

City Council Work Session Transcript – 11/29/2022

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 1 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 11/29/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 11/29/2022

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.

[9:17:04 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: The stuff we have today recognizing that we also have the Austin energy meeting this afternoon. We have four pulled items. I'm not sure any of these will take a long time to go through, but since those things were stuff we needed to potentially talk about before Thursday I thought we'd talk about the pulled items. When we talk about the pulled items we have some of the executive session work that also concerns things that could be coming up so we want to then go into executive session. Councilmember kitchen is going to leave us today at noon and I told her that we would come back out today before she leaves, if not earlier, and we may be here earlier than that, but at least at 11:30 so we can have the presentation on property issue. That will take us up to the noon period where we can then break.

[9:18:04 AM]

The pulled items today, the first one was item 23. Does that one still need to be pulled and discussed? >> Alter: This is the item related to the covid reimbursements from the county. I've been talking at great length with the public health and acms and there should be a memo. I understand coming out today or tomorrow related to that. I've had my conversation but there's a bit more to read so if I have a question for Thursday I'll pull, but hopefully we've moved forward and are in a good place. >> Mayor Adler: Good. I appreciate your leadership and diligence and doggedness on that issue. So thank you. Next pulled item that we had, an item that is double posted for us today. Resalesly, when would be the most appropriate time for us today to discuss it? >> Pool: We have a public

[9:19:06 AM]

hearing on the base rate today and I guess that will proceed as per the agenda. But the discussion of the item is on the oversight committee agenda and I propose that we take up that discussion at that time. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Sounds good if anybody doesn't have any objection to that, we'll have that conversation then. And really that gets us then into -- I pulled 85 and 86 and wanted to touch previously on that, 85 and 86. That's the residential commercial issue and compatibility issues. 56. What did I say? 55 and 56. Planning commission hopped on this

right away and we appreciate that, appreciate their work and they have sent us possible amendments for us to consider which we appreciate.

[9:20:06 AM]

It's my intent to post something to the message board out of my notes on that as I've done in the past on things which will list the planning commission amendments and how I think those fall down with kind of our collective discussions that we've had. Most of them I think are consistent with the kinds of things that we've discussed. Some that I think we've had in the resolution and may not have found their ways into the ordinance, but most of them I think there's going to be agreement on. I did want to talk about these two issues at a kind of higher level. And then to follow up later in the day with that posting that kind of lays out those issues as well as motion sheets, which would pick up those issues, which I'll publish today on to the message board so you and the community can see that.

[9:21:12 AM]

Colleagues, dealing with compatibility and dealing with land development code has obviously been something we spent huge amounts of time on as a city and a council over the last seven, almost eight years and obviously councils even before outside that. Quite frankly, we haven't really delivered in a way that I had hoped that we would be able to and I think others of us on the council feel the same way. We've had some issues that have been really hard fought from a policy standpoint as between us on the dais that's left a split council. We've also tried to effect some changes and the courts have gotten involved and given us rules and parameters, some of which I think will have to be worked out over time in terms of application. But I appreciate the council getting together as a body a year ago and saying let's at

[9:22:15 AM]

least see what we can do and still try to maintain broad consensus, which we need to find in terms of nine of us supporting. I recognize that anything we do that has nine of us supporting it that is as hard fought as this is going to be something that doesn't go far enough for a lot of people and goes too far for a lot of people. That's in the nature of trying to get those votes. But the hope was that it would be better for us to at least establish what we could do with that measure of consensus in part because it's uncertain what the rules are with respect to that with respect to protests and legal challenges. At the very least if we can move the ball down the field and do some of the things that we can agree on that

[9:23:16 AM]

open up additional opportunities, then we had decided as a group we would do that and then let the next council next year wrestle with going further, not going further and what we want to do. I think that increases the chances

of what we do initially would be able to be implemented and affected in place even if there was a court challenge because of that vote, but we're trying to avoid a situation where we do something and then that gets caught in court and nothing's on the books like we've had for the last three years. There are two changes that I think are consistent with the kinds of things that we've talked about that the mayor pro tem and I agree on and I wanted to air now because with quorum and quorum implementations we

[9:24:16 AM]

haven't been able to discuss, but we have been able to discuss with a significant part two right off the bat. And the first one of those is we had three categories. We had transit, we had large and we had medium. But taking the large and transit and moving the large corridors into the transit category and using that standard rather than the large standard I think is something that my hope is there would be nine votes there to be able to do. And that would significantly change the properties. And there were some roads that we wanted to be in that higher group of burnt and south Lamar that were not reflected that way in the ordinance that staff drafted, so we would make those two changes moving burnt and south Lamar into the large category, which they would be taken as part

[9:25:17 AM]

of the combined transit and large. We asked the staff to run the numbers on impact considering those two changes and I think there will be discussion on Thursday about others. My hope is that we have a conversation in the context of what can we get nine votes for. But with just those two changes the staff gave us an updated assessment of impact. And with those two changes the percentage of acreage on the corridors where compatibility is removed or relaxed is 79.49%, so almost 80%, which is a significant and material impact. On the medium properties we don't make any changes to medium, we just make the changes I talked about a 60 ago, we're over 60% of the acreage either having relaxed or removed

[9:26:23 AM]

compatibility. And with that I think we are in an area that gets us to something that is material and we should consider moving on. There are a lot of other issues that the planning commission raised that we'll address. A lot of those are I think not going to be controversial, but again I'll put my notes up so that we can see where the disputes might be. I'll list all of the PC regulations. I'll include some of the draft motion sheets to effect the kinds of things that they talked about. But at a high level my hope is that we use Thursday as a way to try and find at this point where we can get that broader consensus. Yes, Ann. >> Kitchen: Just a question. My understanding was what what we were doing was staying aligned with the resolution that we passed in

[9:27:28 AM]

terms of large corridors and in that resolution we passed, south Lamar was a large corridor. So I just want to make it clear that we're not changing with regard to south Lamar what we had in the resolution that we all passed. Am I understanding that correctly? >> You're absolutely correct. For some reason it didn't work its way into the ordinance. >> Kitchen: But it was in the resolution we passed. >> Mayor Adler: We are trying in this point to effect the resolution as a council. We passed unanimously this summer. >> Kitchen: All right. I wanted to clarify that for folks because calling out south Lamar and burnet, I want people to understand we're not changing what we did before. The other thing I wanted to point out is just -- we can talk more about it, but one of the things that I want to make sure that we're doing, and I think we are here, is that when we look at the culmination of these items in relation to the vmu that we passed and the

[9:28:29 AM]

affordability levels that we passed in vmu that we're not undercutting those. And from what I've seen so far we're not. So -- because we were able to obtain some significant affordability levels with vmu, particularly along the -- particularly along the light rail lines. So I'm wanting to make sure that we're not lowering our standard in terms of the amount of affordable housing that we're expecting. So I just wanted to confirm that that's my understanding also. >> Mayor Adler: That's absolutely true. And if it's important for us to state that, certainly we can do that. I don't know if language is yes, sir. >> Kitchen: I don't know if language is necessary, I'll look. I can't think of all the permutations when you put vmu next to residential and commercial, next to compatibility, because there's affordability required in both of those residential and commercial, and in compatibility.

[9:29:29 AM]

So I just want to make sure that what we say office you've got a piece of property that's impacted by both for some reason that the higher level of affordability is what applies. There may be zero circumstances like that. I've been trying to think through the permutations. I just want to make it clear. >> Mayor Adler: And I think that's right. We need to make sure that we're not undercutting affordability at all. We also need to make sure that we're not doubling the standard. >> That's not the intent. >> Mayor Adler: So the purpose of the compatibility is to unlock the affordable bonus of some of our other projects. It's not to double the affordability requirement. >> Kitchen: Sure. >> Mayor Adler: So we have need to come up with language that addresses both of those things. Alison. >> Alter: I was going to say that the residential commercial doesn't apply to vmu properties?

[9:30:32 AM]

Because they already have that ability? So we're adding the residential into commercial? >> Kitchen: But there's -- I'm sorry, did you finish your thought? >> Alter: I wanted to say that and then there's -- I believe that the bonus for residential is the same as it is for vmu 1 and there is no option for exploding the height because it's everywhere in the city. >> Kitchen: Right, I was thinking more the affordability level than the height. >> Alter: But I believe that the affordability levels were chosen to be the same as -- >> Kitchen: That's great. We just changed them last summer to 10% at 60% mfi I think for rental so we want to make sure we're keeping that. Okay. >> Mayor Adler:

We'll post some of the elements and language today. Alison and I continue to work together to try to really focus in on the issues and propose a path where we think there's agreement and we'll continue to do that.

[9:31:33 AM]

And that's what I think we'll be able to post this afternoon. And if things are up in the air or undecided or we anticipate longer conversation, we'll try to identify those points as well. Yes. >> Mayor, thank you for clarifying that you were having those conversations with mayor pro tem alter. You reference that the data, that there's information that you've asked of staff about increasing capacity on burnt and Lamar -- burnet and Lamar. Where the can we have success for that information? Will that be shared with us as well? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, I think that information was shared and posted by staff as their further answers to compatibility 56. >> Posted where? >> Mayor Adler: Has this been posted? Has additional answers. >> We've submitted it for questions and answers so it should be going out that way. >> Fuentes: So we have not received our q&a report so we have not reviewed that data. If we can have that q&a report sent to us today that would be helpful so that we had time to prepare for

[9:32:34 AM]

Thursday. I'll can request that of the agenda office. >> Mayor Adler: She'll request that. I will post this today so that everybody has that today even if the little q&a report doesn't come out. Yes, Leslie. >> Pool: I appreciate all the work that everybody is putting in on making these changes and I also note that the very complexity that you are talking about and merged in and the little conversation between Alison and Ann really points to the necessity I think to be -- to take a cautious approach to these changes so that we don't in fact cause an unanticipated and unintended consequences. So I appreciate the careful iterative approach. And this is a point that we have long sought to get to on some of these issues. We've taken on land development code revisions over the last two years to

[9:33:35 AM]

good success with near unanimity on the dais and been able to push through these changes that we weren't able to, even though they were agreeable before, we weren't able to get them launched into ordinance form. So it looks like the approach is bearing the kind of fruit that we were all I think really wanting to see happen. And I thank you for adopting the iterative and cautious approach so that should there be any missteps we are able to pull back and adjust them. And if things aren't going great, then we can push ever forward in areas where it's appropriate. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. And thank you to you and to your staff because you're in the middle of this iterative process as we continue to work this through going back to this summer. Thank you. Chito. >> Vela: We were looking

[9:34:36 AM]

at the issue in regard to district 4 and I have a couple of maps up that I just wanted to a lot an issue that's come up when we're looking at the individual properties. Could you put the slide up? I'm sorry, I don't think the folks at home can see this but we'll try to get it in the backup as soon as possible. So one of the issues that we were looking at and that we've discussed is the whole kind of side-facing and front-facing analysis for the lots. Both from my time on planning commission and here at council, frequently folks are combining lots on these large -- on the major corridors. They'll buy two or three kind of lots and either one that touches Lamar and maybe the one behind it and combine those and rezone them into a larger development. And the image on the screen,

[9:35:38 AM]

all the red dots are properties that do not touch Lamar. They are adjacent to properties that touch Lamar. And again, it's kind of random. Like some of them are larger pieces of property where it's a -- there's plenty of room there, but in other cases my concern was that if people are buying multiple lots and wanting to build housing on them, would they be able to combine them and then be -- would the entire parcel then be front facing or side facing? In other words, if you're combining two lots, one which does not touch Lamar and one which does not touch Lamar, then do you waive compatibility on both lots or is compatibility waived just on the front lot that was just -- that initially touches Lamar? And some of the answers that

[9:36:41 AM]

we got back I think there's a little bit of uncertainty with a lean towards no. So I just wanted to highlight that as an issue where I feel like we need to be flexible in our approach to these corridors so folks can combine, you know, a handful of properties. And also so there's a little bit that the distribution of the compatibility limits are a little bit more even and fair and not just kind of random based on how the parcels are drawn. So I just wanted to bring that to the council's attention. >> And that's a good issue to bring. I'd like to work with you between now and Thursday to see if we can come up with some language that either you or I or together we could propose to the body. >> Vela: And the concern would be in the future if you buy -- I-35 got a property on Lamar and you buy the property behind you and you want to build a housing development on north

[9:37:41 AM]

Lamar, is that new property going to -- again, this is happening four years, five years from now, does that entire property get the compatibility waiver? And I think that's -- in terms of the amount of housing we can generate, I think that will be a very important little detail that we should work out. >> Mayor Adler: I appreciate you raising that. I think that's something that needs clarity on it. Let's see if we can get something for the council to look at. >> Kitchen: And as you do that, as you mentioned before, different things are happening across different properties so we need to consider that so whereas that might work in some areas, it might not in other areas. There's also difficulties when you've got properties coming in at an education that create some special difficulties. So I would just like to -- I would just -- I agree with what you're saying and I agree that that has to be looked at in a way that's

[9:38:43 AM]

not -- that's not necessarily cookie cutter. That we have to consider those circumstances. And that's what I would want. I would want to be able to consider those circumstances and not do a blanket rule. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's wrestle with that one. >> Ellis: I'm curious about that. My voice is a little rough today so I -- >> Kelly: I wonder if ingress and egress would be a part of it. Are you accessing it from the back street or front facing or if the lots are combined that if they're walkable to transit, to me that's something that might be opened up whereas something that might not have access to that direction might need to be considered differently. But I like the idea. I think it's really important to address that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's take a look at that and have that conversation. My hope is we can get through this on Thursday, pass something and then be

[9:39:45 AM]

able to celebrate some impact and also just the council's ability to find something that we can get a broad consensus on. And then I'll be eating my popcorn and watching next year's council wrestle with whatever happens next. [Laughter]. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I just wanted to comment on what you said first. I would agree that we need to get done what we can. I also wanted to comment on the fact that this council last year around this time initiated a number of changes that have not yet come back to us that will be coming back to the new council and I think that those are all important. I'm disappointed that we won't get a chance to talk to them now, but they'll be coming back. And that's things like the -- the Adu resolution that councilmember tovo brought. We're not having a chance to deal with that.

