max?

>> Today, yes, sir.

>> Renteria: And if we double that, what would that be?

>> It wasn't doubled. She's proposing taking it to \$35, a daily max, which then would just raise each of those tiers, I believe was the intent.

>> Renteria: Thank you for that information.

>> Tovo: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: May I clarify. I can give you the rates in a minute. This does not impact individuals who are participating in the city's affordable parking program. They are on monthly contracts. Most of them opt to park here at

[3:11:03 PM]

city hall and this amendment does not impact them and it's really important to keep that. That was kind of the compromise that we struck when the city started putting parking meters up that really impacted our service industry workers. I appreciate them for hearing that concern. But this doesn't impact those guys. And it doesn't impact the small businesses who have that deal, though my amendment suggests we take a look at that which has been in place since 2004 and results in considerable loss of revenue here at the parking garage. I'm not sure it's sending kind of the appropriate message out about parking -- about driving downtown.

>> Renteria: Thank you for that explanation.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> I really appreciate you tabling this and I appreciate council Renteria's suggestions but because we would strongly urge that you stay with the \$200,000 because of the variable impact that is unknown and budget is going to be impacted

[3:12:04 PM]

by the \$20 an hour. I think that's what the director and assistant director are thinking about. So I appreciate the consideration.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Okay. Colleagues? Any other thoughts? Is everybody okay with what's on this sheet that we've handed out here? I didn't think so, that's why I was giving you a chance to talk. Some

people are shaking yes, and some people are shaking no. Give a chance -- everybody to have a chance to be able to speak. Yes, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Councilmember

harper-madison: I'm a literal person. When you say is everybody okay and you're trying to extract from us where to go in the process and what to do next. I'm trying to understand, what's the goal here? Are we still just laying it out?

>> Mayor Adler: I think the goal for all of us is to come up with kind of a one-time schedule

[3:13:05 PM]

and an ongoing schedule that we're all comfortable with. So there's a piece of paper that's been hand out to all of us that not all of us worked on. This is an opportunity for people to say, look, I see what's on the chart but these are the changes I would make to it or I suggest or we suggest be made to it. I know there were some groups working during lunch, otherwise people were doing that, there's a chance for people to speak up now. Hopefully over the course of the conversation and talking through these things we will be at a place where people say, okay, we're now at a place where I think this looks good. At which point we'll probably go back down to Ed and Carrie and say, you guys need time to look at this to fine-tune the numbers and calculate a tax rate. Probably take a break while they do that. And then we'll come back and someone will make the motion to adopt, and we'll get it seconded and adopt it.

>> Council member nay

harper-madison: Right now the document is in front of us and

[3:14:06 PM]

you're asking --

[no audio]

>> Mayor Adler: On this page.

>> Harper-madison: I will say, if I may, it might be a good idea to open the process on both days. Remember when we used to have the pastors come in and do a prayer for us to start the energy off to head toward a collaborative. I'm feeling some prickles now. I wonder if people should take a deep, deep breath and recognize that we're not here to fight. We're here to complement. You could be the pastor, mayor, for the invocation. Everybody be nice.

>> Mayor Adler: Liked your sermon pretty much.

>> If I may then, one of my good friends that I made over the years, and actually oddly enough, a former political opponent, passed away. I have found myself sitting here on this dais going through this process and making sure to be grateful for all the moments that we get and even during the course of this difficulty process I'm finding myself very

[3:15:07 PM]

grateful that my colleagues and I are overturning every stone to make sure we're doing the best we can with limited resources. That said, so for all the people who called Lewis Conway Jr. Friend, I hope we all take the opportunity today to remember him fondly and laugh big and remember to count our blessings every day-lewis was a relatively young man, so nothing guaranteed, y'all. Let's be nice to each other. Thank you, mayor.

[3:16:17 PM]

Assigned a number yet?

>> It is -- I don't. It's just Kelly 2, 2a and 2b. Just put it on the sheet.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That works. Thank you.

>> It's also been e-mailed if people want to look at their inbox, it's out.

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you. About that? I recommend -- mayor pro tem next. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: So I want to -- I need to look at some numbers to think about aid but I'm wondering if we could bring in Daniel Caloto from the innovation office to talk about how the grant process would work if it was one time versus ongoing and what the difference might be since there's funding. And while they're coming over I'll just say, I would like to see if we can find a way to fund some additional parts of that

[3:17:20 PM]

amount. There's three parts of it. There's the prime time, the victory, tutorial and the parent support specialist. And even just, you know -- this is to get to 50, you know, the prime time alone, if we just did that, would be 662. It seems like we have the money to do that. I would very much like to do that as well. Mr. Colata, can you speak to the grant position and what a difference it would make if it was one time versus ongoing, both for what you're doing at innovation office and for your work across the city and anything else you would like to add?

>> Yes, thank you, mayor pro tem. When we put forward the proposal for this position it was from a large amount of research that we've done across the city with partners to help fill some gaps in the grant process that are

[3:18:22 PM]

systemic and ongoing. So we are thinking of this as a full-time and ongoing position so that we can basically continue to add that capacity. If it was a one-time position, I think we would essentially go back to where we started once the funding was out without that capacity remaining in the form of that person, mayor. We also could potentially run into some hiring issues. We've seen that when it's a stated one-time position that's time limited. So again, when we were looking at it it was full time so we could have that be a permanent capacity add and help bring in more funding to the city for innovation projects and increase that grant capacity for departments over time.

>> Thank you.

[3:19:22 PM]

You know, I remember looking at various pieces of the budget, and unfortunately I don't have the exact numbers right now but it does seem that we're underperforming in terms of the amount of grants that - the grant we're bringing into the city and I think this small investment would be a good one to do that. So I would propose moving that back over, trying to figure out some other numbers here. I may need a few minutes to see if I can make a proposal for the aid funding.

>> Kitchen: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I would like to listen from councilmember tovo about the aid funding. I understand the thinking behind the buckets the way they are here. But I'm open to moving more of that aid funding back over to ongoing considering the fact that it seems like we have a bit of money to work with in the ongoing. And I'd like to hear from councilmember tovo what her

[3:20:23 PM]

thoughts are on the aid.

>> Tovo: Mayor, would you like me to address that?

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry.

>> Tovo: Does it make sense to address it?

>> Kitchen: She's talking about adding additional money, is that right?

>> Alter: No, I was just trying to see if there was a way to segment in a way to make it logical sense. I'm not sure if the split made sense but I was just trying to look at data that we have to see what might be a split. I mean, there's enough money to cover it all. So I would personally like to just move it all over.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Well, then --

>> Mayor Adler: The best I can tell, if the changes that have been suggested were.

[No audio]

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: The grant writer was \$104,000 if that was

[3:21:24 PM]

moved back to ongoing and we have \$470,000 if those changes were made.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Then I would -- I would just -- I just wanted to say that I'm open to moving -- I wanted councilmember tovo that I'm open to moving aid funding back over. I don't -- if we have to choose twine that and the innovation -- between that and the innovation, I would keep the innovation one time. But it looks like what y'all are talking about is moving some of aid back over to ongoing. Anyway, I'll wait to hear what the thinking is there.

>> Alter: What the thinking is in terms of ongoing funds?

>> Kitchen: The aid funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I would echo that support, if we have a pathway to move the aid funding, currently we have 539 in one-time funding.

[3:22:24 PM]

If we're able to move more of that or all of it to ongoing I would be supportive of that effort.

>> Alter: Thank you, colleagues. That would be my recommendation, to go back to the original proposal that I brought over.

>> Kitchen: I don't know if we can do that -- if we move the grant writing back. Because I haven't done the math yet so I don't know what's available.

>> Mayor, I think if we took a look at the ftes that could move over, we would be able to do both. And there are some that are easier to move than others. So the grant writer could be nine months, for instance.

>> Mayor Adler: Would it be helpful if we took a 10 or 15-minute break?

>> I don't have the -- I didn't see the -- I don't have the sheet. But it might be an e-mail.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Alter: I think we need to talk about the item that you all

[3:23:25 PM]

proposed putting in one-time funds that actually includes an fte. I'm going to ask our parks department to walk us through -- walk us through that. So initially I brought this forward with the fte to support the recommendation from -- let me just make sure I'm clear on exactly which commission. But this is for the summer language -- summer language program through our parks department, to have Spanish language and dual language. That was recommendation from our commission on immigrant affairs. Initially they also recommended, I believe it was that commission that also recommended including support for program that is existing at the Mac called academia. And we talked with our parks department and they said they can absorb some of that work within their existing resources,

[3:24:26 PM]

at least for the first year, however then they all -- we did have some feedback this week. I know they visited councilmember phrenes the and others requesting that fte. So we put it back in the amendment. So I did reach out. I know you and I had spoken about this. And that was the reason I put the fte back in it. But I --nd I did reach out to you during the break to talk about this but I think you were huddling with a different group. So just understand that if it's -- if it is -- if it is one-time funds, then we do need to strip out -- we can strip out about \$80,000 of this but we lose the fte and we lose that additional support for that program. But I wonder if our parks department -- director Mcnealy, could you talk us through a little bit of this, please? I'm sorry, this was also endorsed by -- I said it was commission on immigrant affairs, which it was. It was also initially endorsed -- the recommendation for the summer camps were also

[3:25:28 PM]

endorsed by the joint inclusion committee. And the other is --

>> This fte is about \$62,000.

>> Tovo: Right. Because it was 80 -- my estimate had in there, my original 430 had the fte at a position... I understand. But my point is that it was -- my amendment was \$430,000 amendment with one fte at I believe \$80,000. But, director Mcnealy, I see you on the line to verify and I'm going to go through my folder and find the e-mail that I had with your staff. If we back out that fte it saves \$80,000 but then we don't have the support for that program. This is not factored in at nine months but -- we're not supposed to fund staffing with one-time funds.

>> I just meant you can move 62

[3:26:29 PM]

back.

>> Tovo: I see what you're saying. I see what you're saying. Okay. Anyway, director Mcnealy, could I invite you to talk us through this issue? As I understood staff were willing to take on the summer language, dual language and Spanish language camps within your existing resources with the additional funding that we had come up with, which was about \$350,000. Is that correct?

>> Mcnealy: That is correct. When you add a full-time position to your -- to the proposal, that full-time -- that full-time position allows us to do -- allows us to coordinate outreach opportunities at multiple locations throughout the summer for summer camps. When we don't have that position, then what we will do is we will use some of our existing funding, some of our existing program, and temporary funding that would be allocated to be able to manage and maintain the program.

[3:27:30 PM]

So a full-time position helps affirm its stability and helps us be able to ensure sustainability throughout the years at multiple locations. We would just use -- we would just -- we would be able to use whatever amounts of money we were given depending on the configuration of how we established the program, either the full-time position allowing the multiple locations and more sustainability or utilizing part-time positions which puts the sustainability of the program in a different category and requires us to absorb some of that work. We can make it work either way, a full-time position just provides a little more stability throughout the years, if that -- I hope that makes sense. When we use temporary funds, right, we're talking about turnover, we're talking about just a different flare that would come with the program as

[3:28:31 PM]

we are -- as we are executing it year after year.

>> Tovo: Can you help us understand what is supported? We reduced it down to -- I think the number is -- well, \$80,000 less than what I'm proposing. That's about 350. If we reduced it to 350 and stripped out the fte and full-time coordination, what would that do at the program at the Mac that it was also helping support?

>> Mcneeley: At the near point it won't do anything at the Mac because the Mac will have to physically close in order for us to do the renovations that are planned through the capital improvements and that will happen at some particular point and time frame, which means that the Mac programs are going to end up being distributed for the time being throughout our -- probably have a main location but then also have to be distributed throughout our existing facilities. So in the near term, it won't impact that program very much.

[3:29:32 PM]

When we return back to the Mac and the Mac programs are trying to re-establish themselves and we're also trying to implement a dual language program specifically at the Mac, then having that full-time fte to maintain what's happening throughout the system, plus what's happening at the Mac would be helpful. But that's in the future years. So that's why I'm saying we can make the program work even in the near term with just funding that is -- that does not include enough fte and we can revisit. Maybe call it a pilot program and revisit once the Mac is done with reconstruction and is back up running. .>> Tovo: That was one of the reasons again once I reduced it out and back down to 350 and then the full-time coordinator and I'll invite those colleagues who were supportive of that to weigh in. I do want to say if we're funding it with one-time funds we should back out the fte and

[3:30:33 PM]

put it at closer to that 350. So those are the two options that we have before us.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. About this particular conversation? Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Well, it's kind of a combination because I just want to make sure if I'm understanding we have \$838,000 of ongoing with where you're at, correct? Where with you landed, there's 800 --

>> No, this number over here.

>> Mayor Adler: Which items are we talking about?

>> Alter: I want to understand which pot we have -- my understanding is we have a pot of ongoing money that we're trying to appropriate. I want to understand which number that is because if we stop in the red -- I'm not understanding which number it is then. So if we can understand which

[3:31:34 PM]

number it is.

>> Mayor Adler: The sheet that we handed out had us with \$838,000 in -- I'm sorry. Had us with \$477,000 of one-time cumulative -- one-time dollars to spend, \$477,061. What I'm showing is and subject -- all of this is subject to the real numbers, but if we make a change as we did to the whole blood program and we make that change, then the dollar amount and available one-time cumulative dollars is approximately \$850,000. And Ed, if I'm wrong with any of these numbers that I'm saying at any point, speak up.

>> So the red is the delta between the original and this

[3:32:36 PM]

and the blue is number that you're working off of for what's available.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that might be true. But for our purposes I would just look at the number in blue.

>> Okay. I would like to see if we could figure out a way to get to where we're funding the balance of the aid, we're doing the nine month for the grant and we're doing a nine month for the -- I'm not sure -- what she just described for that fte. I'm going -- I now have the nine-month options. I'm going to see if I can get there but I think we're pretty close.

>> Mayor Adler: Which item number are you talking about? It's tovo 9. Is that what we're talking about?

>> Alter: It would be tovo 9, tovo 2 and then alter 5. And then we also have to have councilmember pool's amendment to yours be included in the totals. Whatever that is.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

[3:33:37 PM]

That was over on ongoing.

>> Alter: So both the grants 1 and the camp support to be nine months.

>> Mayor Adler: Does it help us -- does it make sense if we're trying to take as much ongoing dollars over to one-time or move it back, then it looks like we have more one time. Does it make sense to take the wayfinding and increase the budget to 200, \$250,000 for wayfinding for signage or whatever, and take it out of ongoing --

>> Alter: They need an ft -- they need an fte in order to do the work. But we could -- I think Ms. Mcneeley, is she still here?

>> Mayor Adler: I was wondering if we increased the budget, is that something question contract out for?

>> Alter: I think they really needed somebody to be organizing it but I think we might be -- you might be able to decrease that to \$50,000 and they could

[3:34:37 PM]

use their temporary money for the ongoing money for what they're using right now and then that would free up some money we could apply towards the other camp position.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Mcneeley, do you want to talk about wayfinding, whether it makes more sense to increase the amount to move it into one time, to go to 200 or 250? What makes sense for that?

>> Mcneeley: Council, to be quite honest, I'm confused with the options that we have. I don't in any way, shape, or form to give you wrong information. The reason we wanted an fte is to coordinate the program. However, just like with the other program, if you were to give us a certain amount of money we could combine that with temporary funding and be able to figure out how to progress the program further along than it is currently being -- currently being addressed right now. Right now we're doing very

[3:35:39 PM]

little, or nothing. So any amount of money that we could combine with existing temporary funding would allow us to further along the wayfinding program, further than it currently is right now. So I tell you all that because I just -- I have a little bit of confusion and I don't want to in any way pretend like I can answer the question holistically. I can tell you that absolutely we don't have -- we don't have sufficient funding to further our wayfinding program and it is something that is definitely part of our long-range plan. It's definitely something that we have --

[no audio]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> I just wanted to explain what I was proposing and see if that made sense. So in one conversation I had about the days finding there was a temporary half time role but not an fte to make it full time.

[3:36:41 PM]

So could we put \$50,000 in ongoing, continue with the temporary money and give you the fte so you get your wayfind -- you get your person for signage and then that other \$50,000 goes towards the camp one which we would then just need to add, I guess, \$12,000 for nine months for that so that it could start in time to be helpful for camp. Would that -- just adding the \$12,000 and getting the other work -- did that make sense? I'll say it one more time. There's an existing part-time person in the position. If we combine that with \$50,000 of additional ongoing and an fte, would that allow you to hire a full-time person for the signage and wayfinding? If you want to check with your staff and get back to us, that's

[3:37:42 PM]

fine.

>> Mcneeley: I'm trying to do the math right now. I can check with my staff and hopefully be back with you in just a few. Yes.

>> Alter: Before you do that, then the idea would be to take that \$50,000 and apply it towards the camp fte that we were talking about, which I think you said you needed \$62,000, so we just apply \$12,000 and we would be able to accomplish both. So all you need to figure out is if \$62,000 gets you nine months of a person for the camp, and whether you have \$50,000 in your temporary sign person that we could apply towards the full-time fte.

>> Mcneeley: Got it. I will mute ice and stop my camera and reappear when I have the right answer.

>> Alter: Thank you. Sorry to make it complicated.

>> That's almost a wash, you know, almost.

>> Alter: That gets them two ftes that they need and get

[3:38:42 PM]

the funding moving forward. And then -- so it would be really helpful -- I'm just trying -- if someone could give us how much -- if we had -- we have \$651,420. Councilmember, how much was your amount?

>> Mayor Adler: 651 -- we have 574107 if we make the pool amendment.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Before you guys get too excited about getting to a zero or --

>> Mayor Adler: No, no.

>> We're putting numbers into our tracking spreadsheets. Just a couple things. One of the things we worked on over the break was this idea of putting in more savings related to the new positions. Carrie sent out an e-mail saying, hey, if you did them out at nine months of funding, \$790,000. That was for all of them. Your proposal is not proposing

[3:39:43 PM]

to fund all the ftes. Some of those proposals with fte(r) Not going to be included. Some of the proposals with ftes are for fewer ftes. We have to work through what is that real number. Another thing that that is not in the spreadsheet that you're currently working off of that is part of the staff cheat spreadsheet we're keeping up to date is as you commit to more on going funding under your tonight financial policies we would like to maintain to that 14% reserve. So if you commit to another million dollars of funding and you want to stay to the 14% reserve we need another \$140,000 going in the reserve. We're work on all this and I think you need to continue having your discussions. We're keeping track of all that. I don't want you to get too focused to balance the numbers on your sheets because there are other variables.

>> Mayor Adler: It absolutely know that. It enables the conversation to continue. We need for you as best you can, and we can take a break at any point in time, say, guys, take a

[3:40:43 PM]

break. Get us current to where we are right now. You say that and we're going to take a break and let you do that. We could always go to start discussing riders and the like.

>> And non-revenue, I have one or two that don't require money that we could knock out.

>> If the life guides are already nine months.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you walk me through what your change was? Give me item numbers.

>> So if -- so there is a temporary part-time person who is working on signage. Pard has money for that currently. If we -- do you have an answer? Do you have an answer?

>> So the answer to the question is that we can -- if we can secure a portion of the funding for the fte for wayfinding we can use existing funding that we have for a temporary -- in our temporary dollars to supplement the rest of the full-time wayfinding position. And the one-time funding

[3:41:46 PM]

associated with whatever it is that you would want to give us for wayfinding is less important because we can work through our other funding sources, like pld, perhaps not funding -- I'm not trying to guarantee any particular kind of funding but we believe the actual productions of the signs we can find other funding sources. So I think what you're asking me is if we gave you some money for the fte for wayfinding can you supplement the rest of your temporary funding to make up the full position, the answer is yes. And then I think what you asked me, is then you could put money that would be -- the full-time position for the camp, and it would be a wash, and answer to that question I believe is -- I think the way I understand it is yes.

>> We would probably need another \$12,000 or so to give them for the camp counselor and be a wash.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you tell

[3:42:46 PM]

me which item numbers?

>> Alter: Sure. You would be reducing the ongoing for alter 4 for wayfinding to \$50,000. And you would be moving tovo 2, you would be moving \$62,000 to ongoing. And I'm not sure with how you did it, if the 430 number was her original number or already backed out.

>> Mayor Adler: Which item are we talking about?

>> Alter: Tovo 2, \$62,000 in the ongoing. I do not have any idea whether you're reducing the 430.

>> Mayor Adler: No, that was --

>> Alter: Yeah. So you would be putting \$62,000 into ongoing.

>> Mayor Adler: \$62,000?

>> Alter: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Would that come out of the 430?

>> Yes.

>> Alter: No. You just told me that it wouldn't. That's what I don't know.

>> The 430 was inclusive of the

[3:43:47 PM]

fte.

>> Alter: Okay. The 62 would come out of the 430.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

>> And the 430 had an \$80,000 number in it. So if it's going down to --

>> Alter: Nine months.

>> -- Nine months, then --

>> Alter: You could still --

>> Tovo: Reduces to 350 and 62 moves over. And so that is 415-ish.

>> Alter: You could still up a S. Uplement that from temporary or to hire the person earlier than nine months. We would just be giving you the nine months of money.

>> Director Mcneeley: Does , doesthat work? We had it all as ongoing. Does that allow you to accomplish the objectives of accomplishing both of those programs?

[3:44:48 PM]

>> Mcneeley: Is answer is yes.

>> Mayor Adler: 350 one time and 250 ongoing subject to Ed and Carrie's actual fine-tuning of those numbers.

>> Alter: Right. And then I -- what I would like to do is put nine months of the grant position --

>> Mayor Adler: Which is alter 5.

>> Alter: Right. And the balance to aid and then let's see if we can get --

>> Mayor Adler: Tell me. What was the change we were doing with grant writing?

>> Alter: So alter 5 would be nine months and would be \$92,691.

>> Mayor pro tem, is it ongoing?

>> Alter: It's ongoing. Moving it from the one time to the ongoing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Alter: And then the balance to aid and thin we want to see how much is still to be funded from aisd, and we can see if we need to make any other positions nine months. I just don't have a sense of the total since we only added --

[3:45:51 PM]

we've added 115, I think, no, 105, something like that.

>> Mayor Adler: So just for our purposes, the \$9,174,606 would seem to go down by at least we were adding -- we could take \$100,000 off that number for the -- and I know we're doing this really generally. But where I had \$9,174,606 if we were to take \$100,000 off that that would cover that additional change in the reserves. Is that? Is that what you were recommending before?