[9:40:45 AM]

That's another opportunity to make some changes and open up more housing. We are going to get to talk about E tod, I was happy to talk about that with councilmember harper-madison, we should be able to talk about that. And we should make progress there. I'm disappointed that we weren't able to get do the district-level planning, but it has some relation to etod and also it will be coming back next year. I was pleased that we were able to get as far as we did on vmu and vmu 2. Again, that was never intended to solve all our problems, but it got us a step in the right direction. So I appreciate what you said earlier, mayor, that we're getting an opportunity to take some steps on compatibility and residential and commercial, understanding that there are more steps to be taken. But I wanted to remind people that there's a number of things Teed up already for the next council.

[9:41:47 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Yes. >> Alter: I wanted to add that councilmember pool has load a number of issues in the north burnet gateway sector that are really important for adding the density that we need. It just wasn't a part of your list and I think those are all -- all are well underway. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, chito. >> Vela: Mayor, I also wanted to say thank you to councilmember kitchen for -- with vmu 2. That was really what kick started the whole

compatibility conversation and I'm happy that we were able to get the light rail projects and the compatibility changes done, and I hope we continue to push forward on that. I did want to -- looking at the affordability bonus

[9:42:49 AM]

program for calculate, I do have -- for compatibility, I do have concerns with kind of the arbitrariness of it. For example, when you buy a lot it has zoning. You know what that zoning is. You go into that kind of eyes wide open. And then, of course, people come to us for changes and so on and so forth, but with compatibility, it's very -- first of all, I don't think -- staff, please correct me if I'm wrong, that there is a map out there that when you buy your lot you can kind of check on this database and see how compatibility affects that lot. I think it's an individual property by property calculation. So that there's no real kind of transparency in terms of like I'm buying this lot and I want to do this. You find out well afterwards. And again, then, you don't control compatibility. That has nothing to do with your lot. It has to do with properties around you.

[9:43:52 AM]

Some people are far enough away from a single-family home that they don't have to worry about compatibility. Some people do have to worry about it. Again, it's just a totally arbitrary kind of calculation that I'm uncomfortable rolling into an affordability bonus. I'd like the clarity of, for example, vmu where everybody knows exactly what's going on. The terms are clear. You buy the property, you want to add the Leed, it's a very simple straightforward analysis, but with compatibility, it's not. And I think there are kind of fairness and equity concerns in kind of the randomness with which it's applied. And to get to the point, how is the bonus program going to work? You know, that's going to where -- you know, I know that with vmu, when we were looking at vmu2, the take-up on the

[9:44:52 AM]

program, it was good, but it was probably not quite as high as we would have liked. From the staff presentations and the numbers that we were look at. Whereas under compatibility, I'm just concerned that we're going to make these changes and there's going to be very little take-up, especially when you have lots where it's just a portion, like a third of a lot, for example, is touched by compatibility. Is it worth it to that person, to enter into the agreement, to take advantage of the program or not. I have concerns with using our affordability -- with using affordability bonus program with compatibility. My sense would be, it would be better to just do an overall, you know, reduction and let them then opt into the vmu, and the other programs that we do anticipate them opting into.

[9:45:54 AM]

>> An overall reduction in compatibility. >> Vela: Exactly. A more kind of a clean and simple approach to just say -- and again, our compatibility limits are just so out of whack, as we've discussed. We could cut it in half and still be

the number one -- have the strictest compatibility standards in the country. So, again, that's my approach. I know we're going down this approach. I would prefer a citywide approach to look at this. And again, I think there's a lot of fairness and equity in that as well, where we're kind of arbitrarily picking kind of corridors. We're not even using a -- like level 1 corridors get this, level 2 corridors get this. We're really kind of, you know, very finely drawing lines, which again, I have some concerns with fairness and equity in the layout and design of the program as well. >> I hear that, and quite frankly, you haven't said

[9:46:54 AM]

anything that I disagree with. >> Mayor Adler: And I think there will be an opportunity on Thursday as Teed up by the planning commission to at least discuss that issue within a limited kind of area. And I wish you and the next council, god speed, on picking up that issue. I know that when he tried to raise that issue, that's when, quite frankly, this issue got really elevated and became kind of a high-pitched community conversation that I'm sure you guys will take into account and make decisions, in part based on the makeup of that council. In this case for us this week, the goal is to try to find what we can do by the broader consensus, given kind of the legal status position that we're in and the like. And my hope is that we can hold

[9:47:54 AM]

onto that. And even if you and I would be voting for just more blanket rules, and heck, I may show up at public communication to help you. >> Vela: I appreciate that, mayor, and I promise to keep plugging away. Hope to see you in public comment. >> Mayor Adler: I'll have to figure out how to get my testimony down to one minute, or three minutes, or whatever. Natasha. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor, I appreciate it. It's just gloomy enough outside for me to have worn yellow, so I can bring a little bit of bad news. Honestly, I don't think we are ever going to find ourselves with any iteration of a council that feels consensus with the way that we're going about this process. And that's my honest belief. I think the singular path

[9:48:55 AM]

forward will feel abrupt, and uncomfortable, and people will feel like they lost something, and they will feel like they put in all that work, all that neighborhood planning, all that time, and I say that with that level of exasperation, because that's very much how being on council feels. All that work, all that time, all that planning for the various iterations of council before this one. And this one before the next one. And being in a position, thank god, to not be in an election right now anymore, and realizing, like thinking through succession plans, and how little uniformity we engage, the way we operate as a city. I mean, I fully intend in '23 to bring forward considerations for our city manager to think

[9:49:56 AM]

through, how are we as a body, a group of people collectively, qualified to make a 100-plus-year-long transit infrastructure decisions? What level of proficiency did we establish as a body and as individuals that says we should be able to vote on these things? I want to think through just how much we're thinking about the implications of the decisions we make, and that just maybe we should think through in our charter whether or not we're not the people to make them. Maybe the people who have amassed 20-plus years of professional expertise and relatively complex -- you made a few little changes, and to my colleagues' point, council member pool said, even just with that, look how complex it became. And one of my brilliant staffers sent me a diagram that I wish I knew how to share, and it just says, "This is our code," and it just has all these balls and

[9:50:57 AM]

bells and whistles. It's always going to look like that. Because we're always going to be who we are as a people, as a body, as a city, as a community. We're not going to reach consensus ever. The only consensus we may reach as a community is to determine that we are comfortable with realizing we'll never get there. It will be a fight forever. Until we get to the place where I truly believe we already are. We're looking around -- you know, god bless the people who served us so well during the course of it, but we're looking around at some of the fallout from the pandemic, and looking at areas of town with really good schools. And hospitals and healthcare and good transit. And people make enough money to eat every day. And buy pads. After all the menstrual equity work, I still have constituents

[9:52:01 AM]

who are cutting up t-shirts for menstrual products. Not everybody will eat in Austin. We will never get to allocate where the haves always win, period. And I didn't plan to say that today. So, I'm going to breathe in, breathe out. I've just reached a place where I don't believe we're telling the truth to one another all the time, and I think the other people who are losing are our constituents. And I have a question for staff, whoever is the most appropriate person. But while that person comes up, it's a corridors question. I don't know which staffer is the appropriate person to answer that question. I will close the general commentary by saying, it doesn't feel equitable, council member vela, because it isn't.

[9:53:05 AM]

It doesn't feel right because it isn't. It doesn't feel right because our country has 700 billionaires. And there are people down the street in Austin, Texas, who use cut-up t-shirts for maxi pads. That's why it doesn't feel right. And it never will. So the question is, how does the exclusion of corridors in high opportunity areas, specifically, high impact areas, how does that affect our fair housing goals throughout the city? And does excluding some parts of town from important reforms like reducing compatibility negatively impact fair housing principles? And to council member vela's point about how some of these changes impact the production of

[9:54:06 AM]

affordable housing by way of the tools that we deploy as a city. I could fill this room with small developers who aren't able to accomplish their goals around the production of affordable housing because of barriers to accessing programs like affordability unlocked, and I perceive some additional challenges for them. There's a small huddle back there. I could check back in if y'all want. If I may be so bold, I wasn't angry, I was just really feeling very -- I'm feeling, as we're closing out the year and moving into the new year, I had the opportunity to do a speech the other day where I extended a general apology to everybody in the city of Austin. You know, when you grow up in a place, it's something to evolve in a city. Mackenzie, you know that. You're from here, right? When you're from a place, of course you grow and change, and if you knew me five years ago, you don't know me today.

[9:55:07 AM]

But folks don't give one another the space and the grace to evolve as humans. And so, one of the things that I wanted to say about the question I just asked you, because I'm not trying to set you up, but I do want you to know that I'm specifically thinking about, to the mayor's point, about this conversation and the litigious nature that we've reached with conversations around our land development code. When I'm asking this question, I think it's to some of my colleagues' points about consensus. I think none of us in the room disagree that the housing situation in Austin has been and, you know, reached max level of untenable. And so we're all just at this point definitely ready to do what we can, what we are all able to do by way of our capacity and in representing our constituents, to not hinder the production of affordable

[9:56:07 AM]

housing. So I'm really asking you, this conversation that we're having, is it so complex that we still don't know the true impact to the need in affordable housing that we maybe unfortunately to continue to have that conversation? Because I can't imagine that six or more of us will say yes, if y'all tell us that this will definitely negatively impact the production of affordable housing in this city, where that is our number one challenge. >> Tricia Lake of the law department. So, in looking at the map that shows all of the different corridors, it is spread out across the city, the different corridors.

[9:57:08 AM]

The amount of height changes or ability to develop further -- closer to another lot, obviously when that happens, it opens the opportunity for more housing to be present, when we're changing the height that we are putting on a piece of property or if we're changing how far away the buildings have to be away from the property line. What's been proposed, to a certain degree, citywide in the sense that it touches corridors throughout the city. It's not fully citywide, but it touches corridors. And so, by touching the corridors, that vastly you should have opportunity for housing to increase across.

[9:58:10 AM]

Whether that means it will be utilized in different spaces is a question that I don't think I can answer at this point, and part of that also has to do with what's currently on the ground. So if there's stuff already on the ground, and it's not to the point where it would be redeveloped, we're not necessarily going to have the housing opportunities come, regardless of where we change it. >> Harper-madison: Do you feel like you answered my question? I'm just trying to -- >> I was just going to jump in. I don't know if I'm going to answer your question either. Let me be fully transparent. Mandy Dimaio, planning department. All of the work that we do -- let me say our responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing underpins all of the work that we do collectively and certainly that we do as a department. When we make our investments in affordable housing, we are

[9:59:10 AM]

constantly balancing investing in lower income areas, providing affordability, mitigating gentrification, and providing housing opportunities in high income areas. And it is a constant balancing act. We have tried through our geobond investments to -- in terms of our land acquisition, our goal has been to get land in every single council district. We're down two council districts at this point, but we're not giving up. We have our 2022 affordable housing bonds and we'll continue the investment in every single council district. And we're constantly balancing the high opportunity with areas experiencing gentrification and trying to make every single council district an area of opportunity. >> Harper-madison: It's fresh, is what it is.