>> Alter: Whatever number we get to in the ongoing we have to add more in reserves. Before we start spending any on one time we need to make sure we're covering the reserve. I think there's probably plenty

[3:46:51 PM]

for the amount of -- how much do we have to have oh.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll get to that level of detail later. That's probably a smart thing. What I'm showing is if we take make the changes you just talked about, one time 90 for the innovation office, \$92,691 to ongoing, there's no longer a one time expenditure there, if the signage wayfinding was represented just with \$50,000 in ongoing, I think those were the changes we were talking about. And aid dual language summer camp was \$350,000 in one time and \$62,000 in ongoing. If those changes are made, then it appears to me as if we have just over a million in one-time cumulative funding and just over \$450,000 in ongoing, but we know that's off by at least \$100,000, so probably like \$350,000-ish in

[3:47:54 PM]

original -- probably will come down a little bit because the fte will not be as great as it was before. So we're probably at 250 to 300, somewhere in that range, my guess would be, in ongoing.

>> Before we go too far down that path, I need to just talk about what the impact of this would be. You know, as I'm reflecting on it, we would have an fte that continues and is built into the budget but the actual money for the camps is only built in for next summer. So we would be creating a program to create Spanish language, dual language camps and hiring a staff member to support that program but we wouldn't have the money in the budget to actually execute the program. So I do think -- I do think -- I really appreciate the creativity and the flexibility councilmember mayor pro tem alter and working with your amendment to try to make it possible. However, you know, \$337,500 of

[3:48:54 PM]

that amount is for the materials and counselors to run the program and then the additional money is for the Spanish language marketing to make sure that families know about this option within our program. I just -- if we're going to make the commitment to having this as an offering within our parks system programs for the summer, which I think is really long overdue and should be here, I think we need to make the commitment to try to find the funding in an ongoing way. Yes. Okay.

>> Mcneely: I'm not trying to horse trade here, ladies and gentlemen. I just want to offer this, is that the council last year did provide the parks and recreation department with a certain amount of money allocated for after school program so we could expand after school programs. There might be an opportunity for us to take a portion or a smaller amount of that money and also some money that is already existing in the mexican-american

[3:49:56 PM]

cultural center budget to be able to provide sufficient funding or at least some funding that would be ongoing to be able to support the camps. And so I wanted to -- breath no

[no audio] The dual language camp even if we received funding this time, we would really look at our budgets in this coming fiscal year and figure out how to manage. But it would also mean that we would be very transparent and saying to you that we would be taking some funding from the already allocated funds that you provided for after school program and fy2021 which were not fully executed because of covid and some other reasons over this past fiscal year. So it wouldn't be as though we were retracting from something that was already existing. It would be that we hadn't actually started certain expansions. So just something that I could put on the table as a way that we could get everything done but

[3:50:56 PM]

being fully transparent that we wouldn't be using all the funding that was allocated for after school for that purpose. We would instead take a modest amount and help us get started with -- with the dual language camp.

>> Councilmember pool, I know that was programming that you advocated for and I think while they both fall into the category of out of schooltime programming, they really serve in many cases different age groups and different -- totally different objectives. So my preference would be to do both. If I understand you correctly, I think I understood what you were -- let me ask this question and depending on your answer, I may or may not need to better understand what you just described. But can you rank for me what the priority is from the parks department in terms of these needs that we've identified against the additional money for permanent lifeguards?

[3:52:03 PM]

>> Mcneeley: I would say the need for the permanent lifeguards is a higher priority than the things we are talking about at this particular point in time. I think I answered this question last year when I was asked about priorities. It's like asking me to choose my favorite child so I don't want to diminish the importance of them but if I had to choose one I would select the lifeguard situation or having some full-time lifeguards over the way finding and the dual language camp. But they're all important.

>> So can you help me understand, is it the programming for this next year that would be -- you would be taking money out of the after-school and putting it toward the summer camp? In future years, not necessarily this year because we would be funding it in -- in a one-time fashion. But in subsequent years, if you wanted to continue that and the council doesn't continue ongoing -- doesn't make another allocation for this program, you

[3:53:05 PM]

would work to find the funding for it but it would have to come out of somewhere else and likely it would come out of after after school.

>> Mcneeley: Or other options would be to allow us to spend the next fiscal year to look for partners to implement a dual language camp. There might be R maybe individual entities, not-for-profit organizations or community-based organizations. You have capacity and would love to partner with us. It's just that they don't have a location. I don't know. The possibilities could be endless. We could be looking for a partner that could help us. And you could bring something to the table either funding or in-kind services that we wouldn't have to fund that could allow the program to proceed without taking all of the money out of the after-school program. But giving us time to be able to figure that out is a luxury that we usually don't have. So if we did have one-time funding and allowed us the opportunity to seek partners to be able to plan for and continue the program, that's also another option with another -- with the

[3:54:05 PM]

final option being we could completely take it out of after-school program and the existing mexican-american cultural center budget.

>> Tovo: So that won't be my preference. But if we need to go in that direction, at least it gets the camps up and running. I would say for all of our programs, we should be looking for partners and partnerships. I think the parks department has always been open to that, you know, from what I can remember. I will say when we had the really challenging discussion about starting to charge at places like the botanical gardens we talked about getting partners for -- to make sure that we had free Sundays

or free days. We talk a lot about the need for partnerships here and the hope that the private sector and others will come forward and provide those partnerships and just, frankly, we don't have a lot of, in my perspective, we don't always have those folks coming forward to help fund city programs. But I appreciate -- I really appreciate the parks

[3:55:06 PM]

department's willingness to continue to do that and I hope it will be successful.

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

>> Fuentes: Thank you. Thank you, councilmember tovo, for flagging that the fte for the Mac was part of the -- of your amendment 2 for aid dual language summer camps. Oh, I'm sorry. I don't -- yeah. Which one is it?

>> I think we keep saying aid summer camps and they're open. They're pard's summer comps.

>> Fuentes: Okay. I think the doctor visited with our office and there council offices and flagged the importance of having that full-time fte dedicated staff to helped a administer the programs

[3:56:07 PM]

at the mexican-american culturaller is. So I'm glad to see, mayor pro tem, you're able to identify a pathway for us to keep that fte as part of this budget proposal.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes?

>> Ellis: I just want to flag again, wire waiting for numbers on the budget about one of the riders for a third personal holiday. So I just wanted to make sure we weren't caught by surprise if we're able to track that information down. It was originally a rider. But I also wanted taking in that flag that it was brought up that there was temporary employ eyes that qualified for health care but not dental. But I just wanted to flag -- if it's possible and if people are supportive, I drafted that amendment so we could bring it but I want to be really respectful that we all played by the rules and got our amendments and riders in when the deadline approached. This wasn't our our mind until

[3:57:08 PM]

the lifeguard brought it to us. If it doesn't pan out, we will bring it with an ifc and mid year budget I believe this is something we should be offering to our temporary employees that qualify.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, can I speak to that? Thank you, councilmember Ellis. It's a relatively low dollar amount, if I'm understanding correctly. So it would just be something, if after we finished all this conversation, there was about -- I think it's \$80,000 or so --

>> Ellis: 70.

>> Kitchen: If there's \$70,000 left that people want to do the dental, we could do it now. Otherwise I'm happy to support councilmember Ellis to find another way to get to that after this.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Ellis: I appreciate that. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: I'm not getting down to the 250, \$300,000 range where you are, mayor, because you said it was 574 after councilmember pool's amendment and then it's about 103 between adding the

[3:58:10 PM]

nine month grant position and then that \$12,000 delta to get the other fte.

>> Mayor Adler: \$469,416 with those changes. For the changes that we made.

>> Alter: Okay. I had 471. Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Pretty darn close. And then I took from that about \$100,000 or 140 I think is what Ed said in terms of reserve dollars that he was going to want to put in there.

>> Alter: So I'm concerned -- so the reserve dollars can come in the one-time money. They don't have to be ongoing money. And I think it's higher than \$140,000 if we're spending \$12 million. Can you tell us about what that is because we have our one-time column is low and I don't want us to start spending it.

[3:59:12 PM]

You're not on. We can't hear you.

>> Mayor Adler: Speaker.

>> Am I on now?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> For every \$1 million you need to increase your reserves by \$140,000 to keep that 14%. So if you're adding \$12 million to the budget, it's going to be more like 1680,000 to be 14%, I think?

>> Alter: But I think -- so, if we move, though -- if we move the aid to the other column, then we have one-time money, how much --

>> Mayor Adler: I had us just over a million dollars of one-time dollars with those changes now.

>> Alter: Okay. Is that really the thing that we're hung up on?

>> Mayor Adler: If we're generally, then we haven't decided anything. But this would be a good time to give Ed and Carrie the chance to kind of reconcile and then come back with a better number of where we are, this might be a good time to do that.

[4:00:15 PM]

>> Tovo: Yes, I would like to take a formal vote or whatever it is on moving -- I would like to really argue strongly we move the dual language summer camps into the ongoing in full for the reasons I did I just said. We would be starting a program we want to continue. I apologize for the confusion. We said on the amendment sheet area aids but just to signify local kids participating. It's not an aid program. It's not a program. It's solely run through our -- through our own pard program. And I would suggest -- I would like to talk about why the funding for echo is not one time. We have a lot of fund-raising going on. We've allocated a lot of funding within our own city budget, within our arpa dollars for these needs and we know there's a private fund-raising effort. To me that would -- the additional work -- I would like to see that \$406,000 moved back

[4:01:18 PM]

into one-time funds for this year and the summer comps moved over to ongoing. And these are hard choices and on this day year after year to advocate for the homelessness before it became the council priority, I want to continue to support that as the number one priority but we need to fund other needs as well. To me, those are -- at the moment, we would be prioritizing one over the other and we simply have to, in my opinion, we have to invest at a level appropriate for the youth in this community. And they're all important needs but I would suggest we move that back to ongoing.

>> Mayor, I'm really confuse with all of this discussion. Can we take a break and see the numbers that we have?

>> Yeah. I would like to do that, too.

>> I think that's appropriate but the numbers are based on a proposal that I'm suggesting we take a different approach to.

[4:02:19 PM]

Which is why I'm talking about it now.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's talk about those two things and then let's go to Ed to run that. In answer to your question, you're absolutely right. This is hard at this point because everything on here are things that I want to do and hope that the council does. I personally would prioritize the homelessness services dollars as my top priority of everything on this page that I think is potentially moving around. Just because I see a community trying to dramatically increase capacity. I think that the administrative component of this has not kept up with it. This dollar amount doesn't go up in ten years at least. And it's a really important if we're going to make that significant, greater investment in the community, that we facilitate it. Among the things on the list, I'm going to support the kinds of things that we just talked about to move some of the things over, back to ongoing, as we've discussed. But for me, I think that we have

[4:03:24 PM]

to make that -- it's a need that's ongoing, it's real, and I think it's part and parcel of our larger investment. So for me, that's just real important. All right. Anybody else -- is there a sense of other people that want to move that out of ongoing for right now? This is not a final decision. We can make decisions later. So I'm not gathering --

>> I'm sorry, move what? Move that?

>> Moving the money for echo --

[no audio]

>> What was the second thing you wanted to address?

>> I wanted to ask why the other funding we have in the homelessness budget can't accommodate this additional and also we have had numerous conversations on this dais about all allocating money to specific

[4:04:24 PM]

organizations. It's not identified that way but that's the only organization providing the service at this moment. And they have offered in various public settings to help us raise money for, say, the operations and the management of our hotels. And so I just want to be really clear about what we're doing. We're using additional money from city budget to help fund that organization that has and is engaged in the process of fund-raising. So it's --

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I get what you're saying, councilmember tovo. I would just suggest that we make clear this funding is not designated for any one entity. We've been trying to look across the community and doing capacity building and other things for other entities. I would have to don't prioritize it. So...

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So without making any final decisions, Ed and Carrie, if we're going to ask you to kind of run the numbers on this and tell us where you think we

[4:05:25 PM]

really are, just to review, what I'm seeing is that the things that we have -- I'm going to read down the list here. Adler 1 at the 406270 028. Adler 4 has changed from 301 to 208. The -- stay is proposed. So things that change is the -- I'm sorry. The parks wayfinding is now \$50,000 in ongoing. And then the grant writing is \$92,691 in ongoing. Where you can make the changes in ftes to go to nine months for new ftes we're asking you to make those changes that were components of the \$790,000.

[4:06:27 PM]

In addition to that, the whole blood program, we're showing as 120 in one time and 880 in the debt or other. The animal behavior specialist, we have coming out. We have the dual language summer camp being 350 in one time and 62 in on going. The aid funding is \$539,225 in one time and 150 in ongoing. The permanent lifeguard position is at 250. Ongoing. The strategic stipend fund has come out. The aadc is \$1 million. Councilmember tovo's mine is zero'ed out. Anti-hate campaign is at 350, one time.

[4:07:28 PM]

And then the inclaimant weather shelter is out and it's going to be in exchange for the \$3 million component. The gender neutral bathroom we still have as \$100,000 in one time. And then we have social services is at zero'ed out, the emergency program is at 3. And the environmental testing is zero'ed out. I guess we're going ask you to do your work, whatever, and then alert us when you're ready to tell us where you think you are.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: At that point we'll have full conversation. Mayor pro tem, councilmember kitchen, and then councilmember tovo.

>> Alter: I just want to be clear on two things. One is that if you can make sure you give us a number for the epidemiologist, where we would have all four of them starting right away, because I know that

[4:08:30 PM]

might be necessary if you can -- you can tell us what the differences is, if we did two nine months or all four -- all four -- two nine months to a full year or all four, just so we have the difference there. That would be helpful. It's my understanding the goal would be -- and then we have to decide when we get the numbers, but that amount could go towards the aid bucket as of now.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll see how that conversation goes.

>> Alter: But right now we're mostly talking about the camp or the aid being in that bucket.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't know that you can draw that conclusion from the discussion we've had. We could ask that. So I think the question that mayor pro tem is asking is, do we want to say at this point if we have additional one-time -- if we have additional ongoing dollars, at that point in time, we'll try to move more of the tovo -- 9?

[4:09:34 PM]

To ongoing, I think is the question. Are people ready to --

>> I've got to ask some questions before we take a break.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't know the answer to that question. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: So I noticed I have questions about two different items that are listed in ongoing. The first, councilmember harper-madison, is yours for the historic preservation study. As I recall it did not have an fte in it and now an fte has been added. Is this amount -- can you walk us through what is in this and has it been reduced any since you first brought it forward?

>> Harper Madison: I cannot. I will be able to do so when we get back. I wasn't prepared to do that. I intentionally built what we did in the base budget to bring very little into the process. I did not look at mine, to be honest with you.

[4:10:34 PM]

>> Tovo: That would be great. As I recall it did not originally have an fte in it but then there was a revision to put an fte in it. It's possible that some of that -- I think we should have a conversation around whether it could go forward without that ongoing cost. And I'll have to check back to it, too. I don't have that information. I also notice that we have reduced to nine months most of these positions. Councilmember kitchen, we haven't had an opportunity to talk yet about the dais about the age friendly --

>> Kitchen: That's been reduced.

>> Tovo: I'm looking at the budget amendment, \$100,000, maybe 3, am I looking at the wrong sheet?

>> Kitchen: Yes, it's reduced on this.

>> Tovo: I'm seeing --

>> Kitchen: It's reduced right here.

>> Tovo: On the sheet you distributed --

>> Mayor Adler: Which item number?

>> Tovo: Kitchen 4.

>> Kitchen: Councilmember tovo, it's on here as nine months and I said that yesterday. So they have calculated it at nine months.

[4:11:34 PM]

>> Tovo: I see. Forward for \$100,000 is the nine-month?

>> Kitchen: No, it's old. This is the -- this is the current.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the new number?

>> Tovo: The item that you distributed says \$100,000. The item I distributed several days ago were we talked about the nine months.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the correct number?

>> Tovo: It's not in this spreadsheet correctly.

>> Mayor Adler: What is the correct number?

>> Kitchen: The correct number is -- also see. That is -- it should be \$83,989.

>> Mayor Adler: \$83,989.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much.

>> Kitchen: Sorry about that. I think -- mayor, I think some of the other ftes aren't reflected in here at the nine months. That may be what you're seeing, councilmember tovo.

>> Mayor Adler: I think many of these were 12 months and staff is going to have to discern which ones are already nine months and which ones are --

>> Kitchen: Yeah. I think that's what's going on.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

[4:12:34 PM]

Okay. Are we ready to let them have at it?

>> Tovo: I have one more -- councilmember Ellis can go first.

>> Ellis: I was just going to flag, now that we're getting closer into the numbers. If we're taking a break I hope budget can add in the numbers they're still helping us track down for that third personal holiday. I also wanted to have a procedural question because my understanding is we're not going to up and down vote everything in the spreadsheet. If there's something we do wish to say that we're voting no on do we do that later?

>> Mayor Adler: We'll try and see if we can handle a consent agenda. Which number is it that you're waiting for additional -- which item number?

>> Ellis: It is actually a rider that we've been advised needs to change into an amendment. So it is going to be called Ellis amendment 4.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And what rider is that now?

>> Ellis: It is the dollars for the third personal holiday. So our interpretation when we wrote the rider was that through

[4:13:35 PM]

all of these recruitment and retention plans that we're putting into effect we wouldn't be dipping into overtime as much as --

>> Mayor Adler: So Ellis 4 moving now to Ellis -- Ellis rider 4 --

>> Ellis: Will now be Ellis amendment 4.

>> Mayor Adler: And we don't know what the number is yet? Do you know approximately what the number is?

>> Ellis: I think it was -- it was in one of our q&as, maybe -- Ed, we were just talking about this a few hours ago now at this point.

>> Yeah, the q&a had the cost of adding that holiday at \$550,000 split roughly 50/50 between the general fund and enterprise department. Does not include sworn personnel.

>> So it's 50/50, not one-third, two-thirds?

>> That's what the group texting, chatting with me is. And I don't know.

[4:14:35 PM]

I mean, I can almost promise you that's their best estimate at this point in time. It's not based on an exact analysis.

>> What is?

>> Mayor Adler: So that would be the new Ellis 4 amendment, which would be replacing the Ellis 4 rider, has about 275 in ongoing? And 275 in debt or other because --

>> Enterprise.

>> Mayor Adler: Enterprise. But that wouldn't take 275 out of ongoing.

>> It would take -- I think it puts it in.

>> Mayor Adler: Is that a cost or a credit? It's a cost.

>> Cost.

>> Mayor Adler: It adds to the total of dollars, the delta would go down by 250. It's a 275 cost, so it would be listed among these other things that are cost, it would be listed at 275.

>> Ellis: That's why our rider

[4:15:35 PM]

was written in a certain way but we wanted to make sure that we worked well with budget so we weren't directing something that ended up having a fiscal impact, surprisingly.

>> Mayor Adler: But it does have a fiscal impact.

>> Ellis: Which is what they're telling me.

>> Mayor Adler: It is an amendment.

>> We are probably going to have to take votes on some of these things to sort out --

>> Mayor Adler: Not votes but we're going to continue talking and hopefully continue talking without taking votes.

>> Councilmember Ellis, I know you made changes to your pay eligibility threshold, did it land at 191 as an ongoing?

>> Ellis: Yes, it did. Staff confirmed that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. We're going to let you do that. Colleagues, the time is 4:16. Ed, Carrie, what kind of time do you think you need to -- got to run through this stuff.

[4:16:35 PM]

What are you thinking?

>> If y'all give us about 30 minutes.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want to take a break for 30 minutes, everybody, and review the correction and then we'll come back and get that information? If we have time we'll start with direction. Does work?

>> Tovo: Are we planning on taking a dinner break? I ask because I'm going to have to leave at some point and do a student pick-up. So I mean, at this point I don't think we're going to be taking votes so I can just do it virtually by just wanted to give you all a heads up.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we're close. We -- I guess the question is going to be, in 30 minutes when we're back here at a quarter til, and we get those numbers, I guess I just don't know how far off we're going to be. I don't know how many of the riders are going to be contested. I would think that it may very well -- be possible that we're going to take a dinner break but I don't think --

>> Tovo: We have -- we have a couple hours ahead of us at

[4:17:36 PM]

least.

>> Mayor Adler: My guess is we go until about 6:00 and take a break, unless people feel differently about that. Okay?

>> Tovo: I'll have to switch to virtual for a little bit.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We'll be back at a quarter til. See you then. We're in recess.

[4:59:01 PM]

[Music].

[Music].

[5:26:27 PM]

>> The big driver is that reserve issue.

>> What was that amount again?

>> Wait. For you that. I wanted the council to hear those two numbers.

>> Alter: I wanted to know what the number was. I couldn't hear the second number.

>> I'll read them both again. Available ongoing negative 518135. Available one time negative 733,799.

>> So [indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

[5:27:30 PM]

[Music]

[5:28:44 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We'll go ahead and reconvene the city council meeting here at 5:28 on August 18th, 2022. This is the continuation of a meeting that began yesterday. We are in city council chambers. When we last recessed we were asking staff to tell us about where -- generally where we thought we might be on one-time and ongoing funding. Can you tell us what those numbers would be and if they changed based on what you've learned in the meantime? Can you walk us through that so we understand what those numbers really are?

>> Sure. We're also working to try to get the screen up so you all can see them as we walk through them, but the link has been updated so you can see the document, the shared document and you can follow through as I talk through this. So when you look at the

[5:29:44 PM]

changes that you see, we talked about a couple of things. The ftes and the changes with the ftes as we originally gave you the numbers, when we went through and looked at the changes that were made, the ones that are nine months, some of the ftes that were included in the original were not moved forward and so, for example, the lifeguards we took that down. That was the largest cost. So the savings when we go through all of that and look at the final amendments -- do you want me to go through one by one so you can see the changes or do you want to talk about the total that we're at right now?

>> Mayor Adler: Talk about the total and give us a feel for as you just did.

>> When we look at the total ongoing we are at deficit right now, 518,135 for ongoing. One time we're at a deaf set of 733,799.

>> Mayor Adler: And the reason we're at a deficit of

[5:30:45 PM]

518 relative to where we were before ongoing is in part due to we didn't get as much of the savings as we had anticipated?

>> Correct. We didn't get as much of the savings from the ftes that were anticipated. When we looked at some of the adjustment we were making -- we also did a split of what was enterprise versus general funds. We made all the reconciliations, but it's primarily because of the amount of ftes that caused that large of a deficit.

>> And that does not include right at the end councilmember Ellis was talking about her amendment number 4, which was 275 to the general fund. That's not included in there?

>> That is currently not included.

>> Mayor Adler: And then the number you said for ongoing we were over you said was 733?

>> Ongoing is over 518.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, one time was 733.

[5:31:45 PM]

>> One time is 733799.

>> Mayor Adler: And why is that number where it was? I guess the biggest component of that would be the one-time payment to the reserve.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: About how much did that end up being?

>> Give me one second while I scroll over.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Based on the total ongoing the reserve is \$1,785,741 is what needs to go into reserves.

>> So that's the delta mean the median we had and -- so that explains that. We thought we had a million there but we didn't. Instead of 1.7 we had a million. We thought we had a million there and it turned out we needed a million seven.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. When it's the right time,

[5:32:48 PM]

mayor, I would like to understand those reserves.

>> Mayor Adler: And the 518 we thought we were a couple of 100 up but it's not because of the ftes. Now if we want to ask questions about where we are. Do you want start?

>> Kitchen: I want to understand. The reserve was 1,000,785 what? 1,785,741.

>> Kitchen: Okay. If you could just remind me what determines the amount stated? What's the formula?

>> It is 14%. So as we're adding in the ongoing costs, in order to reach the 14% reserve we have to add that amount into that 14 percent into one time. So that is representing the 14 percent of the ongoing cost that you added.

>> Kitchen: So that number would not have changed because we knew at the beginning how much we had in

[5:33:50 PM]

ongoing. So is the 14 percent of all ongoing or is it just of ftes for reserves?

>> That is all the ongoing from the council amendments.

>> Kitchen: I guess maybe we just didn't have that down before because the ongoing amount hasn't changed. It was 12,162,915, we've known that for awhile. I guess we did not understand how much would be needed for reserves, is that right?

>> Correct. That was -- the amount that was available was the total amount. As you spend that total amount, we were having the conversation of how much upped to spend was ongoing or what could be one time. As you spend as ongoing we calculate the reserves based on your decision to spend those dollars is ongoing.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, but we only have our pot for ongoing has always been 12,162,915.

>> That has not changed. That was the available funds for you to spend in ongoing dollars. Richard I guess when we were

[5:34:50 PM]

doing our calculations we didn't subtract eight percent of that -- 14 percent.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: So if we knew our one-time funding pot was 12,000,000.1, they're separately -- there's a separate pot for reserve funding. In other words, we're trying to shave down our amendment projections to meet that number of 12.1. Y'all factners a certain reserve level for that 12.1, but is there now an increase?

>> You had 12 million available in ongoing funds. As you spend that 12 million, each million that you spend, as Ed mentioned, is 140,000 that you have to move over. So as you spend those dollars we have to calculate based on what you're spending as ongoing. We then calculate what the reserve calculations are. If you chose to spend, for example, all that 12 million

[5:35:51 PM]

in one-time, there would be no need for reserves. So when we give you the full funding we say you have the option to do this -- you have ongoing available. You can spends that one time or ongoing. If you spend it as ongoing we have to start calculating the reserve calculations based on your ongoing choices.

>> Fuentes: Gotcha. So because we're choosing to use the 12 million as ongoing, it then incurs an increase in the reserve level.

>> To make sure we stay at the 14% reserve policy.

>> Fuentes: Gotcha. Okay. That makes sense.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: And the 14% that is taken from the ongoing, is that then part of the one-time?

>> Correct.

>> Pool: And that's why we have a deficit there that's the 733 when we thought that we had actually put that out. So we now have to debit

[5:36:51 PM]

against the one-time for the reserves transfer of 1.786.

>> Correct.

>> Pool: Okay. So it's the one time we're now looking at. Actually, they both have deficit, but the big one is now in the one-time.

>> Mayor Adler: I think Adler number 4 that was discussed from the dais was 3.1208. Which I think is \$70,000 more than what's in that pot.

>> Yes, it was 347. And if we had -- if we walked through all of them, we had an adjustment from Lauren and it was a little bit higher than what we told you this morning. The total now is --

>> Mayor Adler: There was an amendment offered by councilmember pool.

>> Thought it would be 77,000 and it ended up 117. So the total amount of that member is maybe 380 right

[5:37:53 PM]

now but you will see on the sheet we split it between two buckets because we also recognize that it's a support services fund. So it's allocated between the --

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. You have already taken into account councilmember pool's amendment.

>> Kitchen: It's not all in ongoing is what you're saying?

>> The ongoing amount is actually -- even though we've adjusted the total amount from councilmember pool's amendment upward from our original estimate it's from the ongoing fund column to the enterprise column which is a function that gets allocated out to the different departments.

>> Kitchen: So the total is there, we just can't see it.

>> You should be able to see it. If you scroll to the left you should see enterprise that has another --

>> Mayor Adler: Column N on the staff's worksheet.

>> Kitchen: I see T.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[5:38:54 PM]

>> Vela: I think that's the 125 for the Fayetteville testing is still listed in the one time expenses. So I've been communicating with Austin energy and we're finalizing the language on it, but Austin energy is going to fund it out of their budgets so we can deduct that 125 from the one-time expenses for the Fayette power plant testing. That is my vela d26.

>> Mayor Adler: D26. Thank you.

>> Vela: And then I believe the social contract amendment, councilmember tovo could speak to that, but I think it's still listed as a one-time expense.

>> Kitchen: No, it was taken out. Do they still have it here?

>> Vela: I believe so.

>> Kitchen: What line do you see that?

>> Tovo: Thank you, council member vela. I'm listening, but not seeing, so thank you for catching that.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not

[5:39:57 PM]

seeing. What line is it.

>> Vela: 48d.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, that should come out. We took that out. We took that out. That's a million.

>> Mayor Adler: I tell you what, let's take a five minute break here and let everybody check numbers.

>> Alter: It is out because you have where it was listed in the original stuff they were adding up and it's to the right of the blue action.

>> Kitchen: Which column are you adding up?

>> Alter: I think we need to look at J and L.

>> If you look at the spreadsheet you will see all the items and there's a blue column that says pending. If it says pending that means that you have -- this is something you want to consider and then to the right of the blue column you will see the dollars.

>> Kitchen: So which columns are added up for purposes of --

>> Those on the right-hand side of the spreadsheet, the columns to the right of the blue bar.

>> Mayor Adler: So we should be checking right now

[5:40:57 PM]

J and K to make sure that those are what we think they are, column J, column K.

>> Somebody is saying J and L.

>> Mayor Adler: That's right, J and L, sorry. Let's take a couple of minutes here and let's check those numbers.

[5:42:36 PM]

>> Vela: We had a higher value for the Adler 4. While you were talking we updated it to the latest motion of councilmember pool.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[5:45:55 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any costs associated with tovo 12, the additional council fte?

>> Tovo: Mayor, if I could speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: There should not be. I do need to make a couple of clarifications from the dais about that and would love for hr to do that as well. If the amendment sheet doesn't indicate it, it should say unfunded fte. And we'll have to be sure that there's a clear understanding on council now maintained in the future that that fte does not come with the benefits that would ordinarily be provided by the city of Austin. So this fte would be available only to those council offices that have the ability to pay both the salary and what would ordinarily be the city's contribution towards that employee's insurance and benefits.

[5:46:59 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: And I don't know that there is.

>> That's how it was presented by the council member.

>> Tovo: I appreciate you raising it because I think there will have to be an awareness among everyone that just because we have that fte it doesn't come with benefits.

>> Kitchen: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: A question for the mayor pro tem. The signage and wayfinding I was thinking that was 50, but I'm seeing it as 150. It's line 59.

>> Alter: If you look at J it says 50. 100,000 is not enterprise, it's the one-time funds that are coming from hot, tuf and other.

>> Kitchen: I got you. See that.

>> Mayor Adler: Just focus and J and L.

>> Kitchen: Got it.

>> Mayor Adler: Again, rather than -- I'm not sure, again, I think probably

[5:47:59 PM]

having the ability to look at this and go back to the list probably would make sense for people to have a chance to look at. Does anybody have any questions before we take a dinner break?

>> If I could have just one clarification, mayor? The council compensation item, there's three different numbers that have gone around and I apologize for the confusion. I still don't think it's currently correct on the online version of the spreadsheet, but before I have them make the change I want to make sure everybody understands that it had initially been proposed in Adler 4 at 263,885 was essentially to have it go in effect in January. Councilmember pool proposed to bring the start date back to December. Staff said it was cost 341,208. That was incorrect. Lauren who does your numbers says it needs to be 395,695. I wanted to be clear on

[5:49:01 PM]

that. 395,693 will be the number we put on the only spreadsheet.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Could you help us understand are all of these in at nine months, the ftes? Or did we make any changes on the ftes?

>> Most of the ftes are in at nine months. There were two for alter that were kept at one full year funding.

>> Kitchen: For all four ftes?

>> And accc, accc and the four epidemiologists.

>> Kitchen: So is that five ftes at the full year? I don't know how much was for accc.

>> Alter: There were two I said all along because there

[5:50:01 PM]

were already in there. And for the epidemiologist it's about a 30 or 40,000 difference if you do them at nine months versus 12, but the director suggested they could get them all in at 12 months and it would be one interview process rather than having to do two interview processes to do them at nine and 12. And given everything we're asking our health department to do right now --

>> Kitchen: I'm not arguing it against it.

>> Alter: I'm just explaining why it was left in that way.

>> Kitchen: I wanted everyone to said that they would be left at nine months, but for good reason the director wanted them all at 12 months. So those four in there are 12 months.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have any questions before we take a dinner break? It's almost 6:00.

Colleagues, I think we come back and we will obviously try to make that additional cuts that are about a

[5:51:01 PM]

million two and a half, 250. Obviously it gets even harder now. We should be able to get through that. If we can get through that then let's see how quickly we can go through the riders. For what it's worth I handed out on the dais and I've asked my office to post the list of riders I'm working off of. I hope it's accurate. But we'll go through the riders and see if we can do that and then at any point we can make the decision about ending and going tomorrow. But we have the choreography about 12 things we need to vote on per state statute. That probably takes half an hour to work through once we've decided all of the numbers. So I just want to give you notice on that.

>> Tovo: Mayor? Just one sec. I did want to point out that in some cases our amendments

[5:52:05 PM]

also had further direction and so I know mine do and I'll try to figure out how best to go through that. But like [indiscernible] We haven't voted on. We haven't voted on any of these things and haven't brought them forward. So there will still be some amendments. In other words, there will still be some amendments that we need to bring forward and discuss. Also several of us have amendments aren't related to the general fund and those still will require discussion and votes as well. So I just wanted to point that out that we do have some amendments left outside of the ones that we've been discussing.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's good. So procedurally, once we think we know where the budget is, once we've been able to have free form conversation moved back and forth between unrelated amendments, we'll entertain the base motion which will be the staff recommendation

[5:53:05 PM]

we'll adopt the amendments that were part and parcel of what we decided and we'll open up the discussion for changes to the amendments that were offered and then we'll do the same thing with the riders. But thank you, councilmember tovo, we also have about six things that are neither riders nor are they budget stuff, so we'll work out way through that next.

>> Kitchen: I have one other question.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just for purposes of us thinking about this, what options do we have with regard to the reserves? Do we have any? The 14 percent is something that we've decided on, right? >>

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. With that, 5:53 let's take a recess. Let's come back at 7:00. Let come back here. Is 30 minutes enough for people to work through

[5:54:06 PM]

numbers? Let's do 45 minutes. A quarter till 7:00 let's come back, 6:45. We'll see you then. We're in recess.

[5:57:39 PM]

.

[6:33:59 PM]

.

[6:55:55 PM]

.

[6:58:56 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We will now resume our meeting. It is 6:58. 6:58 here on the 18th. I've just handed out, you have the staff's link which obviously is the one that has the best numbers. We tried to reconcile what you see in front of you. We have in front of you draft proposal 8. We think that is pretty well reconciled to what the staff has done, just with a different form. But generally speaking this is about where we are.

>> Kelly: Mayor, is this posted to the hemmed as well to the public can see it and follow along with us as well?

>> Mayor Adler: We'll post it as well.

>> Kelly: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: So now we're trying to find cuts.

[7:00:03 PM]

And this is pretty hard stuff. Anybody want to suggest any cuts? Do you want to talk through some? Yes, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: I would like to raise suggesting and talk through the epidemiologists. I brought forward this item in an amendment in our 2020 conversation. It was at 550k at the time in ongoing. I wonder if this is a good opportunity to talk about the amount of epidemiologists, the amount of epidemiologists and the need and if this is an area where we can consider maybe accomplishing the challenge ahead of us with making some cuts. So I think this might be --

>> Mayor Adler: Is

[7:01:04 PM]

director Sturup? Thank you. Mayor, for what it's worth to get director Sturup over, for what we need or don't need, do you want to maybe take the pulse of the dais of maybe moving from four to two on the epidemiologists?

>> Mayor Adler: We could do that. I hate to --

>> Harper-madison: I think it will help to reduce how much conversation we have. That is the one thing I am

[7:02:05 PM]

going to commit to is not deliberating further than we need to. While I recognize this is a super important conversation, I would very much for us to get it done tonight and go home at a reasonable hour tonight which I think is possibly if we're all mindful about how much deliberation we need to see.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We're not getting a vote, but a feel from the dais. Obviously we have to cut somewhere and these are big numbers. Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: I was going to say I would support cutting the epidemiologists from four to two.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody else want to weigh in? Yes, mayor pro tem and then -- I'm sorry, councilmember Kelly and then mayor pro tem.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I hope to be mayor pro tem one day. I actually have a question for mayor pro tem alter if she could maybe explain why she landed on the number four instead of the number two?

>> Alter: So I asked a question in the q&a about how prepared we were to deal request the epidemics that we are confronted with including covid and monkey

[7:03:07 PM]

pox and whether we had the resources that were needed. It was shared with me that we are not meeting the standards for epidemiologists for our community. That you would have one for every thousand in the community. We don't have a sufficient number of those which makes it harder for us to both plan for and to respond to epidemics and the four number came with what it would take to get us to be to the national standard. And in their response to me to my question, they said aph lacks the necessary fund capacity... For response to outbreaks and prevention strategies. In response to another q&a they said aph currently does not meet the council of state and epidemiologist optimal level of epidemiologists. One epidemiologists per 100,000 population for the population of austin-travis county. An additional four epidemiologists would be required to meet this

[7:04:10 PM]

standard. Number of epidemiologists on staff directly impacts aph's ability to respond to covid and other disease outbreaks. And considering that one of the key reasons that we have even this opportunity to be able to have this 20 million to spend is because of covid-related reimbursements seems to me that we should be investing that opportunity in the health of our community. We were just tested by covid and now being tested by monkey pox and I just don't feel like we're as prepared as we need to be and I think this is a really high priority for our community.

>> Mayor Adler: So I think the way we'll do it is a better way -- I appreciate there should be a limitation if we want to move forward, but rather than having one thing come up and then vote on it, let's just run through real quick what the cuts could be because if other people -- if the mayor pro tem has cuts that are better than that, then I want to give her a chance to

[7:05:11 PM]

be able to identify those. While we're talking about epidemiologists one other thing I would look at is delaying that the same three months that we've delayed the others so we get the fte savings for the epidemiologists. I understand that it's important that we have them. Adding important. I would add everybody -- if we're going to do that I would do that with everybody, the epidemiologists if we were going to keep them on. I think the only other one we had was the civilian conservation corps, which means the parks department would have to go another three months in their existing situation which I know they don't want to do, I understand that. I think everybody doesn't -- would rather have the ftes earlier, but I would make that fte change on those other two areas as possible cuts. All right. So those are two suggested possible cuts. Does anybody else want to

[7:06:13 PM]

make any suggestions?

>> Harper-madison: Mayor? I also have a question about and would like to have a difficult conversation with my colleagues about the anti-hate item. Alter number three. I'm obviously really, really appreciate the sentiment and really appreciate the need, but have some questions about the execution here and the practical application and whether or not this is the most appropriate place for us to put this amount of funding.

>> Are we just supposed to have the conversations right now? I'm not sure what the process is.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been suggested that's another cut. If we approved all three of these cuts we're not there yet. So far those are the best three cuts that have been suggested to us because

[7:07:14 PM]

they're the only three cuts that have been suggested to us. We'll certainly open the door for other cuts to be suggested. Council member vela.

>> Vela: What about moving the summer youth employment to one-time funding and then looking at it again coming up next year so we can -- I hate to cut the amount. I had this conversation with

councilmember tovo, because again we're moving it from eight dollars an hour to \$13 an hour, which is I believe the same rate as Travis county. I completely agree with the goals and honestly it a fair pay even for 16-year-olds, 15-year-olds, but maybe we could shift that to one time and look at it again? I just want to throw it out there.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you for throwing that out. Question --

>> Which number was that?

>> Vela: That is --

[7:08:16 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Tovo 10.

>> Tovo: Can I ask council member vela a quick question about that?

>> Mayor Adler: A quick question because we're not debating.

>> Tovo: I'm not. I'm asking a quick question. What woulding the impact and went subsequent year they would go back to \$13 and hour or have fewer kid. Absent any further action what are you proposing would be the subsequent year?

>> Vela: I would have to know a little more about how many kids, applications. I would honestly like to get input from the director of the program to see what she would do in that context. But I would not like to return to eight dollars an hour, I'll say that.

>> Tovo: Thank you. That's helpful.

>> I had received a call --

>> Tovo: I'm not saying I agree, but it's helpful.

>> Mayor Adler: Is the simulation -- at one point I thought I heard that the simulation was two mannequins. Is that true?

[7:09:19 PM]

Could we do one mannequin in the simulation?

>> I am going to take a look here. Mr. Van eenoo, if you know how many that is?

>> I don't know the number. The chief may be around. In talking to him I thought it was numerous mannequins, not one or two. More than that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I would like for us to consider -- potentially cutting the number of mannequins from a million down to 500,000 or something if we need that. I like that we're doing both the ems. I'm cognizant of the fact that when they had to prioritize that what was most important to them was the whole blood, but anyhow, I would put that on the list.

>> Kitchen: Mayor? On the mannequins, since that's sort of a -- it's an item. I don't know enough about whether debt service is available for mannequins, to purchase the mannequins. I would want to know that.

[7:10:20 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: So that was one of the things that councilmember Kelly and I were going to propose but we were talking about cuts first here. So we can move over the million dollars from the mannequins to debt service for the simulation.

>> Kitchen: You could move it from one time to owe.

>> Alter: From one-time to the other.

>> Kitchen: I would support that.

>> Kelly: So then we would leave the program as is if --

>> Alter: The program would be as is, but it would be debt financed.

>> Mayor Adler: So the one million would come off and the \$20,000 would stay.

>> Kitchen: Yeah.

>> Alter: I have Somer other suggested cuts.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll take some. Right now we have five. Okay.

>> Alter: Okay. I think that we have a pot of three million going to housing on top of other

[7:11:22 PM]

resources. I think that could be scaled back and we could always do a midyear and increase that. So that could go down a a million or more. I think that we could solve the ongoing by moving heal to one time. That would solve a lot of problems with that. We haven't bought the other hotel yet. I don't know if we're going to buy the other hotels when we see the amounts so I think that would be another option that we could look at.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you for those. Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: I would like to suggest that we look at creating the dual language program as a pilot to set it up and get it established which would put that in a one-time -- I don't think that one moved over, did it?

[7:12:27 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: A lot of that did. I think we moved it -- we left 62,000 --

>> Pool: That is to set up the program and determine if it is viable and would continue. Is that correct?

>> Tovo: We would need director Mcneeley to confirm, but that person, that fte would do that, but they would also provide staffing for another program at the mac.

>> Pool: Okay. I see the 350 there in one-time.

>> Alter: Mayor, I have a question. So this spreadsheet adds Ellis' amendment which we haven't seen the numbers from until today. Then it has a considerable amount in enterprise funds. At some point we're going to have to add fee increases. So does that generate a fee

[7:13:28 PM]

increase?

>> Mayor Adler: Ellis 4.

>> Ellis: I know for the service incentive pay it did not.

>> Alter: For the additional personal holidays?

>> Ellis: Right. So for the other one of similar line item it did not. So I don't know if the answer is the same or different for this.

>> Alter: But if you add the two of them, you start adding them together, it might generate that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Ellis, if you had to pick between those two, Ellis 3 and Ellis 4, which one would you pick?

>> Ellis: If I had to pick one I think I would go with the service incentive pay. I know that the numbers for the extra personal day have been coming in late even though we've been working on them for at least a couple of days publicly. If that one doesn't get through today I will bring it back as an ics so we can better understand the implications because I'm still trying to understand where the numbers are being calculated.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So I would add Ellis number 4 to the potential cut list. Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Mayor?

[7:14:30 PM]

Just a quick question. So the dollar amount in the ongoing, we're trying to hit that we're over. Is that the 683 at the bottom of your --

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: Okay. We've got -- got it. That's what we're shooting for.

>> Yes. Council member vela.

>> Vela: Homelessness is a priority for the community and the council. If I'm going to cut something with regard to homelessness I guess I would aim for that spot, not health or any of the other more substantive kind of service provision areas.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, can I speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'm certainly open to that except I don't know that we need to because it's in one time. We've already figured out if the man Kins are a million and that might get us where we need to go in the one

[7:15:31 PM]

time and we're not losing the mannequins, we're just paying for them a different way. We're still going to get them. Whereas if you cut the 100,000 you're not going to get it. So if I'm looking at this correctly, we just need 756 in the one time.

>> That's a good point. I hadn't thought about the man Kins coming out and that number going down.

>> Kitchen: I'm assuming by putting the mannequins in debt we're still going to get them. So it doesn't cause any difficulties there.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's answer that question because it might be a threshold question for us. So I think Kerri and -- Ed, sorry, how do the numbers change if we go to debt finance the mannequins, the simulations in simulation changing.

>> Vela: And the grant writing and innovation office is another one --

>> Mayor Adler: Which number is that?

>> Vela: It is alter 6.

[7:16:31 PM]

No, alter 5.

>> Mayor Adler: Alter 5. That's the grant writer.

>> Vela: That is in ongoing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So if we do the debt financing of the mannequins?

>> Alter: The spreadsheet is 243. That we have 243.

>> Mayor Adler: What's changed in the spreadsheet with that change?

>> Alter: With that change. But if you cut any ongoing and you want to move them to one-time, you need the money to do that. So the logic doesn't really work.

>> If we move the mannequins to debt funded that gives us available funding \$243,101

[7:17:32 PM]

in one-time. We are still available ongoing is negative 683,135.