[10:00:10 AM]

And it's not your fault. So I'm not blaming you. I'm just sitting here listening to you and Trish, who is a consummate professional and always answers my really complex questions, fairly. I appreciate that. But it's trash. Because what you're saying ultimately is what we're going to have to face our constituents and say that it doesn't look or feel fair because it's not. You can't force it because so much of it is about private ownership, and the limitations you have with which you get to make acquisitions. I don't have any other questions. I'm just talking at this point. I appreciate it. >> Thank you. >> I would like to point you to some information in the staff report. It's page 5 of the staff report that does look at commercial properties in high opportunity

[10:01:11 AM]

areas versus displacement risk areas. Even though that is not specifically the parcels where there is relaxation of compatibility standards, through the changed compatibility, it does give you a sense of where properties are located, that our -- there are more properties in displacement risk areas. >> Harper-madison: And I hear what you're saying. Because you answered the point that I was trying to make earlier. I really -- I often just take my hat off to you all, like really walking us through the thing that you are an expert in, and we are not. When I'm asking the questions, I'm trying to make sure I'm taking all of the information into consideration. So, for example, I hear what you're saying.

[10:02:12 AM]

But it's still, on its face, when you're interpreting the data as a layperson, it doesn't look like the numbers are even. It doesn't look like it's evenly distributed, in which case, ultimately, if there were a follow-up to my original question, does what we're proposing -- and is there an opportunity for a proposal for us to consider if what we're proposing today has the opportunity to evolve, for there to be more of a balance. Do you understand what I'm asking? Maybe it's not a question. That's the concern that I am expressing. I'm not asking the question. >> There actually have been conversations in the last few years about there not being as many designated corridors in west Austin. I have heard planning commission, I think members of council talk about that issue.

[10:03:13 AM]

I concur that that may be something that we as a city should perhaps reassess. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate that. And I think you already know this, but I just want to make certain that whichever iteration of the body is taking a look at it, recognizes that that reassessment has to also come with the reallocation of funding. Our dollars have to speak to our commitment to making it fair, period. But I think in a lot of ways, we are going to lean on y'all for your wise council on what does that look like, and as we are making these extraordinarily difficult decisions, I would encourage staff to not be shy. I think as a body, even in the moment, receiving the information doesn't make that council member you're facing happy, tell them to truth so they can represent their constituents well. If we need to move money in a way that people are going to be

[10:04:13 AM]

mad and you're going to have to expend some political capital, I would hope that y'all feel comfortable and confident saying that to council members so we can make these difficult decisions when those dollars have to move. I see you. >> Thank you, council member. We appreciate that. I can assure you that staff always puts forward their professional recommendation. And they do it with their experience and their expertise in working with the community, and I applaud the work that they do. It's not easy, as you mentioned for the various reasons, but most certainly, they always put forward their professional recommendations. We appreciate your comments. And realizing that these are the code amendments. Definitely, we all should consider. We've got the housing and planning subcommittee that also might be a good opportunity for some of these conversations in the future. >> Mayor Adler: One of the amendments -- first, council

[10:05:14 AM]

member harper-madison, I think the points you're raising are really good points. And I think there's an opportunity for us with land development code amendments to actually make a much stronger impact on overall equity in the city than we have. Some of those are going to be really potentially hard choices, because it represents change on issues that are hotly debated and people come sphere lots of different places, and I really do hope that you and

the councils in the future pick those up. We have an affordability statement on both 55 and 56 as part of this, and our staff has indicated that they believe that both 55 and 56 promote opportunities in the city and increase opportunities in the city for us. My hope is that we're going to move forward with those because they represent where I think there could be agreement and

[10:06:17 AM]

consensus. But not to the exclusion of people doing further work. One of the amendments that we're going to be proposing is similar to the amendment that went on affordability unlocked, where there's a request for data and reporting back to council on the impact of this. Is it, in fact, achieving what we hoped it would achieve, and if not, what are the barriers, and is it happening in the places we want it to happen, and is that disproportionate. I think that one of the ways for the city to be able to move forward on issues that are hotly debated and contested like that is to develop that kind of factual underpinning so that when those conversations are held, there's a more objective basis and maybe better tools available to make sure they're doing what we need to do to be the city we want to be.

[10:07:22 AM]

>> Renteria: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, council member Renteria. >> Renteria: I really understand what Natasha was saying. You know, we worked on -- me and my wife off and on, imagine Austin plan. It was a long process. And just to have the courts bring it down that we wasted a lot of resources, a lot of money, and we still ended up getting beaten there at the very end by the court. So it's going to be a long process. These are the kind of things that generation-wise, seniors are slowly moving on.

[10:08:23 AM]

And the new generation comes in and changes things. We have a saying in Spanish, little by little, it goes a long way. We tell people you are going to be displaced if we don't pass more housing, and we're a high-tech company city, and if we don't do anything, then the neighborhoods are going to change and you're seeing it now. You have a home where something sold for \$30,000 30 years ago. This is what's going to happen, and the harder you resist, the more you're going to look around and see that your neighbor has moved. Because they can't afford their

[10:09:24 AM]

taxes. It's a chain reaction. You don't build housing. People move. They won't come back to work unless you pay them a huge amount of money, because it takes time to commute in the city. It's just so expensive. If we keep going down this aisle that we don't want density, we don't want housing. You're going to end up seeing yourself having to be moving, because you can't afford to live here. And that's what's happening. In the eight years, we just slowly, slowly -- it was a long fought process, and we're getting a lot of things done. It's a very slow pace. And

we're going to continue that pace. Individual development has to go through a long process. It takes two to three years just to build anything here. I hope the next council can make

[10:10:25 AM]

a better choice on these kind of items, because other cities are leaving us behind on housing, and once we start losing people, and forcing them out of town, they're not coming back. >> Mayor Adler: Council member Renteria, I think those are good points. Thanks for raising those, and I appreciate your support this week in at least moving this part forward. Council member Fuentes. >> Fuentes: Thank you. Thank you, colleagues, for the conversation. You certainly have given me a lot to think about and to process as council considers land use reforms, and certainly serving these last two years on council and seeing that the way we have approached land use reforms has been poca poco, little by little, with consensus agreement on them. I know that likely will not be the case in all scenarios, in all different iterations of council. And so I'm thinking through what

[10:11:28 AM]

does it look like when we address land use reform that is so desperately needed, because what we have right now is clearly not working. I think we all have families in our district that have been priced out of our city and know that the scale of the housing crisis that we're currently in. And so in thinking through moving forward, what else can we do, is it feasible for us to have super majority consensus on land use reforms moving forward? I don't know. That to me seems like a tall order. But what I do know is that we have to have a process in place, especially for the notifications. We had the first kind of mass scale notification that went out to austinites throughout the city regarding the compatibility standard reforms. And I just want to highlight for our staff, we need to develop a process to seamlessly get the notifications out, because we are going to have to continue to have these conversations, to make large scale reforms, but our community needs to be notified. And that's what we learned from

[10:12:29 AM]

the recent court ruling. So to the extent that we can have the notification in Spanish, that has a link available for austinites to understand what we're talking about. I attended a contact team meeting in our district, and may brought up a good point. The everyday austinite might not know what compatibility means. You're putting verbiage out there without any context. We can at least provide a link so that folks can get up to speed on what that means and what that looks like. So I just wanted to add those comments for our city manager and for staffer. In a few months, when we have new faces at the table that we don't stall on the progress that we're making, and we can continue at the speed that is needed. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, chito. >> Vela: Mayor, I have a couple more questions for staff, before legal. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Vela: I'll start with just

[10:13:31 AM]

the -- any thought or -- I don't think we've been able to model or anything like that. I know y'all are slammed. Any thoughts on the take-up of the affordable housing in a bonus program, in kind of a compatibility bonus program, affordable housing scenario? Is there any -- just anecdotally, from my perspective, it sure seems that people that were planning to do a vmu project on the corridors will take advantage of it, and that's a good thing. They'll be able to add units because they're not going to be -- they're subject to less compatibility. I'm skeptical that anybody that's not already kind of doing a bonus program will opt in and give away a certain amount of affordable housing units in order to -- especially just looking at vmu. Vmu has a lot of advantages. There's a lot of kind of benefits that somebody gets from opting into the program.

[10:14:35 AM]

The ability waiver would be just one benefit. Any thoughts on how much uptake we hope to see, we want to see in the program? >> Good morning. Greg Dutton, housing and planning. As was pointed out by mayor pro tem, I think the affordability levels are set in accordance with vmu today. So eh with know that that's kind of a tried and true affordability level. Compatibility isn't usual because this program would offer a reduction in compatibility in the program itself, something we've never done before. Not aware of other places that have done it before, so we really don't know. Right now, we just don't know how well it's going to work. I think it's a best attempt to base it on something that has worked, affordability-wise, but the bonus itself is a new approach. >> Vela: And to be fair, to

[10:15:36 AM]

Natasha's point about honest and frank advice, I know y'all are not recommending -- you know, you're recommending that we kind of wrap this into a larger kind of approach, and again, I appreciate that, and I appreciate that kind of frank advice from staff. You mentioned another point, too. Is there any other city that has taken this approach? I'm not aware of when we were trying to kind of see if there's a precedent out there for compatibility kind of waiver bonus program. But I guess not, huh? >> We're not aware of one. >> Vela: Well, thank you. To legal, to Trish, any thoughts on the map that we put up earlier with regard to properties later being combined to -- where the combined property touches the corridor

[10:16:36 AM]

and whether they would all benefit from the compatibility reduction in the program that we're talking about? >> Patricia link, law department. If the two parcels are joined together through a unified development agreement, which is where the two lots share kind of the obligations to comply with land development code, if we have something like that, no, it would not be -- the part that's -- the parcel that is not on the corridor itself would not be eligible for these compatibility changes. If it is property that they basically redefine it, they go back and change the property description so that it is two, again, we're still going to have

[10:17:36 AM]

a challenge because that second half wasn't part of the original council action. And so -- but there's ways to address that in terms of adding that additional land to the overlay. I think another kind of idea that is occurring to me, and I don't get attached to it, because I'm just talking off the top of my head here for a second. >> Vela: Appreciate it. >> But for your bonus program, we might be able to extend that compatibility to the bonus program, but I just need to think through how that would look. And if we're not able to do it now, it might be something that council could do in the future as well. >> Vela: I appreciate that, because I just see that as being a real headache, you know, down the road if we don't set some pretty good rules for it up front. And I'd rather deal with it up front than two years from now or whenever. Mentioning the overlay, too. The other question that I had was about the overlay, in the rail compatibility reductions.

[10:18:40 AM]

We just defined that within the ordinance itself, the compatibility ordinance itself. Why the shift in tactics to go to the overlay on this compatibility reduction? >> So, in order for a parcel to participate in vmu, they have to get the zoning change. They have to have the V in the string. And so, what council did is they took what is existing vmu streets, because there's a list of streets in vmu. And for streets that are within that that also meet the definition of the light rail, they get the vmu2 option. For this, in order to make a geographic change that council has asked for, the only way that we can implement it is to do the

[10:19:41 AM]

overlay. Because it's not something -- it's happening now, and it's not something that's part of the zoning string itself, but it is part of the regulations that apply, that will apply if it's approved by council. >> Vela: To the real question, what is an overlay. Honestly, I have not really dealt with that a lot, and it's a new kind of concept for me. >> So our code has a couple of different types of overlays. We have the conditional overlays that council adds into an individual zoning case. >> Vela: Like a pud, for example? Is the pud basically an overlay? >> No. We have -- you get an application for mf6, and council says mf6 appropriate, except we think this one element needs to change. Council can do a conditional overlay to change that one element of the entitlements under mf6.