>> Pool: Mayor, does that then help with the debt reserve piece that has to move over to one time? Does that 243 then reduce the amount of money that pays for some of the transfer into our reserves funding?

>> No, that's just the one-time. You have to change our ongoing to reduce the --

>> Pool: Sorry, exactly.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. And I recognize that if you move stuff over you will need more. What we have suggested right now on ongoing is epidemiologists either going from four to two or getting the fte savings. Did you calculate what the fte savings would be for the four epidemiologists?

[7:18:48 PM]

And I will ask the same thing of the civilian conservation corps.

>> 104 would be the savings if we did nine months for alter 6 for the epidemiologist.

>> Mayor Adler: And what about if we did the nine months for the ftes in alter --

>> 87,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Alter 1.

>> 87,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I don't know if I caught those numbers she just said.

>> Mayor Adler: 104 is if you go to the same treatment for -- you kept all four epidemiologists but you delayed them by three months. That's 104.

[7:19:49 PM]

If you take -- do the same three month delay for the ftes, the civilian conservation corps that's 87. Between them roughly 200,000. If you did that we're still at just under \$500,000.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: If we did Ellis 4, how much was that at one time?

>> 165.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, go ahead.

>> Ellis: I was going to ask on the topic of the epidemiologists, there were a couple of folks who mentioned if we only did two can you tell us the financial impact if we did it that way?

[7:20:54 PM]

And while we wait, some of what I've been thinking about over the past few hours is general balance between what is new issues and new projects versus really making sure we are retaining and recruiting people to fill those. So I'm just kind of trying to national in my head as we work through some of these difficult choices.

>> Renteria: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Renteria. En.

>> Renteria: I was looking over the Austin civilian conservation corporation on those two ftes, and it seemed like they were being built by -- from the resourcing park ranger position. I wonder if we could continue being funded that

[7:21:59 PM]

way and hire those two positions.

>> Alter: Did you want me to speak to that or did you want staff to speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: If staff is here they can speak to that. That would be --

>> Alter: Then pard is down two positions, one of which is the three people who work on homelessness, one of the people on homelessness is out and so they're short staffed and the park rangers are desperately needed. So this accomplishes a lot of things. And it's my top priority.

>> Mayor Adler: If we made the change for the fte from 104 and we made the change to the other fte at 87 and we took out Ellis at 165 on Ellis 4, and instead of cutting the summer program

[7:23:00 PM]

if we moved half of this -- kept half of it in ongoing but we moved half of it over to one time, then the nut to figure out would be smaller. If we do that I have about 610,000 that we're moving out of one time -- out of ongoing. And of those items we would be moving 254 over to one time, which is about what you said we had. If we make those changes I think we're probably within shooting -- we're within -- we're there, right? We do the delay for three months for the ftes for the full epidemiologists, but we keep them in. We do the same thing for the two positions for the civilian conservation corps but we keep them in. That was 104 and 87. If we don't count Ellis 4,

[7:24:03 PM]

that's 165. And if we take the summer positions and move half of the summer positions over to one time, that's 254 that moves from ongoing to one time and it leaves 254 in ongoing. That's a shift of 610, which means that there would be 80 less reserves that are needed. So the amount of money in one time would go from 243 up to roughly 310, 320 less the 254 we moved over, which covers it.

>> Mayor, I caught the 254 for the summer youth programs. How much is the reduction in accc?

>> Mayor Adler: 87.

[7:25:06 PM]

>> Tovo: 87,000.

>> Mayor Adler: 104 reduction for epidemiologists, 87 for the Austin civilian conservation corps. Ellis is 165 that comes out. And the 254 which is half of the summer youth, those things total 610.

>> Tovo: Well, I have real confidence -- I'll wait to hear from the mayor pro tem, but we could transfer less of the summer youth -- we could transfer more to one time and preserve the ftes starting right away if that's a very high priority, have them start right away and I have real confidence that our human resources department be going to be able to work on the summer youth program. I know they have a strong commitment to it. Travis county is committed to \$13 so -- I know we'll get there next summer and they'll figure out ways to do it in the years beyond, possibly more than \$13. I won't say this again

[7:26:06 PM]

because I won't talk about it later. But we have an amazing example of an employee who has become a public servant here at the city of Austin as a result of that summer youth program and that is our director of human resources, Joya Hays who shared with me that she participated in the summer youth program here at the city of Austin when she was a student at Huston-Tillotson. She had not considered a career, was on a different path, and it was a very impactful experience. The city has really benefited from having her fabulous experience and energy and innovation here. It's a good example. Thank you, councilmember pool. I'm wrapping up, but I did want to say that. It's very rare that we meet an executive here at the city of Austin who participated in the program, but that's my proposal that we do that to get the ftes back in 12 months.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: Just to clarify were you suggesting that for both items or for what?

[7:27:07 PM]

>> Tovo: I was suggesting it for the accc. Does that cover the epidemiologists as well?

>> It's about 200,000 that we would need for both of them.

>> Tovo: If we move it to one-time it's 254. They would have the option of reducing the number of students. I hope they wouldn't go in that direction, but again I think they're committed to trying to make this work. So hopefully they will --

>> Alter: I would appreciate that if the rest of the council is amenable.

>> Mayor Adler: So as I understand it what that would be then is we don't touch the civilian conservation corps, we don't touch the epidemiologists but what we do do is we take out Ellis number 4 at 165 and we move the 508 out of the summer youth program from one time into -- from ongoing into one time.

[7:28:11 PM]

So that would be a reduction of 673 out of ongoing, of which 508 would move into one time. That total means that there's another 80,000 that would come out of one-time because we wouldn't need that reserve anymore. And we would be doing the 500 out of the one-time because we would be doing debt for the mannequins.

>> Kitchen: It's a million out of.

>> Alter: We would be doing all the mannequins.

>> Mayor Adler: A million out. 500 goes back in. So I think that gets us there. Can you run that numbers and tell us what that looks

[7:29:11 PM]

like? Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Does staff need an updated budget amendment to reflect where we're going to put the debt as a source of funding for the mannequin program? Or can you do it --

>> Mayor Adler: We can do it orally.

>> Kelly: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's see if those numbers get us there.

[7:30:14 PM]

>> Okay. So I'm going to have verify we have this correctly. We've moved the Elvis 4 to 0 -- Ellis 4 to zero on the ongoing. Youth wages tovo 10 is moving to one-time. 5088035.

>> Kelly: Mayor, is there a way to get this on the screen for people following along to get a visual of what we're doing?

>> Sure. Let me walk through it and I'll make sure the online one is updated so everyone can see this.

>> Kelly: Okay. Thank you.

>> With those changes I'm showing available ongoing negative 10,000, available one-time negative 177.09.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. Ellis 4 came out. The 508 went to one-time.

>> Correct.

[7:31:14 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We have the debt payment for the simulation.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: That's a million. And -- and what were the numbers with those changes?

>> Available ongoing you have a deficit of 10,100. Available one-time you have a deficit of 177.09.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, does that account for the change in the 14% when you moved over the 500? I don't know if that's a big number or not, but it would reduce the amount of the 14% for reserves?

>> That does make those adjustments.

>> Mayor Adler: So we were 756 down. You're saying one-time is overspent by 177,000.

>> 170.

>> Mayor Adler: Just so I can see in my head here. We're about 756 overspend when we start, right?

[7:32:17 PM]

And then we add to that the 508, which would be 1,264,000 roughly. We've moved out of the ongoing about 650,000 which times four percent would be 65 plus 25 so roughly 90.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: So roughly 90. That gets us down to 1,174,000. And then I take a million out because I'm debt servicing the mannequins. I see us -- so that's the-- I have it as 174. Is that what you had? Roughly the 177.

>> For one-time?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

[7:33:18 PM]

>> 170,709.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So Ed, how close do we actually have to get to say that we're within rounding error on a budget?

>> I think we're in rounding error for budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Now?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Good.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Are we okay where we are? Councilmember Ellis? Else I will just say I'm disappointed not to be able to get that extra holiday but I will bring it back because I think it's really important.

>> Mayor Adler: And we understand that and welcome that happening and thank you for helping us end the night tonight. Okay. I don't know if you need to start calculating on that, but that's probably all the shifts that we're going to make unless council colleagues differ. We'll let staff run the numbers, figure out the tax rate and make sure everything is okay and we'll come back and pass all those items. I think we should now, if

[7:34:19 PM]

people are ready, turn to the directions, but before we do that, with respect to the amendments that got on, did anybody put direction in their amendments that they need to elevate here? Councilmember Tovo?

>> Tovo: I did. I'm going to print it out and distribute it. Mayor, as a reminder, we do have other kinds of --

>> Mayor Adler: That's right. We should go to those next.

>> Tovo: Maybe somebody else's first because I need to print this. I think there were some with regards to fire stations that were not part of this.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I have a question. If we're adopting our amendment are we separately adopting the direction that's in them or we're just adopting our amendment? Do we need to call out the direction that's in them?

>> Mayor Adler: I think so just so that the council members know what the direction is on things that are in the --

>> Kitchen: Well, the document won't get lost. I'm happy do it.

[7:35:19 PM]

My assumption is that the amendment document that we presented will get into the record.

>> Mayor Adler: I think they will. I want to make sure everybody understands.

>> Kitchen: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I just want to clarify that for some of these that we did ongoing funding for nine months that means that next year they will add the money, but if a department has the fte and they decide this is a real priority and they want to hire them and they're able to hire them sooner and they use other money because we've given them the fte, they have that discretion, correct?

>> Mayor Adler: That's my understanding as well.

>> Alter: There's nothing ever noted that it's three-quarters of an fte. You have the fte and if you can figure out the balance, you're fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Confirmed by staff to be true. Colleagues, let's talk about some of the other items that were debtor other. The ones that I'm showing that we need to address and

[7:36:22 PM]

talk about is the good night ranch fire station. The ems at the airport. The Rainey street -- I'm sorry. The Rainey street fund. The Castleman Voll house renovations and the brush square museum security. And then the code positions. Those six items.

>> Tovo: One more, the fte.

>> Mayor Adler: The council fte. Council fte, thank you.

>> Vela: And mayor, the vial testing on the fayette since it's coming on the Austin energy budget, that should probably be grouped in with those as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[7:37:26 PM]

>> Kitchen: So how many, six of them?

>> Mayor Adler: I think there's one more. Go ahead.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I had indicated -- anyway, it's the convention center parking garage I had distributed earlier.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: It's a similar action to the other. I just pulled it out from the other amendment.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, do you mind reading that list again?

>> Mayor Adler: I don't mind at all. So the things that are outstanding that I think we need to touch base on are the convention center parking, which is to pull that money I guess into gr. What does it do?

>> Tovo: My parking, my original parking addressed city hall and said look at the convention center. This convention center strips it out and actually makes the change to the ratesment and I distributed it here. It brings it to the same rates that are here at the

[7:38:27 PM]

city hall garage.

>> Mayor Adler: So that just generates more money for the convention center?

>> Tovo: It does. And we can talk about it later. But there may be another proposal, but not today.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. So we have the convention center parking issue, Austin energy said that she would pick up the cost to kind of scope out what a study might be involving fayette. We have the goodnight ranch fire station. We have the ems at the airport which apparently was reached and they will handle it out of their enterprise funds. We have the parking garage we talked about a second ago, parking garage. We have the Rainey street fund. We have the house renovations, we have the brush community and the

[7:39:28 PM]

clean community fee and the additional council fee. On the draft proposal eight that I handed out, those things are all listed at the top. Okay?

>> Kelly: Thank you. I have a quick question that council member Fuentes -- I was talking in my head and thinking, she could probably answer. On this ems amendment I do anticipate the pilot program just lasting a year or do you anticipate it lasting longer? I was trying to get an idea of the timeline to wrap my head around it. I'm supportive of this and I think it's needed. I was just hoping I could understand it a little bit better.

>> Yes, this budget amendment would authorize the pilot program for a year. I do anticipate that given the need that's already been demonstrated that it will be a recurring program, but pilot for a year.

>> Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: One question and one comment.

[7:40:29 PM]

For the canyon creek and getting that design restarted we've decided that's a rider because the money is already allocated. It's just not -- it's just not pulled? I just want to make sure that we are going to also move forward with design on the canyon creek one.

[

fuentes]. I know it's not in his bunch of amendments. It's considered a rider and I'm just clarifying that I don't think it's moving any money but just giving a permission to move forward with money that's already been appropriated in the capital budget. I just want to make sure that we're not missing a step. At this stage.

>> Kelly: I don't have that list in front of me, but from what whether van eenoo said we do have the funding for the -- not the construction, but the design. We don't is for the construction. And I did have that as a --

>> Mayor Adler: Do we have

[7:41:29 PM]

to take any action to allow staff to move forward with the -- okay. There's nothing else we need to do. I think that's the mayor pro tem wants to make sure there's nothing we should be doing.

>> Alter: So we just do the rider later. Then the second thing I appreciate council member Fuentes bringing forward her ems at the airport and I'm happy to be a co-sponsor of that. I'm not going to make an amendment, but I juts want to get on the record something that I've already talked with the chief about. He followed up with my question about who is financing the trips to the airport. And in calendar year 21 we had 583,000 with collection of about 51,000 for billing. And so it's roughly \$532,000 that city of Austin is spending on responding to calls at the airport that we're getting no funding from the airport for.

[7:42:29 PM]

So as part of this process and as part of thinking about this pilot, I want them to also be looking at those expenses and how that fits into how we design the pandemic and what the airport also should be covering with respect to our general fund moving forward. Chief Lundgren got me this information, he's very aware of it. You can certainly add it, council member Fuentes, but I don't think I have to add it because I think Weis very much aware of the opportunity there as part of these negotiations to be considering all of the factors and the opportunity to better serve the people who -- and passengers that are going through the airport.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right, colleagues, I think we have a list of things. I think some of these things we can just agree to pretty quickly. So you might want to check me on this. Ed, are you okay with the

[7:43:44 PM]

the crime center is there anything we need to do on that? That needs to be part of the budget, allowing those positions to be moved. Okay. So make sure that's included in the budget, please. The goodnight ranch ems station and making that debt financed as moved by council member Fuentes, do you need anything else from us other than just making sure it's included in approving it. The ems at the airport that comes out of the enterprise fund at the 460570, anything else we need to do other than approve that. Are you okay with that? The veteran affair fte, that's taken care of so let's move that department. Do you want to say something about that?

>> Renteria: Yes. I talk to the staff. This program -- this

[7:44:52 PM]

position, they reclassified it back to the veteran service coordinator title and would be dedicated to full-time veteran service. So hearing that information I -- I've instructed in direction to the staff to -- I would like to see it -- a

[indiscernible] In the management service department or another appropriate department in the long-term and I also ask staff to collaborate with the veterans commission to ensure that we bring in the most qualified candidate to serve in the veterans community.

>> Mayor Adler: So that needs to be part of our direction associated with this budget as well. The parking garage rates, are we okay moving those up,

[7:45:53 PM]

generating that additional income and making the rates the same? Is there anything else? Convention center center, you guys okay with that? Nothing else we need to do with that.

>> Staff does have a position they would like to state on that. I think assistant city manager Rodney Gonzalez will come up and maybe the convention center staff is on virtual.

>> Thank you, Ann. I appreciate it. Assistant city manager Rodney Gonzalez. Acd staff has some concerns with the parking rate amendment/rider.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's hold ha for a second. It's not going to be

[indiscernible] Section here. We'll come back to that. Won't take us long to get back to it. Then there's the Rainey street fund that allows the city to designate more money in a given year. Anybody have any objection to that. Okay. So that will be included when we -- when we talk about including things. The Castleman bull house renovations, anybody have

[7:46:54 PM]

reservations with this. I think there are. So we're going to not have that one. We'll have to come back and talk about that one. The brush square museum security question, does anybody have any reservations about this one? Are you okay with the source of funds on this one? Does staff have any opinion on this? We'll come back to that one. We don't know yet. Clean community fee code, I think we're probably going to want to discuss that one.

>> Tovo: I'm making some changes to it.

>> Mayor Adler: The additional council fee, does anybody have any objections to that one? So that will then be part of again our approval. So we have four of these we

need to revisit again: The convention center parking rates, Castleman bull house, brush square and clean community fee. Do we want to discuss those now?

>> Vela: And one more.

[7:47:56 PM]

Mayor, I'm sorry, your honor. The fayette power project I don't want to leave that out because I know it's not on the list.

>> Mayor Adler: I put it on the list and staff said they had no problem with that, showing that part of the budget.

>> Vela: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. So now, Rodney, sorry. I think can you come back now. Yes, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Just a brief moment of personal privilege. I wanted to acknowledge we have some special guests in the room. I think I spy Dr. Eugene come in with our Austin youth council observing the budget process this evening. Thank you for joining us.

>> Mayor Adler: Unbelievable that you get to experience this. There's no more exciting thing than watching us go through budget.

[Laughter]. Thank you for your participation. Dr. Eugene, always great to see you.

>> On the brush square item, staff had a concern with the funding source for that one as well.

[7:48:56 PM]

On the line is director Tricia Tatro with the Austin convention center, they want to talk about the impacts of the parking rate to the current business model that the convention center for employees at the parking garage.

>> Good evening, mayor and council. I wanted to introduce our parking manager for the Austin convention center department. I wanted to briefly have him explain the -- some of the unique differences between the convention center parking garage and our business model and how that ties to the fees that we put forth in our fee schedule and how the impacts of the proposed amendment could present challenges for us. Ms. Thompson?

>> Hi, council and mayor. Hays Thompson here. Hopefully you guys can hear

[7:49:56 PM]

me okay. I looked at the proposed amendment with the rates and I just want to give some historical background on how we thread the needle between providing parking to our attendees in a competitive environment with other convention centers and being downtown. It's a tight rope that we walk on that. And in that we're trying to stay competitive with other centers like San Antonio which max out at a daily rate of \$31. Dallas which has -- I think the Kay Bailey Hutchison center which is \$15. And we're also trying to support our service industry employees. And we have a deep relationship in our part of downtown with hotels, restaurants, businesses along sixth street to have affordable parking located in our facilities as well as the competitive rate for our

[7:50:59 PM]

attendees and our folks that come to our shows. So the new rates in my opinion we're going to be so substantial that it will send a shock to our clients, our restaurant, hotel community. We would just like to ask for more time to evaluate those and/or create some kind of proposal where we could staircase our rates by 10% or so per year until we feel there's a collective plan in place between public transportation, building requirement, minimums for garages. I just think that for all of us in the community when it comes to parking it's just at \$30 at a max rate in

[7:51:59 PM]

other cities in Texas compared to this proposal at 48, we just have some deep concerns that are parking base will turn against us and we could see the potential for actually a decline in revenue. And again, it ties back to that fine line between being competitive with other conventions and being a part of the downtown. And you do see garages on second street that the environment is different between congress and San Antonio and the lake in seventh or eighth. There's just activity there where higher rates can support the agenda there, the parker base there. It's slightly different on the other side of congress where we support specific event attendees and people in the service industry. So we hope you guys will

[7:52:59 PM]

take that into consideration and possibly either let us keep our rates as is or do a 10% increase or try to do some kind of pilot program. If we were to accept these rates we would have some review period after 90 days. I just have really grave concerns about the impact on our revenue. That's it, thank you so much.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I have -- Mr. Thompson, let me clarify a few things. First of all as I indicated with the city hall parking garage, this would not be intended to impact any of the service industry workers who have access to the affordable parking program downtown. And I'm not sure if the convention center is one of the participants in the affordable parking program, but that's the program that the city of Austin has created where anyone can, once it's been saved with their evacuee if you work downtown in one of the service industries you can access really inexpensive,

[7:54:03 PM]

comparatively inexpensive parking on a monthly basis and this wouldn't change that. If the convention center garage participate in that it wouldn't impact it. I know you referenced one of the reasons for the low rates is to help out restaurant workers and others in the downtown area. If they don't know about it they should be participating in the affordable parking program. And again this won't impact it. I wasn't proposing making changes to the maximum daily rate of 48. It was my understanding that that was the current rate. If not I'll make that change. What I was proposing we change is what is currently as you point out in your response to 97, one of the lowest, if not the lowest, parking rate in the entire downtown at two dollars an hour. I am proposing bringing that up to a reasonable amount. I think we have a responsibility to use our city-owned resources in ways that allow us to cover our costs. And it's absolutely the case that austinites use your

[7:55:04 PM]

parking garage. It's not just convention Goers. These are parking garages in our downtown. I think we should be consistent across our parking garages. So again a couple of points of clarification on that that I think are really critical to assessing what you said. But I am absolutely I've added direction for the city hall parking garage to come back on a quarterly basis and I would propose we pass my amendment to bring these parking rates in to -- they're still going to be some of the cheapest in downtown, but they're going to be closer to -- closer to what I would regard as a reasonable rate for this public asset. But I will add a line that says -- I think it's a good point to take a look and assess what the impact is. So I'll add the same kind of line that I have added to my direction for the other one, that the city manager is directed to report back to the city council on a quarterly basis beginning

[7:56:05 PM]

immediately on the impact of this increase. And I'll add something about bringing action to change those fees if that seems appropriate. So that will give us the ability to evaluate it, every, every three months. If it looks like it's causing an impact the council can take action at that point.

>> Thank you. So the resolution -- the amendment before us gives me some pause because there are people who work in the service industry and musicians who regularly use city garages to work or get to special events. I've spoken to people in the affordable parking program who have lost access due to an hour change of their shift and that sort of thing. So I think that might be something that we assess maybe possibly to see how the access is given to those individuals and if it's an effective program so that they're not given the burden of the extra cost of parking. And I know that city of

[7:57:06 PM]

Austin residents use the parking garage to go on dates, attend events and concerts and shop downtown. So I wouldn't want the raise in rates to inadvertently have an unintended consequence to prevent people from using them or having access to those garages. So I just wanted to raise the point that there are individuals in the community that need inexpensive parking and it gives me pause approximate to think they might not have that access when their taxes helped pay for the buildings and structures that they're utilizing. I almost feel like it could be perceived as an additional tax on them to pay the extra rate.