[10:20:42 AM]

So we typically use that on an individual zoning case. We have our uno area, which is the university area. It is actually more similar to the corridor overlay, in the sense that it doesn't become part of the zoning string. It's part of the zoning regulations, but not part of the string itself. Our neighborhood plans are the form of an overlay, because we are grouping properties together. We have some variations of how we utilize them at the city. >> Vela: Thank you very much, I appreciate that. >> Mayor Adler: All right. Paige. >> Ellis: Sorry. I'm going to try to keep this brief. I just wanted to flag, I know that we originally talked about the idea of the short-term rental prohibition within it. So I just wanted to flag that there's been some differing perspectives over the years of how those are allowed and where they're allowed, and it seems to me that maybe along transit corridors are more appropriate

[10:21:42 AM]

use as opposed to in quieter family areas in town. And at the same time, I just want to make sure, allowing for them where they should be allowed, not excluding them, because I think a lot of the conversation is very much about the bachelor, bachelorette party complex, and I think that they actually have a use in our community that's much more helpful. For instance, families that are doing home repair like a roof or a kitchen where they need longer rentals to be here in the community and to keep close to their schools that their kids are going to and make sure that they can still function while they're doing important renovations to their homes. And so I know that we have it in the ordinance, or in the staff report, as it currently exists. I know the conversation is more nuanced than just should there be party houses or should there not be. And I also think that if we really want these projects to financially pencil out where we can have that level of affordability commitment, that sometimes allowing some short-term rentals are appropriate to make sure the projects actually get built. So I don't have a lot of

[10:22:43 AM]

capacity to get into the nuance today, but I just wanted people to know I was thinking about that, and trying to make sure that we're making good decisions for the community as we move forward with this. I remember we had a presentation a couple years or months ago at this point, and his assessment, if I'm remembering correctly, was seashell that if there was enough housing in the community, then the short-term rentals wouldn't be impacting affordability in housing stock as a whole. I want to make sure that we're not doing anything that would not allow projects to get built, simply because we get mad at some of the enforcement or the lack of enforcement around short-term rentals. So I just wanted to flag that conversation today while we're talking about it these issues. >> Mayor Adler: Council member tovo. >> Tovo: Are you suggesting that you may bring an amendment to that portion of it, or are you just flagging it for future

[10:23:44 AM]

discussion? >> Ellis: I'm not sure yet because I'm not feeling well. I might. Thank you. >> Tovo: So I'll just say that would -- I mean, I don't want to necessarily get into the conversation then today, if it may not become an issue, but I just want to highlight that that would -- you know, we've talked a lot about making these changes to increase housing supply in our community, and, you know, whether or not a short-term rental becomes a party house, it does become a mini hotel rather than a more permanent housing opportunity for someone. And so, I would -- I couldn't support that kind of a shift. And, you know, it's been interesting, we've had those conversations here in Austin longer than some other municipalities, but it's really clear across the country that those are increasingly becoming -- that is increasingly a conversation about how short-term rentals are taking long-term rental opportunities off the housing market because they're always more financially lucrative than long-term rental opportunities. Anyway, I look forward to the conversation if it happens on

[10:24:46 AM]

Thursday. And that's all I wanted to say on that point. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Ellis: Just to follow up quickly. I appreciate that perspective. And just want to make sure that as we talk about housing and housing stock that we don't inadvertently think that there's definite units and we're either struggling over rental ownership, you know, someone who lives here, someone who is temporarily staying there. I think if the project doesn't pan out, then there's not going to be a unit for someone. So I just want to make sure that we're being very calibrated in that, and I would be open to maintaining some sort of limits on how many could be there. But again, we can have that conversation on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. So I think we've talked about those issues. We'll get some stuff posted to the message board to help facilitate the conversation. We'll make sure we tee those up and maybe address those.

[10:25:49 AM]

Those are all the pulled items -- >> Renteria: Mayor. I have a question for Kathie on item 41. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, go ahead. >> Renteria: And I'm just wondering, it sounds very -- I do have the old brown building area at 411 comal. I also have another triangle there that's also -- and I've been working with economic development department about building some affordable housing. I'm just trying to see -- on 411, we had an opportunity once to -- with this developer coming and saying he would develop that. If you give him 50 at market rate, 50% be low income, I mean, 50% and under. But for 40 years, everything

[10:26:50 AM]

would be given back to the city. What happened was he had a project in Houston, and then hurricane Harvey, one of those big hurricanes wiped them out. So it never got to that point. But I was just wondering, how would those kind of situations -- your amendment will affect? Does it have anything that will affect that, anything like that? >> Tovo: Yeah. Thank you for that question. Thank you for mentioning 411, which we're going to talk about here as part of the staff presentation today. So this resolution with regard to the economic development corporation would make sure that the economic development corporation is a part of those conversations about different city redevelopment projects. You know, when we set up the economic development corporation, we didn't necessarily restructure the real estate process here at the city so that they're a part of it. So, I think this would enhance

[10:27:50 AM]

the redevelopment of the projects you're talking about, the possible redevelopment, because it would make the economic development corporation a natural partner in the beginning. And so, it would direct the manager to establish policies to enhance the collaboration between our city and the entity we set up to help redevelop those who are in a better position in some cases to do the kind of thing you're talking about, to work with private developers in redeveloping those tracts. >> Renteria: Thank you for that. That's the only question I have. >> Tovo: Thanks for the question. And you kind of Teed up something. We're going to talk in a bit, one of the four properties that council member kitchen and I had asked the staff to do updates on is 411 Chacon, and I was unaware of that proposal you talked about. Sounds like that was a pretty interesting opportunity. But I'm going to hand out something that former mayor pro tem Cole brought forward. She brought forward a resolution

[10:28:52 AM]

about 411 Chacon, and there were three follow-up memos looking at the development, the redevelopment of 411 Chacon, and I thought that might be good background for the presentation we're about to see, because there was some impetus behind redeveloping that tract, especially for affordable housing, and then it just hasn't moved forward. So, I wanted to hand that out as background for why we might consider the second part of the resolution that my son supervisors and I brought forward with relationship to the aedc, would direct the manager to enter into negotiations with the economic development corporation about the potential redevelopment of several of those sites, including 411 Chacon to see if that work can move forward, and that site can be redeveloped. >> Renteria: I know that our past mayor pro tem Cole was trying to build affordable housing so they could put students and some of the

[10:29:53 AM]

teaching assistants that are married, but it never got passed. When I saw that address, it was just very interesting because it is in my district. It's right across the street from Chalmers court. If you can just keep me in touch on that. But I guess there's going to be a presentation on it. >> Tovo: Yeah, and hopefully -- I think she was the first to kind of see the opportunities there. And so the resolution that's on top of the packet is the one that she brought forward, and then the co-sponsors were council member Riley. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right, colleagues. We're going to go into executive session. Let's see if we can come back out in an hour to have the presentation on the property issue. >> Kitchen: Mayor, I don't know how long -- I have to leave at noon. So, I don't know how long the

[10:30:53 AM]

executive session will take. Do you really feel like we can finish it in an hour? >> Mayor Adler: I think so, because I think that item number 3, the personnel matters, we're not really going to discuss, it's just something to hand out to us. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: And we'll be able to pick up the larger conversation Thursday. That means it's really just the report on the labor negotiations and the short-term rental, and I think those are brief. So I think we'll actually be back before 11:30. So the city council will now go into closed session to take up three teeps, pursuant to 551.071 of government code. We're going to discuss legal issues related to e1, city of Austin labor negotiations, e2, short-term rental regulations. Also pursuant to 551.074 of the government code, we'll discuss personnel matters related to item 53, which is performance, compensation benefits for the city manager. Without, we will move directly over there, and let's move as directly over there as we possibly can.

[10:31:56 AM]

It's going to be in-person in the executive session room. The time is 10:31. [Executive session]

[11:06:01 AM]

[Music]. [Music]. >>

[12:35:21 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We are out of closed session. We discussed legal issues, personnel matters related to item e3. We are now back into the council work session here on November 29th, 2022 in boards and commission room. Manager, we're going to do the presentation now on palms school district. We're going to do the Austin energy meeting at 1:30. We're going to do the presentation briefing on the city-owned property at 3:00. We're going to be watching the soccer game during all of the breaks and as we can catch that. So, why don't you go ahead and start the briefing. >> Thank you, mayor. >> Harper-madison: You said October 29th? >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. November 29th. >> Today's briefing on the palm district plan is the culmination of work initiated by council

[12:36:22 PM]

resolution from 2019. Our staff from our housing and planning department have mostly worked in-house on the plan, and in collaboration and partnership across multiple city departments with a multitude of stakeholders. The palm district plan provides a visionary framework, which multiple parties, public, private, and non-profit can use to leverage and guide investments moving forward. There are there are significant public investments within the district that are highlighted within the plan, and those include the convention center, the Waterloo greenway, palm park and palm school, the planned I-35 reconstruction, and the innovation district. The city charter requires that the plan be adopted as an amendment to imagine Austin, which requires that the planning commission first take action on the plan. As such, council consideration will be delayed until that occurs. However, we wanted this council to be briefed on the body of work, because the plan was initiated by -- under your leadership. I want to acknowledge the tremendous lift that HPD division manager Steve E.

[12:37:22 PM]

Gradehouse had put into this project, into a traditional setting as the pandemic hit soon after the project got started. The ability to initiate and complete the palm district plan during a global pandemic, which is still present, demonstrates the resilience of our city organization and our community to come together in collaboration for significant effort such as this. At this point, I'll turn the presentation over to Stevie. >> Good afternoon, mayor and members of council, city manager. Thank you so much for that gracious introduction to this body of work. Very excited to be here with you today to share it. I've served as the project lead on this body of work since it was initiated by council in late 2019. While we're requesting city council postpone the hearing on the palm district plan that was originally scheduled for this Thursday to February 23rd, in order to allow planning commission action, we are excited to be able to provide a briefing on this work today.

[12:38:23 PM]

Next slide. I can't advance the powerpoint. In the presentation that I'm going to provide today, I'm going to provide a brief overview of the planning process, as well as the draft plan. The plan really was -- the goal is to develop a shared vision for a complex culturally rich and rapidly transforming part of downtown Austin. The study area extends roughly from 15th street to lady bird lake. Next slide, please. This area of downtown is really ground zero for a number of significant public investments anticipated over the years ahead. And the impetus for the planning process came out of the desire to take advantage of all of the transformative energy that is coming to this district to ensure that the cultural and historic identity of the district is amplified rather than obliterated by the changes ahead. Next slide. In addition to initiating the planning process, the resolution that was adopted by council in 2019 also provided direction on a number of -- several additional items that are moving

[12:39:24 PM]

forward independently. This plan will guide the items that are still yet to come, and guided by the items that moved forward in advance of plan development. Next slide. We conducted pre-planning activities in 2019 and 2020, launched the website for this planning process at the beginning of 2021, and have held three major rounds of public engagement, culminating in release of a public review draft plan in October. And hope to be able to bring this back to council for adoption at the very beginning of next year. Throughout this process, we have approached this work through an equity lens and we will continue to be guided by key equity goals as we move through implementation of the plan. Next slide. And next. So, throughout 2021, and 2022, we've conducted a number of significant public engagement activities. We also partnered with the national American institute of architects to conduct a virtual design workshop and provide recommendations in July of 2021.

[12:40:24 PM]

We hired a local consultant, Marta cotera, to conduct targeted outreach to east Austin thought leaders, through interviews and focus groups and we partnered with the downtown alliance to support a series of scenario planning workshops with key stakeholders and who also supported development of the preferred development scenario that is presented in the plan document. As a result of these activities, we have received rich input from a wide range of stakeholders throughout the process and through various engagement channels, and you can read the results of that work as well as other background materials and video are all available at speak-upaustin.org/palmdistrict. Next slide. Participation in the surveys has been fairly diverse, thanks in part to the targeted outreach we did through Marta coterra. We received about 55% of the initial vision survey responses, where folks that self-identified as hispanic or latinx, which is a major target demographic for this body of work. In June of 2021, we hosted two

[12:41:25 PM]

well-attended visioning forums and received around 370 comments about how folks would like to see the palm district evolve over time. There was a lot of emphasis in most conversations on history, community, and cultural uses. Next slide. Through individual interviews and focus group discussions, our consultant Marta and her team reached out to a variety of key organizations and individuals representing east Austin, and those with cultural ties to the district. The results of this work are incorporated into the listening report. And based on their targeted work, the American institute of architects communities by design program assembled a team that visited Austin for an orientation gathering, orientation visit February 25th of 2020, and we all know what happened about two weeks later. So, that was -- that team visited in-person. We were able to partner with the aia to send a team virtually to participate in our engagement

[12:42:26 PM]

activities over the summer of 2021. We can't call it a regional urban design assistance team, because it was a slightly different format, but they did an original version and provided a recommendation report at the end of that virtual visit. The key ideas in that report included being super intentional with culture and place-making through public art and leveraging the publicly controlled sites in the district to achieve the vision. Next slide. So the plan includes a vision on desired outcomes for the district and identifies a preferred scenario for district development. The overarching vision for the district is that it become a vibrant historic hub of downtown where the past is honored, culture is celebrated, and the future is shaped. Next slide. The first element of the vision looks at ensuring inclusive growth. It will provide a prosperous future for longtime and recent residents as well as established and new businesses. Next slide. The second element of the vision

[12:43:26 PM]

includes ensuring the district becomes a cultural destination that celebrates its multicultural heritage and builds on the many existing cultural resources in the district. Next slide. The third element of the vision calls for strengthening the physical, cultural, and social connections within downtown and between east Austin and downtown. And finally, the fourth element calls for preserving and enhancing the natural environment within the district by restoring existing natural and open spaces and pursuing a high standard of sustainable design and development with a focus on grain infrastructure. Next slide. The plan also identifies around 50 desired outcomes across the four themes. Many of these outcomes are things that are already in progress, because as I've mentioned, there is a lot of work already kind of Teed up to happen in this district, particularly in terms of public investments. Next slide. In the summer of 2022, we partnered with the downtown alliance, who retained Ms. Robinson to support an activity that led to the development of

[12:44:27 PM]

three what-if scenarios for district development, organized around the concepts of live, work, and play. Next slide. They also helped us to develop a preferred scenario, which is included in the plan. And that preferred scenario really builds on those live, work, play scenarios and incorporates survey responses that we received around the live, work, and play scenarios, which indicated a desire for additional housing in a range of incomes and emphasis

on cultural space and programming. We've got quite a few responses to the survey, and sort of across all of those responses, there was a definite interest in seeing this district be a district that is focused on sort of its cultural assets that allows people to live in the district and in some cases to kind of turn down the office development a little bit, if you will, to achieve those other goals. The preferred scenario envisions that the palm district will become a thriving 24-hour a day community. It prioritizes mixed use buildings with retail, entertainment, recreation, cultural activities while supporting existing live music

[12:45:28 PM]

and culture spaces and really sort of builds on the spine that runs through the district of the Waterloo greenway. Next slide. Next. The implementation section of the plan presents specific actions that can be taken to move towards the preferred scenario and the vision and desired outcomes identified in the plan. Many of these actions build on investments and programs that are already under way in the district, or for which funding has previously been identified. The primary role of the plan is really to help guide and coordinate these future investments and programs, so that we leverage this activity for public benefit and create a world class district of downtown. The recommendations in this plan are far from a wish list. Many of them already have willing sponsors that are moving forward with some aspect of the work. Next slide. The implementation section also tees up a conversation about implementation governance. At a minimum, the housing and planning department will monitor plan implementation as we deal with our other small area plans. Many of the folks who provided

[12:46:29 PM]

input during the planning process also expressed a desire to identify a specific implementation governance body that would be responsible for coordination more broadly. There are already multiple key governance entities in the district, so we will be working with our partners to identify an appropriate governance body that builds on this ecosystem to kind of go beyond the minimum of monitoring plan implementation. The plan also and partnerships, and calls for us to work to accommodate housing at a range of incomes in the district through incentives, through investments, and through taking advantage of those publicly-owned sites and opportunities in the district. Next slide. We presented the plan to the planning commission at their special called meeting on November 15th. At that meeting, they closed the public hearing and took action to postpone their decision until December 20th. Because the December 20th planning commission meeting is a consent-only meeting, we anticipate that the planning commission will consider the plan and take action at a

[12:47:30 PM]

meeting in January. Under article 10 of the city charter, planning commission is required to take action on any recommended amendments to the comprehensive plan, which this plan is. We are requesting that city council postpone the hearing that has been scheduled for Thursday to the February 23rd, 2023 meeting, in order to allow time for the planning commission to take their action. Once the plan is adopted, staff would work on several implementation activities, including a focused amendment to the land development code along waller creek, a focused amendment to the downtown Austin plan to ensure consistency with the palm district plan, as well as

working to finalize our approach to implementation governance. So the action that we're requesting this week is really that city council postpone the hearing that had been scheduled for Thursday to the February 23rd meeting to allow time for planning commission to take action. At the February meeting, we would then be asking -- assuming that planning commission takes that action, would be asking city council to adopt the plan district plan as an attachment to imagine Austin and we will

[12:48:31 PM]

also be recommending adoption or approval of a companion resolution that initiates several key implementation activities, including a focused amendment to the land development code relating to setbacks and development standards adjacent to waller creek and a focused amendment to the downtown Austin plan. And with that, I am happy to try to answer any questions, or we can answer them offline before February 23rd. >> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, anybody have anything they want to say at this point? Council member Renteria. >> Renteria: Yes. Have y'all been in touch with the county on the palm school building? >> The county is an important partner in this effort, and we've been working with county staff throughout the development of the plan. They have been kind of reviewing the text along with us that's gone into this plan document. We've had some healthy conversations with them. We have not -- the planning team has not been involved in any of the sort of real estate negotiation activities. We're really trying to make sure that we are teeing up the

[12:49:31 PM]

partnership for success, regardless of who ends up owning the property at the end of the day. The city manager or others may have additional feedback they can provide on that aspect of it. I do know that the county has not taken any additional commissioner's court action recently on it, but the building is empty. The county staff have moved out of it. >> Renteria: Thank you for that. >> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes. >> Fuentes: Thank you. Thank you for this presentation. It's exciting to see this important plan move forward and to hear about some of the recommendations that are coming out as a part of this community outreach, and like my council member Renteria -- and I know Kathie tovo has been involved in the saving palm school efforts. A group that I also organized with before I got elected. So I especially am curious, are there other insights that bubble up related to palm school from the community engagement? I know you have a recommendation listed here to have cultural

[12:50:33 PM]

programming as part of the use of the space, but any other insights that you'd like to share? >> Sure. I think we definitely received -- there was a lot of community engagement and outreach supporting the notion of preserving the site intact and improving it and making it be more of an extension to kind of have palm park and palm school developed in tandem with one another, to make sure that we're robustly using the building itself for cultural uses throughout the building. But we also had a contingent of folks that believe very strongly that we have an affordability crisis in the city that would warrant considering joint development agreements that might take up the portion of the site that isn't covered by the school and have buildings on it. There were community members that

asked for that as well. So I won't say that it was sort of a monolith. We had both sides of that viewpoint. The desired development scenario that is in the preferred scenario shows the site staying with just the palm school

[12:51:33 PM]

building on it, but I do want to be really clear that this plan is not a regulatory document. The county is obviously the property owner. Additional work would need to be done to make sure that the financing for that works for our partner at the county. But what the plan is clear on is that there should be cultural programming on the site. We are unequivocal in the recommendation to have the site be used for cultural programming in the future, and the county commissioner's court has adopted restrictive covenants that would require whatever future use of that site. >> Fuentes: Have we shared the feedback with the county? >> Yes. >> Fuentes: So they're aware that there were some community members who expressed a desire for housing at part of the site? >> Yes. >> Fuentes: Okay. As far as the Mexican American cultural heritage district, are there any additional insights that you'd like to bubble up that came from the community? >> We definitely had a robust discussion around boundaries, because the Mexican American heritage corridor is designated,

[12:52:35 PM]

at least in the quality of life study, was designated to run all the way from republic square to saltio. That's obviously much -- you know, goes beyond the boundaries that we've drawn for the palm district plan. We made a conscious decision to kind of have -- to narrow our boundaries at some point, or else at some point, you're taking in all of downtown with the plan. That wasn't the goal with this planning process. We also wanted to be really clear that we weren't kind of -- even though we would like to sort of overcome the boundary that is I-35, we don't want to signal to the community that we're trying to take sort of a downtown planning approach to east Austin. So, we kept the boundary along 35, but we definitely heard from community members that would have preferred that we had extended the boundaries to cover the full extent of the Mexican American heritage corridor. We're really kind of treating it in the district as an intersection point, and there's also I know work already under way under the leadership of the economic development department has done some preliminary directional signage and is

[12:53:37 PM]

working to do additional consultant retention to do more of the sort of work to explore how we're going to implement these kinds of districts moving forward, and our hope is this plan would be a guiding document to that work that's being led by the economic development department in partnership with community. >> Fuentes: So there were enough insights shared from the community to want to see the Mexican American culture district boundaries go past I-35 through the site? >> Yeah, I think we had that already on the books with what was identified as part of the mexican-american quality of life study, was looking at a corridor that could potentially extend past 35 to saltillo. There's also been conversation with stakeholders about sort of how you actually create that district, but I don't want to kind of steal all their thunder, because I think they'll be coming back to council with direction related to that. It's an interesting conversation about dreams versus building on what's there now. >> Fuentes: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Colleagues?

[12:54:37 PM]

Yes, Allison. >> Alter: Thank you. Really appreciate all the work that went into this report by you and fellow staff in the community. I wanted to go through -- there were a couple next steps you said in terms of city steps. One was adopting this into imagine Austin plan, which is going to happen in February. And there were two other parts that I wanted to get greater clarity on. One was land development code amendments, and I'm not sure what the second one is, but if you could provide some greater clarity. >> Sure. So the recommendation on amendments to the land development code will be a very targeted and focused recommendation. I want to be super clear. That really would be dealing with some setback and building wall issues of development that's immediately adjacent to Waterloo greenway. And it's actually code language that was already in the second reading draft of the land development code that didn't proceed when that paused. That we would be bringing back to go ahead and approve based on a lot of observations that we've had from folks trying to build

[12:55:38 PM]

out the greenway on how development is interacting with the greenway. So we are not proposing a regulating plan as part of this work. Most of this district has already got central business district zoning, and we would just propose kind of working forward in partnership and not trying to implement this plan through regulations, per se, although there is guidance on the plan that at some point in the future, when we're looking at the downtown density bonus program, we could use that guidance for that. But the items that are specifically going to be Teed up in February is that very focused amendment to the land development code relating primarily to setbacks along the Waterloo greenway, and then the second item that is going to be Teed up is an amendment to the downtown Austin plan, to reflect the boundaries and content of the palm district plan. So, again, a very focused amendment to the downtown Austin plan to make sure that it has boundaries that are within the downtown Austin plan that would reflect the palm district boundaries, because the palm district boundaries is different from the sub districts that are

[12:56:39 PM]

currently in the downtown Austin plan. And those, just to be super clear, the actions that we're asking for in February are initiation of those. So the actual amendment to the code and the actual amendment to the downtown Austin plan would return at a point in the future, presumably later in 2023. So it would just be a resolution to initiate those two changes that would be asked for in February. >> Alter: Okay, and staff would be bringing that? >> Correct. >> Alter: And then a key part of this is, you know, using city-owned lands effectively to advance the plan. We had a presentation about the public safety campus. So I have some sense of that. What I'm still missing is what happens to -- and this is probably a question mark for the city manager to get back to us on, is what is the plan for making sure we have all the security needs and policing needs addressed in downtown if you don't have a station at that location, if that's part of the

[12:57:40 PM]

plan, which I'm still not totally understanding where that piece comes in. I understand that we'd be moving headquarters and being able to have an expansive public safety campus, so we could get economies of scale and be able to really meet the needs and that the building is not in great shape, et cetera. But I am concerned to make sure that we have the right basis for our police downtown, and I'm not understanding that piece of the plan. And this plan has certain assumptions based on the future of that. So if you can get back to us, I don't know if today is the right time for that. >> That's a great question, mayor pro tem, and we will come back to you on that broader discussion on what the future of the public safety presence in downtown will be. >> Alter: Okay, and it would be great if we're waiting until February to pass this or adopt it, to make sure that we could have that information ahead of time, that would be great. And then the third thing that I didn't see in here, we had a

[12:58:40 PM]

conversation about the tirz for the Waterloo, that there was additional money that could potentially be allocated from that above and beyond what was allocated for Waterloo greenway. I think it was on the tune of \$30 million, and we had been discussing whether that could be applied to homelessness, and my recollection is we've never actually taken action on that; is that correct? And so, in light of this plan, which is right in the area, can you either speak to or speak to us in the future about what we could use that money to leverage? Because I think we can't use it for housing. There may be other pieces of things that we're trying to do in the district where that would be an appropriate use of funding, even if it could be -- you know, it could be a lot of different options. But it would be good if we had

[12:59:41 PM]

that information. Maybe you have that now. I don't know. >> I don't have it now, so we can definitely follow up with the waller creek lgc and others and law to figure out what the eligible uses are, what I'm hearing is the eligible uses are of the waller creek tirz, if there's surplus, and if it could be used towards any of the activities identified in the plan. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Tovo: Thanks very much. I wanted to start by echoing the manager's thanks, Stevie, for all of your work on this. It was exciting to see it move forward even despite the pandemic. And so thank you for the work. And I also want to acknowledge my co-sponsors on this item, because several of us are rolling off, I really want to acknowledge and thank you for presenting it today, even though this is not the council, sadly, that's going to get to approve it. My colleague, council member Renteria, was a co-sponsor in bringing this forward with me. Mayor Adler, council member harper-madison, and council member kitchen. And so, I really appreciated it.

[1:00:42 PM]

And thank you for -- it was a huge resolution, and did a lot of different things, and most of those are in motion, and those that aren't, I think you've now picked up and are sending forth with the recommendations you have here. So, you know, just to highlight a few issues that will continue to need attention, you mentioned one of them, the Mexican American heritage corridor has -- because of a couple different decisions with regard to consultants, they

have put up -- they complied with our direction in a great way by putting up temporary signs to make sure that we had those in place, but the longer work of really identifying different sites and working with community members is still to happen. And I just want to mention again, the fervent request that community members have made is that that process, that EdD is engaging in not start from scratch. And I know I've had those conversations with EdD and they're committed to working with the community members who have done the history, have done history of different sites along that area and want very much to

[1:01:42 PM]

be involved in that, and I think you said that, that they will be working with the community, and I think that's a really important way for that progress -- for that project to proceed. That it's really hand in hand with community members who have spent years researching some of those spots along there and have a lot of information, and in some cases, oral histories and other kinds of information to contribute to those stories. The Rainey street work that we were able to fix the funding on this summer has also started and is moving forward and there are going to be some great storytelling elements in that pocket, which I think also helps meet a long-felt need that you've identified in here to really celebrate the history, including -- and telling the stories of community members who are no longer in that area. And so that's really important, and I appreciate the way that this really report focuses attention on the people who built that part of town and shaped it and went to school at palm school and played in palm park and once upon a time lived down the street in Rainey.