>> Additionally I would like to add, please, to mayor and council, that as Hays was speaking too, we have run a different business model. There may be people who come to downtown area who park at the garage at city hall who enjoy dinner for two to three hours. We very frequently for example the marathon expo,

[7:58:07 PM]

many of our running events, they will do their packet pickup at the convention center and we have people who are coming in for literally zero to, say, an hour and a half. Sometimes south by southwest attendees, for example, they are coming to the convention center to pick up their badges, and that wait can take often times one to three hours depending on the peak times and how long that is. If we change and vary from our variable rate, I think that it could have a significant impact on not just the parking revenues, but our overall customer experience. And as we're competing with other cities as has mentioned earlier what the parking rates were for Houston, San Antonio and Dallas, as we are putting together proposals and packages to our customers and competing on a national level to bring events to Austin, the parking rates is something that is considered for many of our customers. They're want to go know what that total attendee cost is

[7:59:08 PM]

going to be, including what is the hotel room rate, what is the airfare in and out of our city, what is the parking rate going to be? And so we're simply looking for the opportunity to study this further, or put forth a pilot program where we can -- for a series of months -- change the parking rate or do surveys with our customers. I's just that our parking garage functions in a slightly different way and we do have a mix of the downtown people who do come in and park at our garages to utilize other parts of downtown, but I wanted to offer that up for consideration as well. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: I want to talk

[8:00:12 PM]

for a second. We'll get back to you.

>> Mayor, I wanted to add a few more things.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to let you come back and do it, but I want do get up to the dais for a moment. I want councilmember pool to talk, councilmember harper-madison to talk if they want to have a chance, and then I'm going to recommend we don't about on this tonight.

>> Pool: I appreciate what our convention center staff are saying, but I would offer that \$2 an hour is not an appropriate amount of money. When you are making packages for conventioners coming to Austin, you can say, as a part of the package, we will discount your parking. That should be happening everywhere, I would suspect. But the people who are coming to marathons are coming here for that purpose. They wouldn't otherwise be going to San Antonio. We could have a stamp that gives them an hour free parking, or some program like we have down at the city hall garage. I think what we need to

do is look at this with a little more intentionality, take the market into account, and generally speaking, I do believe that the cost of parking in our city garages is too low.

[8:01:13 PM]

So I appreciate councilmember tovo bringing these items and walking through all of the details, because they are many. And there are some unique circumstances. But I do think that we need to adjust them upward. So, mayor, I like your idea of pulling back and having a conversation. Councilmember tovo, I'd be happy to join you in continuing to analyze this.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor. All the things councilmember pool just said, additionally what councilmember tovo brought forward. I hear what our convention center folks are saying, but I would like to offer -- let's take into consideration if this is an opportunity for us to talk about our asmp mode share goals. Our convention center is right on the doorsteps of a train station, in which case compared to San Antonio who doesn't have that advantage, Houston who doesn't have that advantage, we have really easy access to comprehensive mass transit at

[8:02:14 PM]

our convention center. That's something to take into consideration. Also want to take into consideration that as we are getting people acclimated to the culture shift that's required around meeting our asmp multimodal goals, cheap parking does not incentivize people to not drive cars. Let's make sure to keep that in mind as we're continuing the dialogue. I'm aware that we're not going to get there tonight, but those are things to add to the suite of considerations as we continued this conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: That is the choice of the council. My recommendation -- it's 8:00. There's no way that -- this is a big question. Some of the other elements on here are also big questions. And I'm not going to be prepared to vote on -- I'm not going to be prepared to vote on them. They're the kinds of things we post, people see, there are discussions on them. I'm not going to become close to being able to vote yes on probably most of the things that are still to be brought. I don't know -- I'd like to

[8:03:14 PM]

learn more. But certainly with respect to the parking garage rate, I'd like to give more time to the convention center. I'd like to understand it better before I vote. I obviously supported the work we did with the parking garage in the city. Staff didn't raise any objection to that. But now that objection has been raised, my preference would be to hold off, than trying to figure it out tonight.

>> Harper-madison: Do you mind if I finish my statement?

>> Mayor Adler: Sorry.

>> Harper-madison: There was one tiny bit. I left too much a pause, that's okay. The other thing I was going to say, because this is the second parking item to come up tonight, it occurred to me earlier when we were having the other parking conversation that I really think we need to have our parking enterprise division handle all our parking assets. I think we need to have a more comprehensive approach to handling our parking assets as opposed to this siloed patchwork approach to how we handle our

[8:04:15 PM]

parking assets. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Other discussion? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mr. Thompson, can you confirm what I said earlier? Again, it's my understanding that the convention center already -- that the \$48 maximum is the existing, right?

>> It is, but it's nuanced in

--a way that the structure is optimal and affordable toward attendees. We look at consumer shows and all-day national shows and range from 3 to 7 1/2-hour length of stays, so the rates are lower on that end. The reason why they go to 48 is as the hotel inventory -- room inventory is built out, we are in a position where we don't want to be a storage facility. And that happened. We had to switch gears and rates there to prevent storage from to

[8:05:17 PM]

hoteles and overnight stays. So if the rate wasn't that high for a longer stay, we could be faced with having a garage in the morning set up and having cars in our garage. So the rate's purposefully done that way.

>> Tovo: Can I intervene for a minute? The reason I'm bringing that point up is because in one of your earliest comments to this you compared that \$48 rate to San Antonio's rate of \$31, which is less, but the 48 is a rate that you've come to. So your rebuttal to my proposal was based on a rate that you set. What I've proposed changing is the hourly rate. So I just -- I'm not . . .

>> Well, it's a nuance, councilmember tovo. It's just --

>> Tovo: I need you to verify because you were in part arguing against my proposal based on a \$48 rate that is the current rate. And it's one that the convention center has set. So, if we're going to compare to San Antonio, I think . . .

[8:06:21 PM]

>> Not on that single point, it's on the lower end. We are trying to protect the under eight hours for our attendees and so forth. It's very nuanced in the way those garages are positioned with other downtown assets.

>> Tovo: Do you validate -- have the ability to do what councilmember pool suggested? I think I've even been validated by these garages. I would assume if you wanted to make it part of a conventions packet, you could offer to validate it at a free rate, just as many others do. I assume if anybody who comes through that garage has the ability to park there, you don't reserve it for certain purposes.

>> We do validate, you know, in certain cases, but under this proposal, I would be concerned that that would be a tool that

[8:07:22 PM]

we would weigh heavily on. But, again, it's really about the front end of the parking rate structure and what my point earlier was to give an example of a home and garden show where you could have an austinite attend and they would stay a couple of hours under this proposal, three hours and it would be a \$30 parking rate. And so you can look across the board in Texas and even go beyond, you know, the los Angeles convention center, you know, their daily flat rates and the 15-\$16 or starts at the \$15 rate and goes up to 40 for their max. But again, it's super nuanced.

>> Tovo: But you could always validate it for people attending an event. I go to the palmer event center, for example, and sometimes I pay the fee and sometimes I'm attending an event that actually has paid for that parking. And so I think the settlement home is one of those where the

[8:08:25 PM]

first night -- marking. With the home and garden example, you could give attendees to the home and garden show the ability to validate their parking. But then everybody else who uses the garage would pay the rate, which is certainly competitive with other downtown parking garages.

>> Mayor Adler: Manager, did you want to say something?

>> Councilmember tovo, I understand the conversation. It sounds like we're going to be able to talk about this later. So it would be helpful to wrap that up and move on. Thank you for your help, Mr. Thompson.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, are we okay asking this to come back in the future?

>> Tovo: How does that come back? We've made some huge decisions on big topics. And it sounds as if -
-

>> Mayor Adler: I can't begin to vote on this tonight. This has issues in it that I want to vet with people that aren't in the room.

>> Tovo: So, at this point, anything of this sort where we have conversations we're simply going to need to bring back as ifcs even though they're

[8:09:26 PM]

impacting elements of the budget. I assume if they pass, we will have a mechanism for amending the budget to reflect the new fees, amending the budget to impact other elements of . . . What I wouldn't want to happen is that when those ifcs come back that we hear we can't make changes to the fees outside of the budget year, or we can't make adjustments this soon after budget passage to elements of the budget. Because we've spent a lot of time discussing some people's proposals. These are the ones that I've prepared that I've spent time and energy on as well. And I understand what time it is and that no one wants to discuss them, but just because it's coming up at the end of the day doesn't make it any less deserving of discussion.

>> Mayor Adler: I would agree that you could bring that back as an ifc, anything we move tonight, with an ifc posted so we can vet it. But, yes, I won't object or argue against it on that basis at all.

[8:10:27 PM]

Okay. Does anybody -- are people okay with that? Okay. The next one that we have is the Castleman bull house renovations and rather than having staff come up and express reservations, I know some of the councilmembers have written out reservations. I recommend that this is also something that probably would take more than I would be able to give it tonight. Do you want to address that before we -- before I ask the dais if they're okay moving past this with the same understanding? You can bring this back.

>> Tovo: I can bring it back to amend the budget for cosponsors, whereas tonight I have the ability to make amendment to the budget with just me and a second. So, it is imposing a higher level -- a higher threshold.

>> Mayor Adler: Possibly, but I can't begin to vote on it tonight. There's just so much questions I have. These are big issues and for me, I would need them to develop

[8:11:30 PM]

further. Does anybody -- are people okay with not doing the Castleman bull house tonight? Yes, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Mayor, with all due respect, not only am I okay with that, I'm okay with us just stopping for the night. It is looking very much like we are not going to finish this evening. And that said, I'd like for us to be able to approach this with the freshest, most open minds. And you can sort of sense it's palpable when the irascibility starts to enter the room and I don't think that's when we're doing our best work. It's not our best successful selves we present to the world to watch and put on archived footage. If we're not going to finish tonight and it's looking like we're not, why don't we wrap while we're fresh, kind, and smiling and pick it back up tomorrow? That's my recommendation. Or that would be my request of my colleagues. If anybody else is open to that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember vela?

[8:12:30 PM]

>> Vela: Having not been through this before, I'm not sure how much time we have ahead of us, but I would be -- again, assuming we have a couple of hours ahead of us, my sense would be to push through and knock it out tonight. But if we're going to be here until 1:00 A.M., I completely understand councilmember harper-madison's point of view.

>> Kitchen: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it depends on whether people want to talk about these last items. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'd like to finish as much as we can tonight. I'd like to vote tonight. And get this done. So, maybe we survey what's remaining. The things that we've said we need to talk about more are not going to be resolved tomorrow. So I think it's best that we just keep going.

>> Mayor Adler: I do take what -- councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I was going to agree with that. I think the budget discussions

[8:13:32 PM]

have a way of expanding and contracting and sometimes it feels like you're really far away but you're actually pretty close. We're in a good place here and I would like to push through so that everything is fresh on our minds and we're able to accomplish as much as possible tonight.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's see if we can go just a little bit further. Let's see how it goes. So we'll bring back future -- councilmember tovo, the Castleman bull house reservation. I understand that staff has

concerns with the square museum security fee. Is that the kind of thing we can address tonight, or is that the kind of thing that needs to be moved over, too?

>> Tovo: Mayor, with all due respect, this is just not -- this topic has not been asked -- we have not asked the same thing of anybody else who brought forward items for discussion. And we have spent deny

[8:14:37 PM]

--councilmember Kelly, I would have supported you had you wanted to move forward. You chose to postpone it when people raised concerns. We initially talked about anything we didn't have an opportunity to pass being added to the next council meeting automatically. If that's what we're talking about with the items that we're not interested in taking up right now, I'm comfortable with that approach.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't have a problem with that. I don't know that I'll be ready to vote then.

>> Tovo: That's fine. But at least they are on the agenda in a manner that's not imposing a higher threshold than we imposed on everybody's else's proposals as part of this budget. It sounds like this one doesn't need to be a part of that, which I appreciate.

>> That's correct.

>> You're correct. Staff has looked at this and there is no longer a concern with that item.

>> Mayor Adler: Good.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll move that one to the list. We have two things that -- three things that are probably worth putting on the agenda for the

[8:15:38 PM]

next meeting so we can -- I have three things. I have the convention center parking garage, the Castleman bull house, and then we have the ftes in the code department. Do we want to deal with that tonight?

>> Tovo: No. I am making a change and withdrawing my amendment, but I am pulling forward some of the language of that as budget direction.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. So then the items that we will put onto the agenda for our next city council meeting are the convention center garage parking, and the Castleman bull house renovations. The items incorporated into our budget that we'll be passing here when we pass it is the Austin energy fayette scoping analysis, the good night ranch financing, the ems at the

[8:16:41 PM]

airport, the Rainey street fund, the square museum security, and the additional council fee.

>> Kitchen: Question.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem, then councilmember kitchen.

>> Alter: I'm not sure if this is the appropriate time, but since it's on your list, I just wanted to note that in so far as we postponed the parkland piece, we agreed to postpone the rates for the residential from the city manager for the residential parkland. We're postponing those until September 1st, that proposal, but then we would also be postponing the harper-madison one to that day as well, because we're not taking up the residential parkland fees until the 1st. I wasn't sure if this is the right time.

>> Mayor Adler: We already postponed --

>> Alter: I understand.

>> Mayor Adler: There will be

[8:17:42 PM]

app item where we are approving the fee schedule. My suggestion is on that item, when we get to it, we make clear that we're leaving an item postponed.

>> Alter: Okay. But when we do that, that would have the effect of also postponing harper-madison 1 until that point.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct. I think harper-madison 1 has already been postponed, as was the license fee. I think we took a vote earlier in our deliberations. But, we could do it again.

>> Alter: I didn't catch -- I don't remember us actually doing that, but, okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I said there was a motion to postpone the vote and asked if there were objections. Seeing no objections, we postponed the vote. I will repeat that again. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I think we're doing the riders next. Are you going to do them like consent?

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to ask people to elevate riders they have in their amendments, and then we're going to do the riders that are on the list that I handed out.

[8:18:42 PM]

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? So, let's elevate directions that are in amendments. Councilmember tovo, I think you had some that you've handed out for people.

>> Tovo: Yes. I do. I reviewed those. With one exception, they're relatively the same amendment. 13 I adjusted the wording, but the other amendments -- direction is just lifted from the amendments. 6 I was running out of time before we started, so I'll show you that on amendment 6 with code, the fourth sentence talks about the city manager bringing this -- sorry. The sentence would begin, the city manager shall analyze staffing schedules with the goal --

>> Mayor Adler: Can you orient me again?

>> Tovo: Let me get back to you on the code.

[8:19:42 PM]

These capture the things that were in my amendments that I'm bringing forward. I'm going to have to do more work on the code one. I will also say I have a few edits to make to the budget direction that was distributed the other day that I have to read into the record at the right moment.

>> Mayor Adler: With respect to direction, there are had four directions in the amendments that have been passed, right?

>> Tovo: Yes, one relates to finding a dedicated funding stream for the economic development corporation. The next is going to relate to code. I'll have that in a minute. Amendment 10 talks about the youth wages and looking -- doing some research to determine whether the \$13 an hour is sufficient. 13 is different than what appeared in amendment 13.

>> Mayor Adler: What was amendment 13?

>> Tovo: The parking garage increase at city hall. The first is consistent with what was in the amendment, determine whether the proposed rates should be increased, report back on November. The next addresses the issue that we dealt with earlier in

[8:20:43 PM]

the day where we are using what the staff acknowledged was a conservative figure of \$200,000. This direction would -- we had two ways of going. We've gone this way of adopting -- approving a \$200,000 very conservative estimate. So I'm directing the manager to produce quarterly reports showing how the revenue is coming in compared to what they've projected so the council can be poised to look at that and see if there's an ability to direct -- to capture more of that increase for community priorities that

went unfunded or underfunded. Since we didn't go with the higher amount, we're going with a lower amount. We're going to keep an eye on it and have an ability to act.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think there's an issue with number 13. The manager confirms that. On amendment number 10 you're asking for just -- take a look at the youth wages of summer programs coming in. Amendment 6 is the one you're going to come back to us with

[8:21:43 PM]

wording?

>> Tovo: In a minute.

>> Mayor Adler: On code, not yet. From amendment number 3, you're asking the manager to identify a dedicated funding stream for the Austin economic development corporation in up front years. Okay. So, we have three items here -- amendment 3, amendment 10, and amendment 13. Everybody okay with the directions? Okay. Does anybody else have direction in amendments that should be elevated? Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I had an amendment on inclement weather shelter response with a \$200,000 allocation. In the spirit of everyone cutting funding and trying to balance our budget I met with councilmember vela who I believe is amenable. We are going to roll the direction in my rider. This is Fuentes budget amendment

[8:22:45 PM]

number 7. The direction listed in the additional information section is the direction I'd like to add to councilmember vela's housing emergency program.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you read that direction?

>> Fuentes: Yes, I can. This amendment directs the city manager to develop a calendar-based emergency shelter response plan for extreme weather events including heat, cold, and unforeseen events. It shall include input from front-line volunteers with experience in outreach efforts. It shall be done in conjunction with direction provided by council on July 28th to develop a plan in collaboration with the homeless response leadership council and other stakeholders to assess the current citywide shelter plan and set forth a long-term vision for the design, scope, and funding of Austin's shelter system prior to rebidding these contracts. The manager shall also increase the availability of shelters outside of city-owned facilities by exploring partnerships to

[8:23:45 PM]

manager sheltering sites. Culturally competent training focused on crisis response, de-escalation, harm reduction, best practices, shall be made available to staff at these sites. Shelters shall contain drinking water, first aid supplies, covid tests as deemed necessary by medical professionals, and other supply essentials by November 1st, 2022. The city manager is directed to provide council with a status report on the shelter plan.

>> Mayor Adler: Are you okay with that being added?

>> Vela: No objection.

>> Mayor Adler: Your item.

>> Vela: No objection. Originally the amendment had the \$200,000. I would not object to the \$200,000 within the \$3 million being available for inclement weather emergency shelter. It is directed to emergency shelter and homelessness response, the \$3 million is flexible. And I would like to open that up

[8:24:45 PM]

to inclement weather sheltering as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Should we do this? Should we take everything that's in that section and instead of saying amendment, we can say direction. We append this to the further direction of 3 where it directs that \$200,000 be spent for this purpose.

>> Vela: That works.

>> Mayor Adler: That is how we intend for vela number 1 to read.

>> Renteria: Mayor, I wonder if we could also include to look at the federal funding if we do get a lot of emergency supplies from the federal government. And I know that we normally keep them for a certain time and they expire, so it's also very critical that we also make sure that we are getting all our -- all the necessary funding to have these supplies on hand.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Vela: No objection, your honor -- mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: If the minutes would reflect, we want part of

[8:25:45 PM]

the analysis of the shelters to include the supplies that are on-site, federal assistance with those and expiration issues. Okay. Thank you. That's included as well. Are there any other direction in any of the amendments that we need to elevate? Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I'm not certain. Let me ask a question first. I'm trying to figure out what the distinction is, because our amendment language itself will be included in backup and in the minutes. Because I have a lot of explanatory kinds of things that I want included. I don't consider them direction. But they are explanatory and I do want them included, so I want to make sure that our amendment forms that we submitted are being -- we're adopting these forms, right?

>> Mayor Adler: We're adopting those forms, but to the degree

[8:26:46 PM]

that if you're just explaining something that's one thing. What I want to make sure is, is that --

>> Kitchen: I get that.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me finish, there's not a significant direction contained within the amendment that should have been elevated in a way that we were actually all reading it.

>> Kitchen: That's fine. Then this one, I'm not sure if this needs to be elevated or not.

>> Mayor Adler: When in doubt, elevate it.

>> Kitchen: So I've also got language about . . . Where is it. Well, it recognizes the fact that we're in the process of looking for a shelter to purchase. And, you know, for a new shelter to replace north bridge. So, I don't know that that's direction per se. I know that's something the staff is already doing. So -- and we didn't put in the dollar amount for that. So . . .

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's

[8:27:47 PM]

fine. We've all been asking staff to find us additional shelters or . . .

>> Kitchen: Okay. I just wanted --

>> Mayor Adler: Supportive housing for people. I think that's consistent.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody else have any other directions in their amendments they need to elevate to make sure that they're actually directions that the staff -- the council has confirmed we want staff to do? Okay. So I think we're done, then, with all of those items. Let's turn to directions now, okay?

>> Tovo: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: And riders.

>> Tovo: May I finish the code?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: I'm going to come back -- I think I'll try to come back with an ifc that captures it but I'm going to describe the challenges and one of the reasons why I had proposed initially holding off on these. Last year, as I mentioned, when we talked in the budget work session, we held off on giving code more positions because there were some challenges we wanted them to address. We asked them to come back with a report and never got one.

[8:28:48 PM]

There have been good changes with regard to the repeat offender program but I'm still looking at -- if you look at 94, with you'll see that within the short-term rental program we still have three of the inspectors ending at the end of the work day six or eight and there are no inspectors who work after 11:00 P.M. So when the bars close and we start to have problems at our short-term rentals there are not code inspectors who can respond to those. We have continued to add more resources to code and we still have not been able to solve this issue. So, that's one issue that I'm going to be coming back with. Also, I had asked a question and I have forgotten what number it is, the cost of service for our short-term rental program. We are not -- it's been a while since I did a cost of service, but we're clearly not covering our cost. This is an enterprise fund. Their fees and funds should be covering the cost of service. Those are the two issues I'm going to be trying to address in an ifc and I welcome anybody who

[8:29:49 PM]

would like to work on those issues. In passing this and approving the additional, I want to note that there are real challenges within those programs I hope we can work together to try to address.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Great. All right. Thank you. Let's go to directions -- I mean, riders. Let's start down at the bottom of the budget rider page that I handed out. We're going to go from the bottom to the top so we don't start with me. Alter rider number 3. Do you want to address that?

>> Alter: Sure. I think I can do these without my forms in front of me, but if you get into the nitty-gritty I may need to find them here. So, alter rider 3 basically identifies that there's

[8:30:52 PM]

\$3.1 million in the budget of EdD that should be spent on long-term workforce development and provides some further guidance with that. As I mentioned, there was some question of whether they were only doing the arpa and not the long-term, their normal funding. I understand they are committed to doing their regular funding. But just to avoid any future problems, since it was challenging to clarify what was going on, this 3.1 has not gone out for rfp yet. So it makes sure that rfp focuses on long-term workforce spending and does not designate any particular groups for it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Just to confirm, you're not suggesting that we don't have a competitive bidding process for these contracts.

>> Alter: No, it's just for the scope of it to be about workforce development, long-term workforce development. So it can't be repurposed in their budget for something other

[8:31:54 PM]

than workforce development.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Does anybody have any objection to that rider going in? Okay. That rider goes in. Next rider.