[1:02:44 PM]

I think it's super important. This transforms how we think about this part of town. We renamed it, in fact, in that resolution from the convention center district to the palm district to really recenter it on people, and the stories that are, as you said, at risk of being obliterated as the development in that part of town takes place and continues. So I think this is just a super -- this really meets my expectations of what the plan would look like, and I just am very appreciative to you and all of the other staff and the many community members who worked on it. As I understood the conversation you just had with mayor pro tem alter, it sounds like the waller creek amendments would be coming forward hopefully within 2023? >> That's the goal. >> Tovo: That would be super. >> Land development code could never offer any guarantees of timing, but that is the goal. >> Tovo: And I know we've talked about timing on that for years now, so the sooner the better, because before we see redevelopment along that line,

[1:03:45 PM]

along that area, I think we really want to have those guidelines in place. So, thank you. Thank you for that. I think that's all I wanted to say. You know, again, I think there are some different projects that are -- oh, I had one really important thing to say that I wanted to mention. But there are different elements of these that are going to need continued council support, and one of them is the ongoing work in rainy street. The other I mentioned the Mexican American heritage district and work. I wanted to signal to my colleagues, several of you already know this because you've been working on it the last month or so, but I am working with several Travis county commissioners to see

if we can bring forward some action for our council next week related to palm and continued collaboration around palm skill, but also around an asset we own, the expo center. So I think several of you are committed co-sponsors and a couple others of you are contemplating. And so I'm hopeful that we'll have that action for next council meeting to kind of push forward.

[1:04:45 PM]

We've taken some strong action as a city in terms of palm school, and partnering. I'm hoping we can take some strong action as a council next week in honor of some of the previous council directives. >> Ellis: Thank you for the presentation. Could you speak a little bit about collaboration with transportation planning through this area? There's a lot of opportunity for bike and pedestrian improvements, but there's also cap metro and txdot right on both sides of this. Can you talk a bit about how the different people who are planning transportation in this area are collaborating together? >> Yeah, there's a lot of moving parts to try to sync up that are moving at different speeds, and it's almost like trains on tracks that we're trying to coordinate across them. So, for transportation in general on the actual

[1:05:49 PM]

streetscape, just kicked off the planning process with the public that they've been engaged heavily with the citywide planning team that we pulled together to advise this project. And are going to be taking the transportation projects out of this. For Austin -- for the interstate 35 work, we've also been coordinating with the corridor program office. So we provided some information in the preferred scenarios, some potential scenarios on what caps like I-35 might look like that are very caveated, because they're about to partner with community to design Capps. But we made sure to work with them to make sure we weren't showing anything that was completely zany. We've been working with them to ensure that we can understand what the design work on ih-35 reconstruction is looking like, where the caps will likely be. So what you'll see in the preferred scenario, at least based on the information that we had when we created it is possible within the bounds of what is going to be a conversation as part of the

[1:06:49 PM]

capping and stitching, or whatever we're calling it now. But they've definitely been involved and our hope is this work would provide additional input to that process as they move forward and we've been reviewing at a staff level the technical work around the environmental impact study for I-35 reconstruction and are involved in advising their project as well. And then similarly, for project connect and the potential transit investments, you know, we've got a particular initial investment shown on this map. It's been announced that there will be conversations with community about how to kind of make sure that initial investment for project connect works within the bounds of the funding that's available for the project. That will be kind of an ongoing conversation, but we've definitely had folks from capital metro involved in this process, and then we're also involved in reviewing the environmental work for project connect.

[1:07:50 PM]

So I think there shouldn't be anything in here that is, as of right now, a conflict. But all of our projects obviously change. That's my cell phone ringing in the background. Apologies. >> Ellis: Looks like someone's trying to turn it off for you. I appreciate that. I know there's great opportunity with the trail itself, so. The east-west connections that are likely to be affected by I-35, you know, whatever form that takes moving forward. But I also want to make sure that as we look at this play in, we're not looking outside the box and making sure people can come into the palm district by way of light rail, bike, pedestrian, type of infrastructure. So I'm appreciative that y'all are having all those conversations. >> The conversations are definitely happening. >> Mayor Adler: I appreciate the presentation. I think it's really good. I think this is really exciting. I think this is really good work, and look forward to

[1:08:51 PM]

watching the discussion that continues on in February. I want to thank council member tovo for the ordinance that she brought, and those of us that worked on it. I remember bringing something I call the downtown puzzle in 2016, where I suggested that all these different elements ought to be considered together because they're so interrelated, and I see this as being an outgrowth of that, or consistent with that. Because I do think that that integration is really important, to the degree that -- and I'll just list some items here. You don't need to respond to them, but just in terms of thoughts I had in going through it. It would involve considerable coordination, both in terms of operation and construction with so much happening in this area to make sure that we're building things once, and that somebody who is doing a construction project is aware of the construction project that somebody else is doing to make sure they're never digging

[1:09:51 PM]

anything up or taking advantage of economies of scale that people might not see on their own. So there probably should be at least some consideration and evaluation of a coordination or a governance body. You know, a waller local government corporation or something that is kind of working this area to see whether or not that makes sense to be able to deliver on the promise and the potential of what the integration brings. When you come back with the ldc changes, the ones that you're talking about, I hope that you guys are also considering some point codifying design standards in the district, kind of like how Austin has done the river walk. I think that really increases the place -- a sense of -- the sense of place. And will help everybody in that

[1:10:52 PM]

area. I appreciate the questions about public safety. I know as we move the police out, I just reiterate those. Where's the staging area in this location? If that goes away, how are we dealing with that? The fire station that's down there, too. So overall, public safety plan. I know we have the integrated response that was presented to the audit and finance committee, but I don't think that's been broadly presented to the council. But really, I think what's happening downtown in terms of integrated safety functioning is going to be a big part of this. There's

going to be a question about affordability and preserving what is Austin. In this particular case, most of those conversations are dealing with affordable housing and those kinds of questions, and for me, in this particular area, I think affordability with

[1:11:52 PM]

respect to music venues and art venues probably is even more important, given the nature of this particular location. And I know there's a broader council, you know, debate and discussion, which I'm sure will continue next year as to whether or not this is even the place to be focused on trying to provide affordable housing, because of the cost associated with that relative to having twice as many units a mile away on a transit corridor. But music venues and making sure that there's affordable spaces for that, that really has driven a lot of the creativity in this area. We will lose unless there's a planned response to that. Probably also involves figuring out, you know, the downtown density program and whether there are ways that dollars could be coming from that to music venues on the ground floor as people are building or underwriting lease payments for those kinds of uses.

[1:12:52 PM]

But also seeing if there's a project connect displacement funds. We talk about coordinating them on environmental issues, but I think that's also something to be taking a look at with respect to -- because that is also a displacement and affordability issue. Probably needs to be some analysis of the arch and the concentration of service providers in that area. Hopefully with finding home atx and the progress on that as we get more and more units, there's probably a change in that many where we're doing sheltering. But that conversation is going to be happening, and it needs to be integrated with the planning of this so that those things are helping one another. So I'd make that additionally an element of the report. We're considering sixth street reconstruction, and overlay exemptions and safety improvements in one context.

[1:13:52 PM]

It doesn't stretch all the way to the bounds that you have, but they overlap with one another. So I would hope that your eventually report would speak about how that integration is or how that overlap impacts the there's also some discussion about removing capitol view corridors and impact if we're burying I-35 there may be action at the legislature, perhaps concerning some of the properties that are immediately adjacent to this that are around the arch. I don't know if that's going to happen or not, but if that does you need to be part of those conversations too in terms of the impact that that might have on the ecosystem that's in this area. I think there needs to be at some point, whether it's part of this plan or otherwise, greater focus on vehicular-pedestrian

[1:14:53 PM]

activity on relevant and the balance of -- Rainey street and the balance of that. We have one of the tallest buildings in the city that's going on at that intersection and I'm concerned about how that connectivity works and I think also needs to be a real focus of the report that's here. Councilmember tovo had raised some issues earlier with some of the improvements and areas of the houses in the area, the castle man bull house and the convention and the hawk house that's next to Waterloo park. We had hoped when we were having those conversations that the next evolution of what we're doing so that they're here and part of this plan. What is the game plan and we kind of punted that as of the hawk decision looking for this process programs to give us that overall focus while you have the focus on

[1:15:53 PM]

the convention center and everybody else, I think that's important. And then finally, you ought to pause a take a second to determine whether or not we should be continuing to call this the palm district. There's been some question about whether or not we should be naming this after swanday palm and that will be a lot easier conversation to have early and to decide that question so that you're going forward and to continue granting time and people understand the project with a name that could change, if it needs to be changed now. It's not going to change. Everybody needs to know that who raised that, but I would say that's one of the first things that needs to be resolved. Just some knots as you go through. -- Thoughts as you go through. Yes. >> Vela: I wanted to say how much I appreciate the work in the time I've been in Austin at waller creek.

[1:16:53 PM]

A lot has changed, waller creek and the surrounding area of waller creek might be the most changed part of Austin. I remember before you really took your life in your own hands going down into waller creek and then especially like late at night and this past Sunday I went with my family to the creek show and it was interactive with a new park there. It's just gorgeous, really just gorgeous. And I just want to give city staff credit, prior city councils, all the decisions that were made have just turned that into a real jewel that a generation of people in Austin will be able to enjoy. I appreciate it and I'm excited to see the visioning. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember harper-madison. Harper-madison I want to echo the appreciation for the presentation and the overall dialogue. I appreciate, mayor, you bringing up the name change component because that's

[1:17:54 PM]

something people are interested in. I want to take a brief moment of personal privilege. There's a firefighter by the name of David Thompson, II. He and the folks over at fire station number 8 are watching us right now. They didn't know that they had the privilege of watching us do this Tuesdays and Thursdays every other week. So now you know. We expect y'all to be tuning in. And that just leads me to remember something that I wanted to make sure to share with my colleagues while we're all together. It was really at aing on the campaign trail to see just how little people know what we do. They have no idea what we do as a building. What we as a body do. What we do and the county commissions does. I hope when we're having these conversations that we talk about how

collectively we get to bring the community with us because I got to tell you, I think most of the people that I talked to have no idea what

[1:18:57 PM]

we do and that's frightening when we have so many conversations about bringing the community along, advocating for people, making sure it's equity interested. If we're just making all that up and not actually representing anybody's concerns or cares because they're not talking to us bah because they don't know that's what we do, then I really think we have a bigger conversation that we need to be having. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anything else? Kathie. >> Tovo: Thanks for mentioning the conversation around renaming. I think that's an important one to have early on as well. And I hope that whatever the eventually name is that it's not a reversion back to the convention center district because we've spent a lot of time revisioning that area. And that leads me to one other thing I wanted to mention to my colleagues remaining beyond January and that is the convention center passion. I have looked at the rfp and thank you to the staff who made that possible. I won't talk about it here, but it's clear to me that

[1:19:57 PM]

it's going to be important to really make sure that any proposals for the expansion are parking within the palm district framework and you are visions for the convention center expansion of not just being a larger -- a much larger facility that is not interacting with the surrounding districts. That's going to be something that the next council I think will have to be vigilant about when these proposals start coming back in, that it really do what we hoped it would do or it will be a convention center district and not a palm district or whatever the eventual name it and the focus on those activities and not on the other ones that we want to see and encourage in that area. Thanks again, Stevie, for all your work. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ready? All right. I think it is 1:20. I don't think we can start Austin energy until 1:30 so I'm going to adjourn the --

[1:21:01 PM]

no, I'm going to recess the work session here now at 1:20. We'll reconvene at 3:00 for the last presentation. >> Pool: And we'll convene at 1:30, in 10 minutes, for Austin energy. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: We're in the 20th minute, the score is still 0-0.