>> Alter: So, we launched the office of the chief medical officer. And we have fees that we're putting in for the office and the paramedic practitioners in order for us to be able to generate the revenue that we can legally charge for the services that are already being offered and saving lives, we need to have a health records system and a billing system. And they are in the process. The current budget has what we need for health records, but does not fund the billing system or have a clear plan for the billing system. This is telling them they need to come up with that and report back us to so that we can generate the revenue.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. Any objection to alter riders 1 and 2 coming in? Hearing none, those are part of

[8:32:54 PM]

our budget adoption, or will be. That gets us to councilmember --

>> Alter: I have another rider.

>> Mayor Adler: Oh, I'm sorry.

>> Alter: The first one is about the billing system. So, we have a 19,000-case backlog for ems, which is probably \$5 million just there. We did some -- we took some steps after last year's budget to recoup about \$4.5 million in charity care. And in this year's budget I was pleased to see we have nine additional professionals for billing within ems to assist with things. So the first thing that this does is direct the city

manager to continue the efforts to improve and fix the billing system for ems so we can take in this revenue and to provide progress reports of various kinds to audit and finance. The second part of it says that the city manager is to come back to council to proposal mechanisms where we could

[8:33:56 PM]

re-invest this revenue in recruitment efforts, which would consideration for incentive-based structures for sworn and non-sworn ems professionals. And when we go through the contract process we have to leave the flexibility to do that. And then as a due date for those recommendations. And then finally we are able under our fee structure because of the cost of service study that we did last year following my budget rider, we can raise the ambulance rates by \$500. Sneak -- speaking with the chief, he said to wait until we fix the billing system before we raise those rates, so we're asking them to come back with a recommendation as to whether we can change the rates to take in the revenue and have that additional revenue for our ems system and our general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to alter 1 rider going in? Hearing none, that's in as well.

[8:34:58 PM]

So, 1, 2, 3 are all in. That gets us to councilmember tovo's budget riders. Councilmember tovo, starting at the bottom or at the top, whichever you'd prefer.

>> Tovo: [Off mic]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we can come back to you. Councilmember Ellis, your riders.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I will go in numerical order. My budget rider number 1 is preserving the reproductive health funding. This is a \$150,000 line item that has been in place for a number of years. Given the changes in the laws that the state has been passing, we are redirecting it -- sticking within Austin public health funding, but we are instead providing education and services focused on sexual and reproductive health wellness, allowable contraception and/or service navigation. We are maintaining this funding. It is accompanied by

[8:35:59 PM]

councilmember Fuentes' budget amendment that has been included in the spreadsheet that will increase this funding. This is the line item that was already in the budget, which is why it was a rider. Budget rider number 2 is maintaining the fy22pard summer employee recruitment bonus program, the mid-year and end of season bonuses that we were able to use as incentives to make sure we had

enough lifeguards to staff our pools. We know at this time there is likely to be some vacancy savings and we'd be able to continue this program, but it allows for staff to come back to budget if that funding is not there so that we can work together to identify that funding and with the intent of being able to do those bonuses again next year. Rider number 3 is the vacation leave and incentive pay calculation. So this one has taken a number of forms over the past week as we've had conversations about the human capital software program, but it now reads in such a way so that we can make sure that as the rfps come in

[8:37:00 PM]

and are completed and as staff is negotiating the contract for who will build this program, we want to make sure that it has the ability to calculate people's total time of service within the city of Austin instead of having a gap when you leave and getting reset all the way at 0. We want to make sure if someone has five years of service, leaves for a year and comes back, that they pick up at the incentive pay and approval that a person with five years of experience with the city would continue to have. So those are the three that I have right now. My fourth one was converted into amendment, so it is no longer a rider.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody have objection to any of those? Yes.

>> Alter: I don't know -- I don't have version four. I don't know where to find it.

[Laughing] I don't have version four. I just wanted to understand if we were making sure that the system could do this, or we're

[8:38:01 PM]

telling them that they had to implement the program.

>> Ellis: Well at this point the system they have can't do it at all. We are at the stage of the game where we need to make sure that we can make that calculation. That's step one.

>> Alter: Okay. I fully support it if we're just making sure we have the opportunity. I think there's some other pieces there that I would want to understand a little bit better how they move together, but you can see why it's important that we have the system that we've been funding for five years and don't have.

>> Ellis: Exactly. We will know more for the next budget discussion, but it's going to take that long to build the program, so we wanted to make sure the calculations and information could be accessed.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So that will be in. Those are all of those. It's been pointed out to me, mayor pro tem, that as I look at

[8:39:10 PM]

this, there was some language that you and I were talking about with respect to the civilian conservation corps. Is that included into the amendment that you brought to . . . ?

>> That's your rider three, version three.

>> Mayor Adler: Associate with that. And then the hate crimes one?

>> Alter: You guys didn't redistribute your amendment, so we didn't . . .

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The language we talked about with the hate crimes, we're going to -- I'm sorry?

>> Alter: Go ahead.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem has agreed to language. When we get to a vote, I'll make sure that's incorporated. To close the loop, so you know we've agreed to add that, it said -- and I think that there may have been . . .

>> Alter: Do you want to do it off of mine?

>> Mayor Adler: That would be great.

[8:40:10 PM]

>> Alter: Where my amendment says this should include digital and/or visible commitments across the city to combat hate and helping the public understand the steps they should take to report a hate incident, we added the following sentence. To the extent feasible, this campaign should include information on the steps the public should take to report someone around us that raises a concern and might need help and support. And then we kept the sentence, these could include billboards, capital metro bus placards, wraps or banners, as well as aligned social media assets promoted on city accounts. New sentence, without limitation, staff your from the equity office, public health, and cpi should work together, and we kept the rest of my language. We will get that -- either my staff or your staff will get that to staff.

>> Mayor Adler: They may be coming down here and we'll hand that out. That is part of amendment --

[8:41:13 PM]

which number, councilmember tovo? I mean, mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: That would be alter 3.

>> Mayor Adler: Alter 3. Thank you. We'll hand that out on the dais so that everyone has that. All right. Let's pick it back up in the direction. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Okay. Let's see. I have kitchen 1, direction on the 911 call-takers and dispatchers. And that's basically -- we talked about this a couple of days ago. It's to report to the city council in three months progress on reducing the vacancy rate and the impact on wait times for 911 call center response. So that's that one. Any questions about that one?

[8:42:14 PM]

No? Okay. The next one was direction to the -- the next one has to do with the senior and disabled property tax exemption. And this is direction to the city manager to raise as of October 1st, 2022, the senior and disabled property tax exemption by 11,000 to 124,000. Any questions about that? Yes.

>> So there was a really good q&a on this where it was explained, so I just wanted to ask staff so that we have clarity, because this doesn't change anything that people are going to experience when they get their taxes this year. It doesn't -- it's sort of setting up the next council to adopt something that would happen in fiscal year '24 that has to happen in a particular sequence. Or can you explain? There's some timing issues there that are confusing that I don't want people to think that this is raising it for this tax year.

[8:43:17 PM]

>> Kitchen: Let me also explain the reason and why timing. What we did with the senior tax exemption is we wanted to look at the impact of the housing bond. And so we looked at a level to raise the senior tax exemption -- senior and disabled tax exemption to offset the impact of the housing bond. The housing bond will not take effect until next year, assuming it's passed. So the timing of the implementation of this senior and disabled tax exemption will align with the timing for the housing bond, assuming it's passed. Beyond that, if you want to explain the fact that, you know, we are able to raise the senior and disabled tax exemption at any time during the year, it's just that it won't take effect, because it takes effect at the time that -- now I have to turn to him. It takes effect at the time that you certify the rolls or

[8:44:18 PM]

something like that. But you can explain that, Ed.

>> Yes. So, the tax year is essentially the calendar year. The calendar year overlaps the fiscal year. So later tonight or tomorrow, you'll be adopting a tax rate and sending the senior exemptions for our fiscal year '23 budget. And at least the way it's currently laid out is the senior exemption won't change as part

of that action you take tonight. This rider is telling -- that will set the tax rate and it will set the tax exemptions for the bills that people will receive in October and the taxes they will pay in December and January. The rider from councilmember kitchen is directing staff to come back in October with an increase in the senior exemption that will take effect for the next tax year.

>> Kitchen: Mhmm.

>> So we would come back in October with an ordinance to actually increase the senior exemption for tax year '23,

[8:45:18 PM]

which would reflect the bills that are going to go out in October of '23.

>> I thought the TRE took effect right away, but the bond doesn't take effect until the next year?

>> Well, once you establish your tax rate and your senior exemptions in the ordinance you're going to pass later tonight or tomorrow, that is it. That is the tax rates and the examination -- exemptions that go onto the tax bills that are sent out in October. Councilmember kitchen's talking about would have nothing to do with this tax year. It would be about next tax year. And it would only -- the rider is direction for staff to come back with an ordinance --

>> Alter: I understand that.

>> Kitchen: The bond --

>> Alter: I was trying to understand for the housing bond, the timing of when people would see that on their bills. And I was trying to understand

[8:46:18 PM]

that.

>> Kitchen: You have to issue the bonds before it raises your tax rate. So we have to pass those bonds and then we have to issue them.

>> Alter: So that's why it would be --

>> Kitchen: Right?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Your question is when does the exemption or the bond show up on someone's bill?

>> Alter: When we did the TRE for project connect it was right away and the bond is now a year later and I was just trying to understand why the difference.

>> Kitchen: Because the bond --

>> Mayor Adler: When a bond is passed, at what point does that bond payment show up in people's tax rates?

>> Well, after the bonds are approved, if they're approved this November, the city would immediately be allowed to issue bonds, but we wouldn't do that. We would not anticipate the first bond issuance being for at least a year after the bonds are approved.

>> Mayor Adler: And it doesn't show up on the tax rate until after the bond is issued.

>> Right. The earliest would be September

[8:47:19 PM]

of '23, the debt service associated with that would then start hitting after that.

>> Alter: Great. Thank you. Appreciate it.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. Any objection to that one moving forward? Okay, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Now, I have a third one that should just be sent out to you guys now and is something that councilmember Ellis and I have been talking about, so, again, I apologize that I don't have it printed for you, but I had sent it to be sent to all of you. So I'm just going to read it.

>> Mayor Adler: Should we hold off until everyone has it and double back to that?

>> Kitchen: I'm assuming that Katy is still with us. I sent it to her to send out to everybody. Is that right, city manager?

>> We don't yet have it. It will come. Everybody's still here.

>> Kitchen: Then we can come back to it.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's come back to it.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay?

[8:48:19 PM]

And I'm handing out the amendment to alter 3 that we talked about. So let's continue on, then. We've done the kitchen ones so far. That gets us to councilmember vela, parking shading infrastructure rider.

>> Vela: Yes. This is an item directing the city manager to prioritize infrastructure to provide necessary shade in the parks, conducting an inventory which the parks department has honestly already done an

excellent job of, and then identifying prioritization strategy for parks that are missing the necessary shade structures, identifying funding and coming back to us with funding recommendations so that we can basically completely shade the necessary areas in the parks.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Any objection to that being included? We can move past that. That gets us to Renteria, the

[8:49:21 PM]

veteran services coordinator, you've already introduced. There was no objection to that. That will be part of what we have. Councilmember Fuentes, you have a couple riders, or one rider?

>> Fuentes: Just one rider. It is a tenant relocation assistance program. Councilmembers, my staff and the team from councilmember vela's office worked very closely with our housing and planning staff on figuring out what amount of funding was allocating to the tenant relocation program. We have a tenant relocation ordinance with no funds in the program. After a series of exchanges we have determined that staff has allocated \$700,000 to the tenant relocation fund. As such, this rider lays out that we would like a status update on a solicitation process of this fund within 30, 60, and 90 days. It also lays out that last budget cycle had another budget

[8:50:22 PM]

rider that was focused on the displacement prevention community navigator program, a program that I think is very important as we try to combat displacement. Unfortunately, it has taken a really long time to get that program off the ground. Here we are a year later, it has not been launched. I'm told it's going to be launched next year, in 2023. We have a displacement crisis going on. Every day this program is not launched, it is to the detriment of our community. This rider also asks that staff provide an update so we ensure this program launches in a timely manner.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Any objection to that being included? So when we talk about riders, that one will be included as well. Colleagues, I have three riders. They have all been handed out. Rider number 1 was asking staff to come back and talk to future council about what would be

[8:51:23 PM]

involved and what could be included in a description of what we do from a taxing standpoint -- the fees, the impacts, perhaps including it in with the utility bill, something that happens after the tax session. So it's not something that's covered by the state law, but it would be a way for us to be able to explain to our taxpayers and fee-payers what we've done and how that's changed. Is there any objection to that

rider being included? Hearing none, that will be part of it. The tirz policy is the rider, it's version 3. It basically says hey, if we establish a tirz and there's time left on it, it's raising money, the default would be that that money would be spent on homelessness issues in that area. Certainly councils can change

[8:52:23 PM]

that. You can cut off the tirz early or change the project settings, but that's version three. Any objection to that being included? That will be part of it. And then the last one, the Austin civilian conservation corps, and I appreciate the mayor pro tem working with me on this language. It provides that the corps will explore how its mission should include pathways to jobs, specifically for people experiencing homelessness, and also ways to support the homelessness response system and directing that the manager prepare an evaluation of the civilian conservation corps, including the elements of that as well. Any objection to that rider being included? Hearing none, that's included. Now let's double back to the things we needed to double back on. We're going to start with councilmember tovo.

>> Mayor, I have a quick question.

[8:53:23 PM]

On your tirz financial policy, could you clarify how affordable housing works with that? Is that allowed or not? I wasn't certain what it had said. Sorry, I don't have it in front of me.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes it's toward addressing homelessness and other housing initiatives, so it's that broad.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. Yes, councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: I did not yet go over my budget riders.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, did I skip you? I apologize.

>> Kelly: That's okay. Thank you. I know you have an amendment for one of them. So my first budget rider is very similar to the one that I brought forward last year for the modified police cadet academies, or transitional officer programs. As of August 8th there were over 270 operational police officer vacancies. And so we wanted to make sure that we had the added flexibility to allow for this program to happen to cut the time down from when officers need to be trained, basically cuts it in half. These two classes are only

[8:54:24 PM]

available if there's funding already in APD's budget. And so I didn't know if you wanted to lay out your amendment now, or if you wanted me to keep going?

>> Mayor Adler: Let me lay that out so we can incorporate it and move forward. I appreciate your opportunity to add a line. And I appreciate your leadership and working to make sure that we get approved and funded police positions filled with officers so that they can be on the street. You made reference to one of the resolutions we passed that spoke to that that we did in 2021. There's also another sentence to add that I think I may have handed out already, but if I didn't, I'm handing it out now. It makes reference to the direction that we put on the Kroll contract we passed. This adds the language, city manager must adhere to council

[8:55:24 PM]

direction passed with item 182 on the July 28th, 2022 council meeting which said that if you move to more classes you need to bring in a third-party person or entity to watch what's happening it, review it, report back to the community, and bring that scope back to the council as part of new cadet classes and get that done. And I thank the city manager's office and assistant city manager for already moving in that direction with the scope of service that I think has already been shared with stakeholders in the community, with real favorable reviews. So, thank you for that. And thank you for your rider.

>> Kelly: Absolutely. Thank you for bringing that forward. It is a value-add so we can ensure we have the best-quality class for the cadets possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to this rider as amended? Hearing none, that's included.

>> Kelly: Okay. So, the second budget rider I'm bringing forth is direction for design continuation and construction of the canyon creek

[8:56:25 PM]

fire station for the next fiscal year. As you have heard, the fire station is the fifth of five fire stations planned to be constructed in Austin. We have sufficient funds for design work but not construction, so what this rider does is direct staff to proceed with the design work, and report back to council when construction of the -- the construction budget is finalized. And it should be put into the five-year forecast.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody have objection to that rider being included? Hearing none, that's included as well.

>> Kelly: Just one last note, district 6 is where the canyon creek fire station currently is located, so we're real excited to have that out there to make response times lower.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kelly: Kelly 3, the budget rider, is direction to return to council with recommendations and costs regarding a comprehensive study to city of Austin retirees. We've been talking about pay increases for current city of Austin employees, but there are

[8:57:26 PM]

some issues in the community. When I've talked with residents, related to being retired, that I'd like to get the idea about so we might be able to address that. And so I'd like recommendations and the cost of initiating this study by the end of 2022.

>> Mayor Adler: So it doesn't initiate the study, just for staff to tell us what it would cost.

>> Kelly: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that being included? Hearing none, that rider is included.

>> Kelly: And Kelly 4, budget rider, direction for the city manager to work with the parks department in establishing required resources and costs associated with the completion of the play for all abilities park. I'd like for it to be somewhere in northwest Austin but I'm not tied to that specifically. This would just get us more information on how we can complete the process, what it looks like, and that sort of thing. If you remember, I had an amendment to the budget with the cost -- the estimated cost of this park that I had taken down and replaced with the rider.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[8:58:26 PM]

Anybody have objection to that rider? So when we consider riders, that will be included as well.

>> Kelly: Thank you. And

>> Kelly: Then Kelly five is to fully fund an animal behavior specialist. We had considered funding that in this year's budget to ensure that we had additional funds to expend, but also it just makes more sense to turn it into a rider until we wait on the results of the audit for the animal services organization.

>> Mayor Adler: So this asks that this item come up to council at some point after that audit is done.

>> Kelly: Correct. It would return to council for further, I guess, action.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that rider? Hearing none, when we consider riders we'll make that motion part of it.

>> Kelly: That's all. Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you, mayor. My first rider directs the manager to move forward with the nexus study. I did make one edit that I'm

[8:59:28 PM]

going to read into the record. Instead of no later than April 1st, the language of this should say and to bring forward this information to city council no later than 17 months from fiscal year 23 budget approval. This is the nexus study that would help us determine what the costs are to the community and to the city when there's a need for a tenant relocation.

>> Mayor Adler: So does this rider say bring it back for authorization or does it order the study to be done?

>> Tovo: It orders the study to be done. It's my understanding that our previous budget -- our previous council action directed the funding and that we still have funding available for this purpose.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Staff's okay with this?

>> Funding is in there.

>> Mayor Adler: And without objection that will be included in the riders when we pass them.

>> Tovo: Item 3 I will

[9:00:28 PM]

skip too for the moment. Item 3 requests that -- direct the manager to work with the sobering city for the five-year projections that the sobering city is currently preparing and to bring forward any amendments to the interlocal agreement. I think we will need an amendment to the interlocal agreement rather quickly to codify the action that we're I hope prepared to take to increase the funding. I think we discussed this the other day the projection hadn't been updated or entered into the system.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that being -- yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I don't have an objection and I don't have to make an amendment. I would just ask the city manager to also explore whether Travis county can contribute more funding as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Please note that as part of the rider.

>> Tovo: At the moment the original agreement that that they don't contribute because they contribute the building and the cost of renovations but it's almost at the end of that period of time so that's a good point because that will need to be negotiated for the future.

[9:01:30 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Next?

>> Tovo: Item 4 I will have to go out of order because I misplaced it. Item 5 is APD residency incentive study. We've had an opportunity to discuss this in the past. We haven't discuss it had recently. I'm happy to answer questions. This would conduct a study to assess whether or not it would be an effective strategy to provide incentives to have our police officers live within the stint. We did negotiate for that to be included as a potentiality with our counties several cycles ago and this would move us further in that direction of actually having the information we would need to make a decision. I am adding a line to it that says -- thank you. I am adding a line to it that says the city manager shall return to council with any funding requirements. I think back when we discussed it a few years ago I believe, if I'm remembering correctly, that there was some suggestion that we could do it with our existing resources. I'm not sure that's still the case and we haven't had an opportunity, thank you, to address it. So I'm adding that line in

[9:02:30 PM]

case there's a funding cost to come back.

>> Kitchen: I have a question about this one.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I think you answered this, but let me ask. This is not making a decision that we want do this, just getting information on it, right?

>> Tovo: Yes.

>> Kitchen: Because I know in years' past there's some concern by police officers about requirements to live in the city and I would just want to fully vet that. But I'm okay with getting the information.

>> Tovo: Surement and this isn't -- just to be clear this isn't talking about a requirement. It's talking about an incentive.

>> Kitchen: Gotcha.

>> Tovo: And let me say we did consider it a few years ago. It went forward at the end of the day, the budget rider did not pass. And so I'm resurfacing it. I will say the Austin police association did approach us. They have several individuals who have been researching it. I think there's strong interest in looking at it again.

>> Kitchen: That's fine.

>> Tovo: This puts us on

[9:03:31 PM]

the path, but not very far on the path because if includes funding we don't have any in this year's budget so the manager will have to come back and let us know. And I will say shall return to council with any further funding requirements and report in on that by let's say November 1st. What would be a good date? Really all you're doing is determining whether or not -- it's a question we haven't been able to run down because of some of the staff -- we just haven't been able to talk to the right staff on this because some of them are out of the office right now. So the only thing I'm asking you to return with is the answer about whether or not funding exist to do this study currently.

>> Right. Ray arrestian cross, assistant city manager. We have requested an extension if necessary.

>> Tovo: So the additional line, the city manager shall return to council with any funding with information about whether any funding would be required.

[9:04:35 PM]

By November 1st.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> I have a quick question and maybe there's background on this that predates me. Do we do this for fire and ems or have we looked into that as well? Is anyone opposed to getting that information back at the same time?

>> Tovo: I'm certainly not opposed to it. I don't know that their contracts have been amended to include that possibility of having that kind of program. I know APD has and I just don't -- I don't know what the impact would be of including them within this. I would say they should be separate ones, but I'm certainly happy to have you add a line if you want to suggest that -- if you want to suggest a line.

>> Ellis: I'll just meld what you had said and basically say, and include fire and ems if that is a provision allowed in their contract.

>> Tovo: Could we separate it out so this one could go forward? I guess I want to make progress on some front. So it would be good to have this one be a standalone an then add on the city manager

[9:05:36 PM]

is further directed to report back on...

>> Ray Arrellano again. Councilmember Ellis, I can certainly go back with labor relations and see whether or not the provision exists currently in their agreements and then can come back and discuss into separately whether an ifc or have staff come forward and say or investigate what it would cost and include them on separate studies in this regard.

>> Ellis: I would appreciate that. I'm more interested in the information if we're doing the work that we're doing as much of it as we can once, but I certainly understand councilmember tovo's desire not to move up one end of the process if one is moving faster than the other.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I have a quick question.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Kitchen: So Mr. Arrellano, I understand that the ems contract is going to be expiring relatively soon so there are conversations happening right now with ems.

[9:06:37 PM]

So if you're going to go back and check on these other contracts, you might also check about what might be upcoming shortly in terms of a contract.

>> I'll do that.

>> Kitchen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: So at least for ems, we can -- they told me with respect to my rider that they can do a memorandum of understanding and cross them if it's mutually agreeable to do it at any time, which this might be. I would assume that would be the same for fire. So eventually you would want it in the contract, but to get it started I'm not sure you have to.

>> I think we'll be happy to take a look at this and leave it as a standalone as councilmember tovo councilmember tovo has asked and we can look into the other two as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. With that understanding and with that language included,

[9:07:38 PM]

with that amendment being -- and the rider being included. So the rider be included as amended. Go ahead?

>> Item 6, and I made an adjustment so you're looking at version 2, directs our manager to come back to us with a recommendation for how we could provide more information and really publicize our medical and legal registry to those who are relying on electricity for their medical needs and medical equipment

can be part of that, which provides them with a variety of really important services, including if they needed additional time for bill payment. But I think there's also proactive work that happens with the staff who serve in this area in times of emergency, reach out to those customers. So we had talked about this I think at one of our meetings. This just directs them to move forward with that, come up with recommendations for making it more widely known

[9:08:38 PM]

and the utility bills I think would be a really great option in addition to communicating with our networks of hospitals and doctors.

>> Mayor Adler: But to be clear it's not just to make recommendations, but to develop and implement those recommendations.

>> Tovo: Correct. I offered a few possibilities and I'd like them to come back to us with some recommendations and a timetable for implementations.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have objections or concerns about this? Okay. That will be included when we're approving riders.

>> Tovo: Number 7 I need to make a couple of adjustments to. This is the direction that our manager should look at a couple of sites in particular that used to be very popular event and wedding venues providing the city with some additional revenue. One is right-clickers ranch owned by the water utility and the other is

[indiscernible] Ranch which directs them to look at any cost. An initial study, not like a full flunk analysis, but to come back with us about information about why they're not currently being

[9:09:38 PM]

used. What it would take generally for them to get it up to speed and some information about past revenue. So the edits would be to lower case departments in the firefighters line and in the second in the be it further resolved to add in after pard and other departmental site.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that one? So when we do riders that will be included with those.

>> Tovo: The lgbtq quality of life advisory commission requested that we create an fte, a community liaison position that would report to the city manager. I began that way. I may have even distributed amendments. I transformed it into direction after consulting with staff. And this would request that our manager meet with representatives of the commission to learn a little bit more about the recommendation, what they had envisioned in terms of the scope and the role of that position. And it would be with the aim of either creating a position or reconstructing one of the existing positions to capture some of

[9:10:39 PM]

that need. And that commissioners have identified.

>> Mayor Adler: And then to report back. Any objections or concerns for this rider? Hearing none, when we approve riders this will be part of that. Okay?

>> Tovo: Last year on the dais I brought an amendment that the council supported to bring in how some of the contract positions and I had hoped to see some more in this year's budget. We are making some progress. I think we still have a lot more progress to be made. We have a pending contract on our next council agenda that I had postponed that's coming forward. I think it's a custodial contract for Austin energy. I want to be sure that we do not lose ground on our end sourcing. I think it was this morning or yesterday in our amendments we saw -- one of the amendments is to insource the jobs that had been contracted out to Lincoln properties for our planning and development

[9:11:39 PM]

facility. And one of the things that the staff pointed out is that when -- because they're bringing those jobs online we're actually saving money. So for all the reasons that our work group thought it was a good idea to bring the jobs that are representing permanent needs, security and custodial among them, I think we need to continue to make progress on it. This just codifies that. Austin energy has a very large number of custodial positions and this would direct the manager to work with -- to continue the work with Austin energy to craft a plan for at least 10 positions per year which I understand is what they thought was reasonable, but to do as much as possible beyond 10. I have to make a couple of corrections. I misunderstood some information from staff. The second paragraph where it says Austin energy currently has a large -- currently has 51 contract custodial positions, I don't totally understand what the information was that we got from building services, but it's my understanding that they have been assessed to

[9:12:41 PM]

need 51 custodial positions to meet the need. So at this moment I couldn't run it down. I will change it to nearing currently has a large number of contract custodial positions.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: Do note the additional piece of direction that the manager should provide us with a memorandum outlining the goals and expectations and the timeline for Austin energy custodial positions. They should -- the manager should accelerate these goals as much as possible. I'm leaving out

a lot of the rationale so ask me if anybody would like us to recap or would like me to recap why we're doing this. It would require quarterly reports to audit and finance committee so that they can keep tabs on the progress that we're making toward fulfilling those goals at the council resolution that was passed. And lastly in light of the expanded role that the building services department now has in terms of hiring

[9:13:43 PM]

and training and monitoring the staff that are serving different departments, the manager is directed to determine whether this department will need additional resources to do their expanded role.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection or concerns with this rider?

>> Tovo: 10, animal services asks for some additional information to be added to the dashboard. It also puts forward an idea that the city had offered us about how we might market -- do some marketing based on collecting information when visitors to the animal center sign in. And it also asks for some procedure -- asks the animal advisory commission to consider some procedures and I think it's appropriate given that we're allocating some very much needed ftes to that department.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have any objection or concerns with this rider number 10?

>> Tovo: Let me just say as the new parent to a puppy who came from the animal center this week, there are

[9:14:45 PM]

a lot of really fabulous staff and volunteers over there and they really need more families to step forward and adopt dogs because they've got lots and lots of them right now. Four, Austin ISD partnership. We've talked a lot about these programs. This budget direction would capture what we had talked about earlier, which is to direct the manager to incorporate funding for these programs into the base budget once the contracts expire. In five years. I understand law has some concerns about direction so far in the future. So I don't know if this would resolve that concern. City manager, if I said the city manager is directed to pape funding, pape including funding -- propose including funding.

>> I think it might be helped if you said the city council would desire for the city manager to put something in the budget five years in the future.

[9:15:45 PM]

Since this council can't direct the manager to do that five years in the future. Thank you.

>> Tovo: I think I captured that.

>> Mayor Adler: Where would that be?

>> Tovo: I think it would be before the city manager. The city council desires that the manager include funding for these programs in the city of Austin's base budget. Is that -- city manager, is that what you were suggesting?

>> I think the city manager or the city attorney could live with that.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Tovo: Thank you, city manager and city attorney the. And I think that covers it with the exception of -

-

>> Mayor Adler: You didn't do tovo rider 2.

>> Tovo: Right, I was going to go back to that one. This is the new program that I described the other day. There is no budgetary impact so I didn't have to bring it forward as an amendment. It would create a new program here at the city of Austin for students of aid with intellectual and developmental disabilities and it would help provide --

[9:16:47 PM]

it would help transition those students from the school into the workforce. And I'm super excited about it. I think really going to make a big impact and going to significantly benefit the city of Austin. As mentioned, aisd has agreed that they are able to provide a level of support and training and guidance not just for those students who would be participating and working with jobs at the city of Austin in this pilot program, but are also able to come in and do some discussion and some training with that individual's colleagues and co-workers. So one, it does address the issue of municipal civil service. The municipal civil service rules would not allow preference to be given to those individuals who have completed that pilot program. They would then be able to say that they were city of Austin, had that city of Austin experience and so both the training and that experience one hopes would lead to eventual permanent

[9:17:48 PM]

jobs. This is a program that exists with some private businesses in our community, but I think that the city of Austin would be one of the first public entities to do that and I think it would also be a good model for other public entities.

>> Mayor Adler: Can this also include students or individuals, students or adults from other districts as well?

>> Tovo: It certainly could. And I think there was some language about expanding and looking to expand. What I know is that Austin independent school district is poised to be able to provide that support as soon as we're ready to go. And those conversations have not happened with other school districts.

>> Mayor Adler: Can we add to this that in developing the program they should check with the other surrounding districts here in the city to see if they're also able to proceed with the program?

>> Tovo: Yes. Could we do so in a way that allows this one to move forward? There have been a fair amount of discussions and I think they're poised to be able do that with the four pilot departments here at

[9:18:48 PM]

the city of Austin.

>> Mayor Adler: That's why the language I gave back to you, which was the manager is directed to check with the other school districts in the city of Austin to see if they would also be able to participate in this program?

>> Tovo: I would want to check with hr. I don't know if director hays can speak to whether we would have the capacity to work with multiple school districts in this pilot year.

>> Mayor Adler: Can we add if possible and amend that language?

>> Tovo: Sure, I'm trying to think about how to do that. Something like the city manager is further directed to explore the possibility of working with other ISDs

[9:19:54 PM]

as soon as feasible, something like that?

>> Mayor Adler: Sure, thank you.

>> Tovo: And it is my intent that if we can get it up an running this year to do so. And I've asked for a report back to council no later than November 1st, 2023.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that or concerns? All right. So we've gone through all the riders, all the riders are there. Have rider three as version three. Kelly rider five is version two. Ellis rider three is version four. Tovo rider six I think is version two. And we have approved all of the riders that we have except for Fuentes rider one which was converted to the direction associated with the amendment.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I had another rider.

>> Mayor Adler: From council member Fuentes. Okay. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I passed out

[9:20:56 PM]

this rider. This one relates to the dental insurance that councilmember Ellis and I spoke to earlier. You all have a copy, but I'll go ahead and read it to you. The city council seeks to provide dental insurance as an option to temporary employees. The city manager is directed to identify the funding and provide this option in time for the next open enrollment. The estimated cost is 70,000.

>> Mayor Adler: This looks awfully like an amendment on a rider.

>> Kitchen: It's not changing the budget. It's just directing the staff.

>> Mayor Adler: Those would have to come back to council with a budget amendment in order to be able to fund the \$70,000 for the program.

>> Kitchen: Oh, that was not my understanding. I thought we could just direct this. Can we not?

>> Mayor Adler: No. Not if it has -- if it involves money.

[9:21:59 PM]

>> Ellis: In one of our conversations I believe it wasn't needing to be moved, that it could be done as a rider this way.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, this was our understanding.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want to help us here?

>> I think that the point of the exercise was the amendments were if there was money involved and we really appreciated you doing this way, the amendments involved money involved and if the rider was direction related to the budget, but not involving money. And if you want to have an ifc that is something that is a different topic that you would bring that later.

>> Kitchen: The problem is that the next -- we understood from Ms. Hays that we needed to direct her to have the authority to go look into this right now because open enrollment starts in October. And if we didn't -- we thought we would bring an ifc, but we understand that's too late for Ms. Hays, that the -- director hays, that she needs to have authority to at least start looking into it.

>> Mayor Adler: How about the city manager is directed

[9:23:07 PM]

to see --

>> Kitchen: Identify and bring back to us maybe?

>> Mayor Adler: To see if the city can fund and provide this option in time for the next open enrollment and to timely report back to council.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Director says, does that give you the authority to start looking at it?

>> Yes. In order for us to execute this for 2023 we would have to have them participate in open enrollment and have that information in time for the November installment to the company in order to have them set. So we want to do this for 2023. We will have to have that participation in the open enrollment this October.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think the way you're wording it sounds like it would work.

>> Mayor Adler: So it would say the city manager is directed to see if the city can fund and provide this option in time for the next open enrollment and timely report back to

[9:24:08 PM]

council.

>> Kitchen: Works for me.

>> Mayor Adler: Does that work for you, director says?

>> Yes, it does, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. With that change, which requires it to come back to council which makes it a rider, not an amendment. Any objection to this one? This one will go in and we'll refer to this as kitchen number 6.

>> Kitchen: It's actually three.

>> Mayor Adler: Kitchen number three. I was looking at the amendments thank you. Kitchen three. Kitchen rider three. Thank you. All right. I think those are all of the riders. I think those are all of the elements that we have to decide. Are you ready for us to proceed with the script? Okay. Let's see if we can do this, guys.

[9:25:21 PM]

Okay. First I'm going to call up agenda item number 1, which is the Austin resource recovery rates and fees. We've now heard all the speakers. Is there anybody here today by the way that wants to speak? Okay. Hearing none. We have now heard all the speakers. Do I have a motion to close the public hearing

on item 1 regarding rates and fees for Austin resource recovery? Councilmember pool makes the motion. Is there a second? Councilmember Ellis seconds that motion. Any discussion? Any objection? That's approved unanimously. We've closed the hearing. Do we actually -- all we do at this point is close the hearing. We don't adopt the rates and fees? Okay. Item agenda number 2, parkland dedication, something we postponed to September 1st. Item number 3, which is the Rainey street historical

[9:26:22 PM]

fund, item 3 is an ordinance that relates to the Rainey street historic district revenue fund revising the total amount of funds to be annually appropriated by council. Do I have a motion and a second to adopt this ordinance? Councilmember tovo. Makes the motion. Council member vela seconds that motion. Any discussion? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? Unanimously that is approved. That was by the way one of the things we had in the non-[indiscernible] Alternate funding work page that we were working through. We did vote on it and it passes unanimously. Okay. Item number 4, item number 4 is an ordinance adopting the city's budget for fiscal year 2022 and 2023. We have the -- the staff has

[9:27:24 PM]

presented its recommendations and its changes. Someone want to move the recommended budget as our base budget? Council member Fuentes makes that motion. The mayor pro tem seconds that motion. That is our base item. We've agreed to make some changes to it, and the following amendments, amendment 1 by Adler, amendment 3 by Adler because amendment number 2 was withdrawn. Amendment 4 by Adler. And all these things are as amended as we've discussed and modified now. In some cases from how they were written. But continuing on, we said Adler #, Adler 4. Adler 5 was withdrawn. Adler number 6 also part of the amendments to the budget. Councilmember harper-madison moved her amendment 2.

[9:28:26 PM]

Council member Fuentes -- by the way, Adler number 6 was a v2. Council member Fuentes moved her 1, which was a version 4. Also her amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5, which was a version 2. Also version two of Fuentes 6. Council member vela had his amendment 1, which was a v3 and vela 2 which was a v3 and council member vela also had his amendments 3 and 4.

>> Kitchen:, her O owe councilmember kitchen, amendments kitchen 2, 3, 4, 5 with a v2 and councilmember Kelly I think was just amendment 2 which was a v3, and I think the others were converted.

[9:29:27 PM]

Is that right, amendment 3? I think that amendment number 1 was the animal behavioral specialist which became a rider. V2 of Kelly 2 was the whole blood program, which had two components as we were going through the budget. Both the whole blood component and the simulation. Your Kelly 3 I think was converted and handled differently. So the only amendment to pass was Kelly 2, which was a v3. Councilmember Ellis had one and two and three which was a v3. And not Elvis v4. Tovo, councilmember tovo, moved -- oh, the version. I said v2, that's version 2. Or v3 was version 3 so we make sure we're all looking at the right one.

[9:30:29 PM]

Councilmember tovo had amendment number one and amendment number two. Also had amendment number three which was a version 2. Councilmember tovo also moved her amendment four and five and six which was a v2. Seven and eight which was a version 2. Tovo amendment number 9 and also number 10. I said that. We did not do eight, which we said was a v2. That one was not included. And I'm going to do councilmember tovo's again, please. We'll start at the beginning. So it was passed with tovo. I have one, two and three, which was a version 2. Four was postponed until our

[9:31:30 PM]

next council meeting. Tovo five was passed. Tovo number 6 was postponed to our next council meeting. Also not part of this budget. We handle it as an item of council. Or just postponed. We'll pick it up then. Tovo number 7 passed and is part of -- is an amendment that we're considering. Tovo number 8 is not part of the amendments we are considering. It also includes tovo 9, tovo 10, tovo 11, and 12 and 13 and 14. Tovo 15 was not acted on. We're going to consider that on September 1st when the council comes back. Mayor pro tem alter had one, amendment 2, amendment 3, amendment 4, amendment 5. And and

[9:32:30 PM]

at least one of these was amended with my amendment but all these as amended.

>> Alter: So I had amendment 6 as well. It was amendment 3 that I had [indiscernible].

>> Mayor Adler: Amendment 3 contained an -- alter 3 had an amendment from me and also alter number 6. So alter one, two, three, four, five, six were all part of the motion to amend the budget. We also included riders as part of the budget. And I think that with respect to the riders we approved Adler rider one, Adler rider two, which was a version two. Adler rider three, which was a version three.

[9:33:31 PM]

We also approved council member Fuentes rider number two and councilmember Renteria's rider number one, which is a veteran services coordinator. We called it up as a rider and it was language we put into the record, so he has a rider in as well. That gets us to council member vela who had a rider number one that was approved. Councilmember kitchen on riders had one, two and three that were approved. Councilmember Kelly had one, two, three, four and five, which was a version two. All these contained amendments that were made and I proved including Kelly rider number one, but not limited to that as we go

[9:34:31 PM]

through riders. Councilmember Ellis had riders one and two and three, which was a version four. And councilmember tovo had rider one, two, three, four, five, six, which was a version two. Seven, eight, nine and 10. And councilmember alter had riders one, two and three. Is that correct? And then in addition to that, the amendments to the base motion includes the Austin energy funding, the scoping analysis for the fayette investigation as we discussed. It includes the financing of the goodnight ranch fire station. It includes the pilot for

[9:35:33 PM]

ems at the airport that's paid out of the transportation enterprise. It also includes adding the additional council ftes, unfunded ftes. I think that's all the elements of our budget. Am I missing anything? Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Mayor, I just need to clarify. Can you just look at your list of mine, please?

>> Mayor Adler: Riders, amendments?

>> Tovo: Amendments, I'm sorry. One through three passed. Four postponed. Five passed. Six was withdrawn.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: Seven passed, eight withdrawn. Nine through 14, nine, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 passed.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. And also was there a 15?

>> Tovo: 15 is the convention center, which is postponed. I don't think it had a number because it was

[9:36:34 PM]

distributed -- and I think that was the one we missed. There was one you mentioned earlier that I thought we had a discrepancy on. Does that match what you have now?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, it does. All right. So I think that's all of the budget items in front of us. Is there a motion to adopt the budget with the amendments that we have outlined? I'm going to let the mayor pro tem make that motion. Council member Fuentes seconds that motion. Okay. So it's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion? Go ahead.

>> Tovo: One additional point of clarification. When we raised up budget riders, you didn't netsly call those out just now, did you?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, I went through them by name and by number.

>> Tovo: All right, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: I went through the amendments, I went through the riders and

[9:37:34 PM]

then I went through the other items that were at the top of that work page.

>> Tovo: Because I did not number the ones that I raised up. I had numbered the ones that I distributed originally. The ones that I distributed here on the dais are from amendment -- let me just clarify that this would also include the riders attached to amendments three, 10 and 13.

>> Mayor Adler: As we discussed, that's correct. Those directions were included in the amendments that were passed. Okay. Continuing on, ready? Yes, council member Fuentes. Yes, you can comment now on the budget. Yes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you, colleagues. I wanted to express my gratitude and how excited I am that pending this vote we'll able to deliver a 20-dollar minimum wage for city employees. I want to give a big, by thank you to afscme and all

[9:38:35 PM]

of our unions, our community groups, the living wage stakeholder, our advocates who testified who showed tremendous support for us reinvesting in our workforce and really focusing our budget on our employees, understanding the critical role that our workers play in keeping Austin running. I think this budget delivers so many important investments and really gets back to basics to ensure that we're able to deliver high quality and consistent services to our community so that our workers can live in community that they serve. I'm super proud of this budget. I'm thrilled to have so many important priorities, including this budget, including rolling out enhanced library card pilot program, funding to bring the first trauma recovery center in the state to Austin as well as investments in community safety with getting construction funding for the goodnight ranch fire station and of course bringing paramedics to the airport for a pilot program. Super excited and I wanted to thank my colleagues for

[9:39:36 PM]

all their support. Thank you.

>> Kelly: Thank you. Mayor and council, I provided the clerk, which should be circulating soon, the notes on my budget amendments and riders. This will be included in the backup for later reference. I'm not going to list each amendment or riders that I'm voting no on so as to save us time, but there are several times brought forward today that I just can't report. This year's five billion dollar budget is the largest in our city's history. This is no small lift. I want to thank my colleagues for the co-sponsorship, the city staff and budget office for all their hard work and my team for their consistent hard work and dedication and constituents who gave invaluable feedback and support. I was happy to support other council members in some of the budget amendment initiatives. I'm thankful for your invitation to those items and how they will positively impact the city. With the passage of my

[9:40:36 PM]

budget amendments and riders we can fill police vacancies, give direction to the city manager for an animal behaviorist, condition with the design of a fire station in district 6. Equip individuals with much needed training. We expanded the whole blood program at ems and steak to conduct a study for cost of living for city of Austin retirees. I'm thankful for the support I received from my colleagues, co-sponsors and the community. That support allowed for these initiatives to be realized. I want to highlight some things in the budget I'm hesitant about for community. As I stated at the beginning this is the largest budget the city has ever seen and it has the growth of programs and initiatives that I'm still reluctant to support. This budget includes an electric rate increase, a parking fee increase and by contract a street repair budget is drastically low for a city that's rapidly growing. The number of authorized officers sworn and not has not increased since 2019 and vacancies have increased

[9:41:37 PM]

year over year since 2020. Projected vacancies for this year are four times more than in the previous year. Previously we had programs with the American rescue plan act, funds that need to be phased out or slimed down, are now being funded with property taxes. And like many austinites I'm a renter. Renters have been affected by the increased property tax due to landlords passing additional costs on to tenants. Home prices climb higher and higher every year and we have people moving out of the city. Even though I'm hesitant about some of the items in the budget, I know firsthand how challenging crafting a budget can be because I've seen our budget office go through that and I really appreciate it. So thank you, mayor and council and the city manager for your efforts in working on this year's budget. The process that we followed is crucial because it provides accountability to our residents and how the city of Austin spends money. And I know we all work hard to produce the greatest positive impact in our community, including a better and safer city to work and live in. So even though I'm skeptical

[9:42:37 PM]

about these things in the budget, I hope that we as a council are sure that we're doing the best we can for the people that live in the city of Austin. Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Yes. I want to add very, very briefly, there are many, many things in this budget to be thankful for and broad of and I appreciate the collaborative work from the whole dais. And I want to just highlight two things. I want to say thank you to council member Fuentes for her leadership on the -- getting the wage up to 20. I'm very proud to have been helping with that and I'm thankful to all my colleagues because everyone contributed and I think it is critically important for our employees and I want to thank afscme for their work on this and everyone

[9:43:41 PM]

involved. I also wanted to thank you all for continued support of the heal initiative. This is a successful program that is very important for us to continue, and I appreciate the commitment of council to continue with that effort. There are many, many other things that we've talked about today. I've been very impressed with the work of all of my colleagues and with the creativity on this dais. And I want to say thank you to everyone for that.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I know when we get down into the nitty-gritty of doing the numbers like this a lot of attention and focus it put on the largest of amendments and the budget riders that we all bring. But I know there is so much more to this budget. There are a lot of programs that we've all been working on, some of us for years. A lot of great things got baked into the city manager's original proposal. We've been able to include funding for living streets

[9:44:41 PM]

and block parties for the clean air coalition, for expanding health care and reproductive, for free gun locks and a storage campaign to make sure that the epidemic of gun violence in our community that we can do something to help stop this. And it also includes funding for neighborhood speed mitigation so I know this is a really huge conversation. Just today I've seen fire and EMS sharing information about how many tragic accidents that they are having to respond to right now. So these are all things that were already baked in. I don't want people to lose sight of the big picture and the work that we do every other week here on the dais, but I'm really proud of this budget. I think it does reflect our values. I would like for the record to reflect that I would be a no vote on Adler amendment number 4, but the rest of the budget I'm very proud about and happy to support it.