[4:24:35 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Greg, thank you. Let's go ahead and reconvene the Austin city council meeting. Thank you, Austin energy, for the work and for the work you still have to put in. Still daunting task in front of you. Thank you. But I think it was helpful the conversation we had. I think we're focusing on issues. Back to the city council meeting. Reconvened. I think we had earlier come out of executive session so we're going to the last presentation that we

have here. At 4:25. Let's spend the next half hour on the real estate question. >> Councilmember tovo requested this. >> Mayor Adler: And councilmember kitchen as

[4:25:35 PM]

well. Let's go ahead and have the presentation. Manager. >> Thank you, mayor and council. Our last presentation this afternoon is a request from councilmember tovo and councilmember kitchen to provide a status update on four properties. And so we have a presentation prepared on the redevelopment of city-owned properties and providing a status update on those. We have Daryl Alexander and Kim our deputy chief financial officer who will be giving the presentation. I'll turn it over to Daryl. >> Thank you. Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem, councilmembers. I'm Daryl Alexander for the building service department. We are going to give you a presentation on the redevelopment fee on property, the status update. Requested by councilmember tovo. Next slide. This is the council status

[4:26:36 PM]

and the update requests. This is the agenda. We'll talk about the strategic facility governance overview real quick and go on to the city-owned facilities status and talk about our collaboration with Austin economic development corporation. Next slide. Strategic facility governance team overview -- strategic governance team, excuse me, was launched in 2013 to establish policies of process and create a corporate strategy. To actually be a one-stop shop in renovating city-owned facilities. The principals continuous improved work environment for city employees. Decrease over occupancy for costs. Improved stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Improve the public facing service and advance customer service and amenities to retract and retain talent.

[4:27:36 PM]

In plan for flexible and resilient changes to future environment and city needs. Next slide. The overview, the executive oversight for the sfg team is the assistant city manager, Veronica brezi no. [Lapse in audio]. Next slide. Key administration responsibilities, implementation of strategic administrative occupancy plan. Internal review of leases. Proposed sale of city property. Administrative oversight of all the primary requests for facility and space requirements. Frequent communication with

[4:28:36 PM]

ING city manager's office. We're collaborating with -- space needs. That ser to risk, staff continues to request council approval for sales, leases in compliance with the charter and state law. Next slide. Some of the accomplishments and projects the sfgt has is accomplishments development center, standard of headquarters. Some projects are renovation of town lake center. Austin energy service center. The public safety administrative facility, we're working on that. Fleet and ar service center which has direct impact on relocating fleet services from

Hargrave site. Then our administrative space planning, that's allowing us to take departments out of leased property into city-owned property. Next slide. Status of the four properties. One Texas center.

[4:29:36 PM]

Constructed in 1983. It's over a 213,000 square feet. Before the pandemic, about 1,000 city employees there. Six departments. It is close to city hall. Options under consideration include tear down, rebuild, renovation or relocation of staff for alternative facilities. Our recommendation is to continue discussion for more collaborative mixed use approach for affordable housing, cultural space, municipal space to include childcare and other council priorities. All options including affordable housing on the site and collaboration with the Austin housing finance committee and Austin economic development committee. Next slide. Old municipal building on 8th street built in 1938. Over 48,000 square feet. It's an historical property. It houses financial services

[4:30:38 PM]

department. During the dac discussion while putting it there we discussed that this property has some comprehensive renovation that will be needed before we move anybody in there. Aedc recognizes that and understand the time and costs associated with it. This is not something a building that they will need immediately. Our recommendation pursue opportunities to make the building available for cultural space. And assess the impact on the -- the long-term office space needs. Once we move FSD, we'll need to put them somewhere. 3002 Guadalupe street. Right now the Austin fire department arson division is there, about 25 ftes. Again, this is an historical property. It's about 76,000 -- excuse me, 7,600 square feet. Our recommendation is make space available for this cultural space. Staff is in tough discussion with the adc. We'll collaborate with the Austin fire department for

[4:31:38 PM]

relocation for its staff. Next slide. 411 Chicon. This is where I live. Currently this is used by building services, the Austin police department, swat, ems, watershed, [inaudible] Approximately about 300 ftes, about 5.1 acres. Over 67,000 square feet. Aedc has expressed interest in the property, but they've got to recognize that we've got to find a space for the city operations that's already located there. Or there's got to be redevelopment where operations can be maintained there. Our recommendation is that all three entities, aedc, sogt, partners conduct feasibility study to discuss the potential capability for a cultural space, affordable housing, city operations. This is prime real estate

[4:32:39 PM]

and I think we would be remiss if we didn't go into some detail to see how much we can get out of this. Optimize the use out of this piece of property. Next slide. And I'll hand this over to Kimberly. >> So we wanted to specifically

note the coordination and partnership that we've been actively working on -- >> Just a moment. Mayor, would you mind muting your microphone. Your shaky leg comes through on the MI consider. People are worried about you out in the world. >> Mayor Adler: Sorry. >> So the aedc and city staff, we began biweekly real estate focused meetings this past July. We're currently collaborating with them on particularly with the cultural trust to ensure that each of the deal structures for those projects not only address ownership and lease requirements for those agreements, but maintain the

[4:33:40 PM]

tax exempt status of bond dollars where they might be used. We're also have been working with them over the past month or so to start figuring out an inclusive mou to establish all the different goals and roles that would need to be defined for conducting various site evaluations, conceptual feasibility studies of city-owned facilities and sites. So staff's assessment of those future space needs at those locations is pending. Because of that wide -- the widespread adoption of hybrid working environments, in the last year or two -- well, due to the pandemic, there was definitely a shift in how we look at office space. Now, the way we are looking at it pre-pandemic has changed completely. The entire landscape has changed. So through -- because of that, we're also just having to kind of rethink the city properties and any of our

[4:34:40 PM]

properties in general so make sure that we're meeting our needs long term, not just in the immediate space, but also in partnership with the edc. But in addition to just the desire to do those assessments, we do need to note that there are no funds that are budgeted to support those assessments. So that's something that we would have to discuss further with council to ensure that they could carry forward. I think it's important to note when we look at these four properties, but in particular, but also just all of our properties across the city, that we consider the overall landscape. The landscape of our office needs, the landscape of the real estate market, the landscape of the city's priorities have changed drastically over the last few years. So we definitely are -- we actually have time -- significant time scheduled in the next week or two to

[4:35:42 PM]

do some deep-dive discussions on comprehensive plan for -- of our city facilities and overall needs. Relative to that changing landscape. But also because it's really challenging to look at the -- each of these individual properties in isolation. We need to be considering them in a more comprehensive manner. This also will allow us to be more comprehensive in our we assess and analyze the funding options. That funding landscape has also change understand the last few years T state has put more significant limitations on what kind of debt can or cannot be issued. For when non-voter approved versus voter approved. We need to be taking that into consideration going forward as well. So that will help us in determining what might be best used or included in a future bond program, what would be eligible for non-voter approved bonds, but just being eligible does

[4:36:43 PM]

not mean that it should be the use or the funding source used. And also looking at where monetization versus a ground lease might make is most sense for a particular property. There's a lot of questions to be answered going forward, but we know that the partnership we have with edc as well as with our colleagues in housing and planning and ahfc, we're in a much better spot now than even a year ago for us to be able to make more meaningful and strategic decisions around those facilities overall as well as the four that are under consideration today. So with that, we'll answer any questions. We also have Michael Gates on the line as well. >> I have kind of a general question. I was sharing with some of my colleagues considerations and opportunities that I'm recognizing in district 1, and I shared with them this map that I have. It's a facilities map.

[4:37:43 PM]

It has a key and shows the legend shows where all the facilities are. But then it subsequently doesn't -- it says how it's used by department, but like I was sharing with you all, we found a space for all intents and purposes, this 2200-foot house, it's a house sitting empty. It has a couple of bottles of pool chemicals. A family could be living there. I wonder how long that's been sitting there empty with a couple of bottles of pool chemicals in it. I'm curious not just around the audit of the facilities themselves, but how are they actively presently current day used, what are the limitations to their use. Like do we have anything even remotely comprehensive like that, and if not, what council action would you all recommend that we give the city manager in terms of direction to get that. Having that information would be very helpful. >> I'm going to ask Michael if you can talk about what

[4:38:44 PM]

your team is doing for the real estate management system implementation and how that might help with answer the councilmember's question in the future. >> Harper-madison: And if I may add just to make sure we're really answering the question, I'll give you another anecdotal answer. We have another city asset that sits on 12th street. I asked multiple people, some literal on the paperwork as board members and they didn't know they were board members, which is terrifying. It's just sitting there empty. Half the people supposed to know what's happening inside this building has no clue. I went up, knocked on the door, it happened to be open. Not just are we making an assessment about the physical presence of the property but is a person on more than one occasion going to the place and talking to the people who are supposed to be the folks like running the whatever the thing is or

[4:39:45 PM]

the stewards for the space. Like even that, we didn't have stewardship for a space. That's an historically designated city-held asset. So there are certainly parts of town where things aren't being kept up with and so I just wonder how many of those places need somebody to physically go knock on the door and find out what's going on. >> Thank you for the question, councilmember. With the [inaudible] We hope to meld essentially -- with data. We've

got the inventory. And then typically building services, what those properties are used for. So with this new system, we hold to meld together those -- the inventory with those active uses. And then we could have a push of a button list of all -- [inaudible] And what they are actively being used for. We're actually implementing these processes right now

[4:40:45 PM]

and hope to have that online first quarter of 2023. But we are working on that and we hope to get that soon. >> Harper-madison: For fear of beating this thing all the way to death, I'm just going to say, I recognize limitations and capacity that we have as a municipality, and so I don't feel confident when you say that that we have the capacity for somebody to physically be going to these places. I guess I'm asking is there protocol. Aside from a number to call, leave a message and let's say somebody at that 974 number calls you back in three months, then you know. It's just the lag time, the drag time that how are we quickly assessing what's happening in these spaces. Is there a system? Do we have a system? Should we engage some of our volunteers -- we have d1 volunteers begging for something to do. Just trying to figure out how to quickly assess what

[4:41:48 PM]

is actually happening behind the doors. >> We will be relying on those departments, stewards of those properties to update the system. We'll need to establish a [inaudible] With that. But folks on the ground in those facilities. If there's a change in use or better use of a footprint, it won't be -- typically it's not proactive [inaudible] Going out and scouring for this information. But rather establishing a system where these departments notify us proactively that they are changing their use or their [inaudible]. >> Harper-madison: To be clear she that's my concern. >> Tovo: Mayor, may I say something? Councilmember harper-madison you raised a good question. There are other vacant properties and you asked about the policy measures. I just want to call your attention to lines to 170 in

[4:42:51 PM]

the public land item. Some of those are already embedded in the agenda, but one of the things in 170 to 177, that action would actually it sounds like it would work well with a system that you're rolling out, Michael Gates. It asks the manager to please report to council on city-owned facilities for those that are vacant or underutilized so council can be aware of them. I think there are some properties that could serve some really interesting purposes if the council were aware of them and could direct some further action. But until we have a mechanism for the manager reporting back on those, I don't know that it's going to be a source of information that the council has access to. That's lines 170 to 177 in item 36. >> Kitchen: I have a

[4:43:51 PM]

question about the municipal building. I have on more than one occasion, I've been part of some reviewing or touring the building for cultural space purposes. But I had thought that was something that was going to be done in conjunction with aedc, and I don't see that on this slide. Is it just not mentioned? It's still happening, right? >> That is a property that we've absolutely have been in discussion with the aedc. Regardless the purpose or use of that space, it requires comprehensive renovation. So that is a barrier at this point. But we've -- aedc would absolutely be a partner in that. >> Kitchen: I guess I'm reacting to the language that wasn't meant this way. The recommendation is pursue opportunities to make the building available for cultural space. But does that mean pursue

[4:44:51 PM]

opportunities with aedc. >> Yes, I'm sorry. >> Kitchen: Just to be clear. >> It is with aedc. It is not in our most recent conversations with them, it's not a top priority location because of the renovation needs that exist that space and the costs associated with them. >> Kitchen: Okay. Just for my colleagues' information and you may want to speak to this too, but on our December 8th agenda, next week, there's two properties that are -- two properties that will be -- there's an agenda item related to cultural trust. I understand we'll also have available -- I'll mull pull that item for work session. The aedc has been going through an rfp process for the bond money and also for other funds that are dedicated to cultural trust. And so the two items on the agenda next week, the two

[4:45:52 PM]

properties relate to that. But there are other properties and other arrangements that I think it's important for this council to be aware of. So we can either do that in work session or if it's the kind of thing that needs to be done in executive session, we could do it in executive session. But I think it's important that the council have a heads up. It's very exciting and we've been working on the use of that bond money ever since 2018, I believe, as well as other cultural trust dollars. So I think it's important that -- that the council understand the time line. I remain disappointed that we don't get to vote on it because I know the mayor has done a lot on this and others have done a lot on this, but at least we can talk about what you guys can vote on next year. So... >> Alter: I wanted to ask if you could speak a little bit more about our next

[4:46:53 PM]

steps with respect to the fact that more people are working from home. You mentioned you don't have money to do it, but what is planned and what is needed at this point? Because we have seen a considerable shift, as you noted, in work habits, and, you know, when we did the strategic facilities governance plan, which was worked on with audit and finance committee, there was considerable savings in A&M from switching from leasing to owning and if the number of spaces needed is less because we're doing more hoteling in terms of space, that increase could be even more over time. So I'm very interested in that, also interested from the teleworking and what it does in terms of mobility freeing up some mobility issues. Can you speak a little more to what you're doing? >> So the lack of funding