>> Mayor Adler: Anyone else want to say anything at this point? Mayor pro tem?

[9:45:42 PM]

>> Alter: Thank you. I'll be really brief. First I want to thank our budget staff for their hard work. This has been a rollercoaster of a budget. I was pleased that we had funding that we could spend on our priorities, but it has not been easy I think all the way around. So I appreciate the hard work and all the many answers to my many questions. I appreciate that. Thank you to my colleagues for bringing forward some really important initiatives, foremost among them the ability for us to invest in our workforce. I've been talking about that for a long time back when we had our strategic direction really felt like we needed to put that high in our SD23 and I'm hoping with the new council we can develop that to a top 10 indicator.

[9:46:42 PM]

We face a lot of challenges as a city beyond our workforce, public health, economic opportunity and readiness. I'm really proud that we've been able to make some investments here that help us to address the vulnerabilities in our communities and to foster a resilience. We have added to our ability to respond to disease. We have invested in sustainable revenue streams for our EMS and our paramedic practitioners program and we're committed to the green program with the Austin civilian conservation corps. As a council we're also continuing to keep our word to the many survivors who have come and spoken their truths to us. In 2019 when we passed the comprehensive evaluation that led to the police economic research forums evaluation, I said then that we would be judged by our

[9:47:42 PM]

subsequent actions and the actions that we're taking today are among the many ways that we are going to reform this response. I want to invite the community and the council to read that report when it comes out I think probably next week. There's still a lot more that we need to be doing. There is a ton in this budget that was not the subject of our debate today or yesterday. And there are many things in there, but I'm going to save them for my newsletter, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. I also want to thank council member Fuentes for her leadership on the \$20 and also councilmember kitchen on her heal program. It's so important. We're facing a real challenge right now with our homeless population camping out in our parks, and just

[9:48:43 PM]

today I received notice that we were able to locate 70 people from the parks, Guerrero park, into the heal program. So I'm really just grateful for your leadership. Another important one is council member vela and his leadership role and putting in three million dollars for tenant relocation and displacement service for our very unfortunate renters that are facing displacement right now because of the high cost. And I'd like to say developers are coming in and take advantage of our very low income people and buying up properties, especially apartments and trailer home spots and displacing our people. I really want to thank you for that. We couldn't get the five million, but three million

[9:49:43 PM]

is a great start and thank you for that.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member vela.

>> Vela: Thank you, councilmember Renteria, and to council member Fuentes on the 20-dollar an hour, thank you to all my colleagues. As my first budget, I really appreciate the communal work to get to that number. It's tough, especially at the end I know people fight hard for their items, but I really appreciate everybody working together to accomplish the goal. And the other -- I am so proud that the vast majority of new money in this budget goes to working class people in Austin, either as the 20-dollar wage or as the eight million dollars in rental assistance and displacement assistance. Mine was three, but the base

[9:50:43 PM]

budget had five. So that makes me very proud of what we did here today.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. So before we move on I want to add my thanks to the staff. Not an easy thing to do and it's the staff that you see, but also the staff that you don't see. We had hundreds of people that were standing by phones today. We've had over a thousand people who have worked in preparing this budget now in the last five months because it's a long process. The fact that we're able to actually get it passed this council in the first day of setting I think is a testament to the work that you all do both taking it not just from departments but also the council offices that you were working with as this is moving forward. So thank you for that. And I was real proud of the budget that the manager suggested because there was so many elements that really did address the affordability in this city,

[9:51:45 PM]

and then to hand it off to the council to be able to really -- just really lay into some of those elements and add to them. This really is fighting for ability budget. I'm really honored to be working with my colleagues on the council. When we look at how this city operates and its values, I think that we've often heard that a budget represents values and I'm just real proud of the values that are represented in this budget. So much done. It's good to be part of a city where the economy is hitting on so many cylinders because it generates more revenue for us to be able to spend on programs. That's where the money comes in this budget for homelessness and for the extra money for housing and for heal and for all the programs that we do. And the fact that we spend so much on social services and on each other is one of the reasons why this is a

[9:52:47 PM]

healthy and safe community. And we've probably been able to escalate that spending over the last number of years and real proud that in doing that taxes and fees having gone up for them an average of three percent over this last eight year period of time which I think is pretty remarkable combined taxes and fees in the city. So I'm proud also to be working with you and to pass this budget today. I've been asked to say out loud in case I said it incorrectly before that Adler rider two was actually a version three. I might have been wrong.

[9:53:52 PM]

Ellis 3 I think may have been version 2, not version 3, so I think I may have called that out wrong. And I also want to point out again that there were a number of changes to the dollar amounts in the amendments that we passed that were not reflected in the amendments as they were written, but they were done -- those -- some changes were made on the dais and they were picked up by our staff. And those amendments are part of the budget that is now being approved. So with that all done in discussion, let's take a vote on the budget because we are now ready to take that vote on item number

4, adopting the city's budget as amended both by staff and by council. The allow requires this to be a -- the law requires this to be a record vote. Will the clerk call the roll so each of us can state a vote.

>> Mayor Adler.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor pro tem alter.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember

[9:54:52 PM]

harper-madison.

>> Yes.

>> Council member Fuentes.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Renteria.

>> Yes.

>> Council member vela.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember kitchen.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Kelly.

>> No.

>> Councilmember pool.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Ellis.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember tovo.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: With a 10-1 vote, the budget is adopted. Congratulations.

[Applause]. All right, we're now going to take up item number 5, which is an ordinance authorizing fees, fines and other charges to be set or charged by the city for fiscal year 2022 and 2023. Do you want to say anything or present anything? You have presented to us the schedule for fees, fines and other charges. This council is going to postpone and not act on the

[9:55:53 PM]

residential parkland fee so we will pass something today that just leaves that entry right now blank for the 2022-2023 fiscal year, and we will consider the issue on September 1st when we are back together again. My understanding also is that we're also doing the Austin energy or is that somewhere else?

>> That is somewhere else.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: Thank you. I just want to clarify that we're postponing the manager's recommendation.

>> Mayor Adler: We're -- we're not doing anything to change the fee schedules --

>> Alter: I know, I'm just saying that we're not -- we'll be taking up the manager's proposal. On the first. For that fee. Postponing that section --

>> Mayor Adler: We're postponing that section.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Alter: We're not putting up a blank sex but putting up the manager ooze.

[9:56:54 PM]

>> That's correct, we're not taking up the parkland dedication fee, we'll consider that on September 1st. Yes.

>> Thank you, mayor. Based on the changes that were made to the budget we have some fee schedule changes that were discussed. This first slide speaks to the pool lifeguard fees that are revised based on the updated -- based on the updating living wage. The next slide shows the parking management fund, the changes to that based on the -- again, the updated amended budget -- approved budget. And then finally, this speaks to the tough changes, the 15-cent increases to the tuf based on the changes to the approved budget.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Tovo: Mayor? I think your first amendment was the one I directed staff to bring forward yesterday. Is that the one that updates the pool fees based on the changes? I think you may have -- I

[9:57:54 PM]

apologize if you said councilmember tovo. I thought you said someone else.

>> I didn't give any council member's name. I said based on the approved budget.

>> Tovo: Thank you, gotcha. But that is the one that.

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to adopt the ordinance for fees, fines and other changes with the staff recommended amendments reflecting in part the work that we did in adopting the budget. Is there a motion? Councilmember pool makes that motion. Is there a second to that? Councilmember Ellis second that. Is there any discussion? The law requires our vote to be a record vote. Will the clerk please call the roll? On the fees, fines and other charges.

>> Clerk: Mayor Adler.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Mayor pro tem alter.

>> Alter: Yes.

>> Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Yes.

[9:58:56 PM]

>> Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Yes.

>> Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yes.

>> Council member vela.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember kitchen.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Kelly.

>> No.

>> Councilmember pool.

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Ellis.

>> Yes. Councilmember tovo,.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: With a record vote of 10-1 this -- the ordinance for fees, fines and other charges is adopted.

>> Alter: Mayor, could I just ask if they could send thaws last little presentation?

>> Mayor Adler: Could you email that out to everybody? That would be great. Post-that in backup so it's easy for the public to find as well, thank you. All right. These agenda items, 6-8 can be taken up by consent, so I'm going to call up items 6-8 on

[9:59:57 PM]

the agenda. This establishes classifications and positions in the classified service for Austin fire, police, and the ems departments. Is there a motion to approve these items 6-8? Councilmember harper-madison makes that motion, seconded by councilmember Ellis. Any discussion? Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? With respect to the classifications, did you vote in favor? Okay. So this was unanimous, 11-0, items 6-8 pass. All right. That gets us to agenda item 9. This is the vote to ratify the tax increase in the budget. This vote is, in addition to and separate from a vote to adopt the budget. And the vote to set the tax rate. This motion is made in the form

[10:00:58 PM]

that we're going to make it in as required by statute. So, item number 9 will ratify the property tax increase as reflected in the budget. When we approve the budget, we identified how much we wanted to spend based on that number and based on the property value as certified by the Travis county tax official, assessor/collector and the appraisal district. The rate is calculated. The vote we're about to take now is required by state law, and we take this vote separately to make it clear that we know that it's going to take more property taxes than the city raised last year to pay for the budget that we approved this year. We know that costs go up.

[10:02:00 PM]

I'm proud that we've been able to minimize these increases to a level I think that surprises people over the last eight years. But nonetheless, the amount of revenue required increases. This is not a vote on the tax rate. We take a separate vote on the tax rate after this vote. I'm going to ask, is there a motion to ratify the property tax increase that is reflected in the fiscal year 2022-2023 budget that was just adopted by the council? Councilmember pool makes that motion. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember vela seconds that motion. Is there any discussion? Then let's take a vote. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? And voting no on this is councilmember Kelly. The others voting yes. This passes 10-1.

>> Mayor, it's after 10:00.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry?

>> It's after 10:00.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any objection to continuing on past

[10:03:01 PM]

10:00?

>> I'd like to abstain.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. No one objected to this continuing on, so we're going to continue on. I think that we just voted on item number 9, so now we're up to item number 10, which we're now going to take up. This is to approve an ordinance adopting and levying the property ad valorem tax rate for the city of Austin for fiscal year 2022 and 2023. So, this motion adopts the property tax rate. And I want to know if someone will move that the property tax rate be increased by the adoption of a tax rate of 46.27

[10:04:04 PM]

cents per hundred-dollar valuation.

>> So move.

>> Mayor Adler: Which is effectively a 2% increase in the tax rate. Councilmember pool makes that motion. Is there a second to that motion? Councilmember vela seconds that motion. Is there any discussion on the motion to set the tax rate effectively at 2% increase in the tax rate? Then let's take a vote. The law requires that this be a roll call vote, so would the city clerk please call the roll.

>> Mayor Adler?

>> Yes.

>> Alter?

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember vela?

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember kitchen?

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Kelly?

>> No.

>> Councilmember pool?

[10:05:04 PM]

>> Yes.

>> Ellis?

>> Yes.

>> Tovo?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: 10-1 with councilmember Kelly voting no, the tax rate and the 2% increase in that tax rate is approved, effectively a 2% tax rate increase. So that's approved. That gets us, ten, to agenda item 11. This is the item to order the general election for November 8th. That includes the electing of officials and also the affordable housing bond. That matter is is of record in the backup.

>> Mayor, I'll note that --

>> Mayor Adler: Microphone?

>> It's on.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> I note that you're voting on version two that has the blanks filled in. And you all have received that -- or should have received that by now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And the blank is filled in,

[10:06:06 PM]

what's . . .

>> The blanks are filled in to show that the bonds -- the space on the estimated tax rate of the city is expected to be approximately 0.4759 cents per hundred-dollar valuation.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. That's how the blank gets filled in. All right. This is item number 11 that is in front of us. Is there a motion to approve item number 11? This is the version 2. Councilmember Fuentes makes that motion. Councilmember kitchen seconds that motion. Is there any discussion? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I want to thank you for your leadership on the housing bond. I'm excited that we're putting forward a bond for \$350 million. I was proud to make the amendment to move it from 300 to 350. So, I look forward to the conversations with our community

[10:07:06 PM]

and I feel that this level of funding will be very important, and look forward to the conversation with our community as that item is put on the ballot.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other discussion? Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: I'm wondering if we might be able to divide the question here?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we can.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I appreciate that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Well, it's one set of language. I'm not sure we . . . Can we just note in the record your objection to the housing bond component?

>> Kelly: Yes, thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion about the housing bond? Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Yes, mayor, thank you. I appreciate it. So, our long-awaited colony park

[10:08:06 PM]

sustainable community effort is stuck, absolutely stuck, in a pattern that needs a \$26 million funding gap to be taken care of. This is a neighborhood that we annexed nearly 50 years ago, and 50 years of taxes -- taxing these residents without providing them the same level of services that so many haven't enjoyed. We've been planning to fix that for a full decade now, while there's been some -- very little -- progress, it

feels like mainly it's been promises and very little action. These residents deserve some very long-awaited follow-through. They deserve the same healthy, safe, and active community that austinites all over Austin enjoy. So, they deserve to live in a neighborhood that has good schools, that has jobs, that has transit, food access, quality

[10:09:07 PM]

green spaces, and so much more. They say it takes a village to raise a child, so I would add that it takes money to build a sustainable community. I think I see an opportunity here to finally deliver the city's promise of finding that money to get this project done. So I am very deeply curious to know if we can use a part of these affordable housing dollars to close the \$26 million funding gap to finally put our money where our mouths are and have been, and kick-start the colony park sustainable community plan.

>> Mayor Adler: So I think this answer to that question, this money is certainly eligible for that. This is the kind of project that is included. In the resolution we passed at our last council meeting, we specifically put in language to say that this can be spent on

[10:10:09 PM]

city-owned property, which, again, has colony park being eligible for that on that basis as well. We are not identifying any particular properties or any particular projects in the passage of this bond language, but it is certainly something that's eligible and I will personally work with you to see if we can get some of this money sent that way.

>> Harper-madison: If I may, just to be clear, I don't push real hard that often, but, I mean, just fair warning, I'm going to push really hard -- really, really, really hard here. And it wasn't a question about eligibility so much as really getting an early gauge from my colleagues about level of commitment to getting this done. I want to look into one of these cameras very soon and tell Ms. Barbara Scott we did it. And so.

>> Mayor Adler: I feel Ms. Scott looking over my

[10:11:10 PM]

shoulder as well.

>> Harper-madison: She might be touching it, too. Thank you, mayor. I appreciate that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. First, mayor, I want to thank you for your strong leadership on housing, and for your record on housing. I know I've said this several times before, but I think we have one of the strongest pro-housing mayors in this country and it's been an honor to serve alongside you and be a part of this ballot proposition, and speak to our community about the importance of supporting the affordable housing bond. It is much-needed. We all know the housing crisis that we're in, and the extent that these bond dollars will -- have shown and have a history of producing affordable units. My district has had over 200 affordable units produced and created as part of the last bond, so I'm excited about this effort. I was thrilled to be a cosponsor of the resolution to put this on the ballot, and I'm looking forward to the next few months.

[10:12:10 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Anything further on this before we take a vote? I'm also proud to be joining with my colleagues on this housing bond, one of the most successful things that we've done was a housing bond just before I joined the council. That demonstrated not only it would be supported by the community, but what the multiplier effect was. Proud to be part of a council that did the historic \$250 million bond. And right now even prouder to be part of a \$350 million bond. It's leveraged so much in the community, the impact on housing in the community from the bonds has been dramatic and certainly we're in a crisis. We're building more houses than anybody in the country and it's still not enough, so we have to keep our effort to fill these gaps. And this does that. And I certainly hope that it's something that the community considers and comes out to vote on. With that, let's go ahead and take a vote on this item

[10:13:13 PM]

number 11. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? It is unanimous on the council to call for this election. Thank you all for that.

>> And mayor, that's with the notation that --

>> Mayor Adler: With the notation that councilmember Kelly is opposing the bond.

>> Kelly: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. Agenda item number 12 is -- I'm sorry.

>> Tovo: Just a quick note. We just now received your -- the items that you voted against, councilmember Kelly. And several of them that you said you voted against, in my portfolio, I had withdrawn, so I'll just let the record reflect that those are -- those didn't move forward for a vote.

>> Kelly: I see. I will make sure my staff gets the updated version. We had been working on it as we were going to the clerk before, so, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. Item number 12, we have already postponed that item for consideration at the

[10:14:13 PM]

September 1st meeting. Item number 13. This is the further contract with the voters. Is there a motion to approve this? Councilmember kitchen makes that motion. Councilmember harper-madison seconds that motion. Is there any discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? I'm showing it -- yes? No. With councilmember Kelly voting no, it passes 10-1. I'm proud to have supported that as well. It helps explain what the bond election is all about, and it is a way that our community can hold this council, and future councils accountable for doing what it is that we said we would do. That gets us to agenda item

[10:15:18 PM]

number 13. We just passed. So item number 14. This is the ordinance setting the mayor and councilmember salary and compensation. Is there a motion to approve this? Councilmember pool makes that motion. Is there a second on this? Councilmember harper-madison seconds it. Is there any discussion on this?

>> Mayor, can I just be sure that everybody's clear that councilmember pool's motion is what you're voting on that we move everything to December?

>> Pool: Yes, in fact, that is the date that is reflected in the version that we were emailed at 10:10ish this evening. Yes. It does say December 1, 2022.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. Everybody clear? Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of this item 14, please raise your hand.

[10:16:18 PM]

Those opposed?

>> I'm abstaining.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Kelly abstains. Voting no is councilmember Fuentes and councilmember Ellis. The others voting aye. So on an 8-2-1 vote, this item 14 passes.

>> I'm sorry, mayor, that was a no. I was under the impression that was with the -- that was just the amendment that councilmember pool brought forward, but that is an actual no vote for me altogether. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So we'll make the vote 8-3 with those three voting against -- Kelly, Fuentes, and Ellis. Okay. Let's move now to item number 15 and 16. I'm going to -- there will be no reason for us to come back together as a city council, I don't think.

[10:17:19 PM]

Is that right? So I'm going to adjourn the Austin city council meeting here. The time is 10:17. What? But don't go anywhere. This meeting is adjourned. But while we have everybody here, we're going to go ahead and convene the Austin housing finance corporation meeting. This is part of our collective meeting. It was originally noticed for August 17th, but it is part of our continued meeting -- continued agenda, rather, as we have moved forward. We had anticipated to get this done yesterday, haven't been able to, so it just got rolled over. We are in the city council chambers here at city hall.

[10:18:21 PM]

The Austin housing finance corporation has a quorum of its directors present. There are two items on our agenda. One is to approve the capital budget for the fiscal year 2022-23 in the amount of \$14,609,827. And item number 2, which is to approve a resolution adopting Austin housing finance corporation grant operating budget for fiscal year 2022-23, and a housing assistance fund budget for the fiscal year 2022-23 in the amount of \$380,000, for a total budget of \$20,600,000, further authorizes the guidelines for the named housing projects for the fiscal year 2022-23 and authorizes the transfer of budget amounts under certain conditions and establishing administrative approval limits for the general

[10:19:22 PM]

manager. Is there a motion to approve those two items on consent? Councilmember Renteria -- no, director Renteria makes that motion, harper-madison seconds. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? It is unanimous among the directors. It passes. That's all the items we have, so we're going to adjourn the Austin housing finance corporation meeting. That now gets us to the -- we're going to go ahead and convene the Mueller local government corporation here. This is the continuation of the meeting called for, the agenda set out for August 17th, anticipated to be done yesterday. We were not, so it rolled over. We are in city hall, council chambers, and the time is 10:20.

[10:20:27 PM]

There are two items in front of us. Do you want to take us through the agenda? Do you want to lay out 1 and 2?

>> Thank you, chair, economic development department. Before you are two items for consent, approval of the minutes from August 11th, 2021, as well as item number 2, approval of the operating budget for \$4,842,296.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to approve these two items, the minutes and the operating budget on consent? Director Renteria makes the motion. Is there a second? Director vela seconds. Is there any discussion of these two items? Mayor -- director alter.

>> Alter: Yeah, I just wanted

[10:21:28 PM]

to check why we can't -- why there's still a balance that's so high in the Mueller fund. It doesn't seem -- is that there to pay off bonds down the line that we owe, or is it -- is it just a matter of timing, or can those funds be used for other things?

>> The balance is a surplus of the tax increment revenue less the debt service payment. So until all of the bonds are defeased, balance will remain.

>> Alter: How long do we have for that?

>> The last bond will be paid off by 2032.

>> Alter: Okay. So in 2032 at the same rate there would still be some number of million dollars left that would then go to the city?

>> That is correct.

>> Alter: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion?

[10:22:29 PM]

We'll take a vote on the two items on consent. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Directors vote unanimously to adopt the consent agenda. Is there -- I think that's all the business that we need to cover, so the Mueller local government corporation meeting here today is adjourned at

10:22. And with that, colleagues, we we have done everything we need to do. There will be no meeting tomorrow.

>> I want to thank our budget staff tremendously. This council has been working really hard since the budget was given to them. But our budget staff has been working very, very hard for many, many weeks before then and has been working hard since then, so I truly appreciate everything you all have done.

[Applause]

>> As have our staff. Thank you to all of our staff on

[10:23:31 PM]

the council dais. 🎵🎵