[4:47:56 PM]

bullet point, that was specific to the property feasibility studies that are being envisioned with aedc in partnership for those properties. That was a separate funding issue. When it comes to the space needs in general, like Daryl mentioned that we're doing administrative space planning where we're actively putting together the puzzle of where does everybody go that's in lease space to get them out of lease and into owned space. In addition to that we have been doing significant work about collecting data about teleworking practices within each of the departments. When it comes to the teleworking, it's not a one size fits all sort of situation. Each department has different work programs, services that require some may require folks to be in office regularly, others it can be done remotely. So we've been collecting data from the departments accordingly to figure out what's the amount of space we actually need. There was a resolution from

[4:48:56 PM]

councilmember Renteria that's been driving some of that work. So we're working on a response that can go back to council here as soon as possible. But that is absolutely part of the kind of the equation in determining our space needs. We know by eliminating the lease space, we're able to do that far more easily because of the hybrid working environment than we would have been prior to the pandemic. So silver lining of the pandemic, I suppose. But so that's something that we're actively working with. For example, the town lake center projects that Daryl mentioned, that will be one of the first opportunities for us to really put into practice -- once that space is ready to be moved into, that will be one of our first opportunities to really test the kind of that new approach to how we do the space planning, how we do hoteling and the sort. It has a lot of logistical

[4:49:56 PM]

requirements. It's not simply setting up desk space and folks walk in the door and do the work. There's a lot of technology needs to ensure there's either equipment available for computers available or docking stations. There's things like folks that have ergonomic requirements. There's a lot of different pieces to the puzzle to make that work, but tlc is definitely one of those spaces we can put those new approaches to work. And no matter what, the data of how people are teleworking or working in the office is a major driving component to it. >> Alter: Can you say one more time what's happening at town lake center? >> Town lake center was previously occupied by Austin energy. Since they moved to their new headquarters, we transferred ownership from ae to city of Austin in general. They were in the process of moving out so we're getting to a point where we can start doing some rearranging

[4:50:57 PM]

in there to be able to occupy it with support services departments and the sort, just other general city operations. So that's -- that helps us in moving out of the lease space. >> Alter: And what are we paying Austin energy for that space? >> There is -- try to remember off the top of my head. We had the mou -- if you give me one second, I can

pull that up. >> [Inaudible - no mic on]. >> It was around, oh, gosh, around 30 million total. There was an appraisal done of the property, so we do -- according to that appraisal we are -- there's a payment back to ae over a number of years to cover that cost to make the ratepayers whole on that amount. And I'm almost there.

[4:52:00 PM]

>> 30.5 million. >> Thank you. \$30.5 million in total. >> Alter: I'm fine with the rate there, but city manager, when you give us answers Thursday on our other ae questions, if he with know this much certainty about the sale to Austin energy, sounds like a pretty known variable that we could be calculating and reducing by five or six million a year the revenue. Requirement. Accordingly. I mean this sounds like we're already moved in there and we've agreed on the price, if I'm understanding what you just said. >> We've not physically moved in. No. So -- and, I mean, it's not like there's just an automatic savings for ae. I want to refrain from speaking for them, but there's the costs they are incurring at the new facility. It wasn't just we're no longer having to pay for

[4:53:00 PM]

this building because it was a owned entity. >> Mayor Adler: We asked Austin energy for a list. Could you add to that list. They said it didn't credit in the year they were analyzing. So I guess the question is whether or not it credited in the year you are analyzing, it's \$30.5 million. Is that appropriately taken into account whether we're figuring out what the revenue is, revenue requirement is and let them put forth their best argument for whatever position they take. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: Yes, on that 411 Chicon, I notice that -- I go by there almost every other day, but I know that there are going to be some more development, but couldn't we use the

[4:54:02 PM]

displacement money that we're getting from our taxes from metro? Because it's less than two blocks from the rail station. And it's in a prime area. So I would really look into, you know, using some of that affordable money to try to work with someone else, you know, someone in the private business or non-profit to look into that. And at the same time, you know, we have some of the small city office buildings there located right off of fourth street -- I mean fifth street, excuse me. And we could incorporate those office buildings into that and have it like a mixed use building where our city employees can work there and might even have the opportunity to be able to live there at the same time. So I would recommend that y'all look at it that way. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Tovo: I really agree.

[4:55:04 PM]

It seems to me these four properties really present enormous opportunities and I again want to recognize mayor pro tem to bringing about the resolution of 411. That was a lot of progress that happened early on and we have the three memos I distributed earlier but it never moved forward. In many ways it's like the Ryan drive property. It

made a lot of sense to have city functions there at one point, but now in addition to city offices, and thank you, I had the opportunity to tour recently and saw our fleet services is there, but we also have about a 9,000 square foot warehouse storing our city's used furniture, which I think is a really important function to have, but no longer necessary in central east Austin in the middle of our transit oriented development. I wonder about, for example, whether that furniture could go and be housed at, say, the convention center warehouse or somewhere outside of our central city. Again, I love that we buy --

[4:56:06 PM]

that we keep that old furniture working through our system, but I don't think that's the best and highest use of that right there on that site. So again, I think these four properties are really -- I really appreciate the way in which you talked about the aedc's role in each of those. I think that's very consistent with the resolution we're considering for Thursday about making sure that the manager is directed to negotiate with the aedc with regard to these four properties so that we can see them moving forward. I think there are a lot of possibilities with all of them and especially with 411. And if we have that entity we've set up to do this very kind of project, I think we'll see movement on those four and I'm excited about that and I thank you all for your work. I want to not lose sight of the downtown Austin community court. The staff had come forward when we asked the manager to find a permanent site with a recommendation that they be -- that our 124 west eighth street be used for

[4:57:07 PM]

the downtown Austin community court. You were asked, we postponed it and you were asked to have stakeholder meetings and that was the last we heard about it, last spring. It sounds like from this presentation as if the conversation around the muni building is strictly looking at it for cultural purposes which leaves us without a permanent home for the downtown court. It does need a permanent home. Maybe it's one Texas center and the redevelopment of that or another city-owned site, but it should be downtown, not south of the river, but regardless, regardless of what council decides, we postponed that and I didn't intend for it to be indefinite postponement. Mayor, you made the motion, I don't know that you intended it to be an indefinite postponement and it's not fair to the downtown court personnel for that to be a pending question. I just note that.

[4:58:07 PM]

Again, thanks. I think there are a lot of good possibilities here and I'm excited about it. Also excited about some of the things that we're talking about that would bring these questions up before council on a more regular basis so some of the properties that are not being specifically talked about can also be considered for other purposes like the property you mentioned, councilmember. >> Mayor Adler: Anybody on this before we stop? It's 5:00. >> Quick question of the of the items you listed for city facilities, which one would you recommend that we prioritize for that feasibility assessment. >> Which location? >> 411 has got to be -- >> I think 411 Chicon is probably -- would probably be kind of the most productive. There's so much other -- like the [inaudible]

[4:59:08 PM]

Building, it's in need of renovation costs, group street, that's more easily achievable space. One Texas center, that's a heavy lift on that one. >> I think I get your biggest bang for buck out of 411. It's just some great opportunities there. If we do our due diligence and really do a methodical look at how do you maximize the use. >> Good deal. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: As I look at housing projects in downtown, and I've often spoken in this debate about where things should be at ground zero or not, I think when we own the property like this in that situation, the considerations are different because we can get to that lower basis because of the ownership. As we see things play out. Not a hard and fast rule, have to look at the tracts and what the alternatives

[5:00:09 PM]

are. Yes, Natasha. >> Harper-madison: Here we go. Just two things. I was hoping that y'all could offer us the opportunity to really as a body be more clear about the intended purpose for the separate entities. I was in a conversation with other day and the person didn't intended to it, but I can see how easy it was to do. They were interchanging the economic development corporation with the Austin economic development corporation -- or EdD with aedc, and then with now the facilities, is it facilities management? >> Strategic facility governance team. >> Harper-madison: No, but it was -- management corporation or -- it was a shorter. >> [Off mic] >> Harper-madison: Too many people. >> PFC? >> Public facilities

[5:01:10 PM]

corporation. All the acronyms. >> Harper-madison: So the PFC, EdD, aed consider. Could you very quickly let us know who does what and who does not? I with the fleet services site, I've talked to for years now the arr in fleet services folks, but only very recently what I heard or who we heard from about that site was the facilities -- the -- the efc. >> PFC. >> Harper-madison: PFC. I'm trying to figure out who's who and what's what. As an extension of that, there's actually I was visiting a friend in Clarksville and there is a facility in Clarksville and I just found myself thinking what a very empty looking space. It's the Clarksville community health center. And the lot looks huge and the parking lot was huge. And it was the middle of the

[5:02:10 PM]

week on a weekday and there was two cars in this giant parking lot. When we see things like that, I would like to know for my colleagues probably do this too when you are out and about you are seeing things like that really have to do with transit or sidewalks and I sort of take note. If we're out and about and we see something like that and wonder, you know, I guess Michael that question is for you. As you are going through this assessment with our -- with our stock, with our assets, what's the best way to shoot you over like I have this address for this Clarksville community health center and some of the basic stuff I know. What's the best way to shoot it over to you to get a quick assessment about what are the possibilities here and whose radar should it be on if not already. >> A phone

call or [inaudible]. >> Harper-madison: And then the other one? >> So when it comes to the alphabet soup of the aedc,

[5:03:12 PM]

sat and pfcs, so right now the only PFC exists there's an affordable housing PFC. Sfgt. We discussed that, a combination of Daryl and myself and Michael. And we are focusing on city-owned properties. For EdD versus aedc, I think there's -- there's a transition of roles and responsibilities that previously EdD would have been handling that are shifting over with aedc since council's creation of it. I know from sfgt standpoint we are being looking at particularly opportunities where we can partner with them that allows for them to have revenue generation for them to be able to sustain themselves. So we're also working on a more clear roles and responsibilities type of chart that can be easily shared. So I'm not necessarily prepared to right off the

[5:04:14 PM]

cuff go through all the rules and responsibilities, but something -- that's something I will be -- we're working on that we can share with you all to make it easier. >> Tovo: Mayor? Just a couple quick things. Councilmember harper-madison, I have some information about that site because I think I brought and our council passed a resolution related to another property. The Clarksville community development corporation has been in conversations with our housing department about that site. And so if you remind me, I will try to collect that information and pass it along to you because I -- it was a neighbor -- it is a neighborhood center and I think a lot of its audience is dispersed across the city and it's a site that would be great and the Clarksville community development corporation has been in conversations and I think would very much like to use that and redevelop it for housing. There were some impediments to that and I can't remember what they are, but those are

[5:05:15 PM]

conversation they were having with our public health folks but also our housing folks. I think it would be a good site to take a look and see whether there's an opportunity there potentially with that really wonderful community development corporation to crowd in and create housing opportunities. Remind me and I'll pass it along. >> Renteria: Just like the east Austin neighborhood center, a lot of that was funded through federal funding. That's a lot of restriction comes with that. >> Tovo: That would be part of the valuing. But maybe there is some possibilities there. >> [Off mic] >> Tovo: I think the challenge was more about the -- about possibly what councilmember Renteria said because there was another property that the city owned that in the consideration of these conversations we did -- course of the conversations we did transfer to the Clarksville development corporation. There was another city-owned

[5:06:15 PM]

tract they had raised at the same time is that we were able to effectively transfer and they are building on it. The other thing I just wanted to note, and if you could when you are returning the response about the -- about town lake center, recently staff communicated with us about a property transfer from department to department and I thought it was this one but I may be wrong. It caught my attention because it talked about the method of calculating the costs and it was going to be the price that this department had paid plus the carrying costs were going to be assessed to the new department. I raise this because it is also captured in item 36. Because from time to time with the Ryan drive, with other properties, the question has come up like how could that department be reimbursed and should that department be reimbursed for the current market value or should they just be made whole -- or should the original department just be made whole for their

[5:07:16 PM]

original price plus the carrying costs. And I just think it's really important because in the early days councilmember pool, the Ryan drive tract looked like -- when I was working with community members to bring that forward for potential redevelopment as affordable housing, the cost, the market price -- the market value of that tract was really high. And so had Austin energy needed to get the market value out of it, we probably wouldn't have been able to redevelop it for housing. I think it's role important that we use a mechanism like the one you just recently used which is, again, the department gets made whole for the purchase price, plus any carrying costs, but not necessarily the marketplace. We're keeping it within the city of Austin using a simple purpose. But that is -- that's one of those wheels that we've had to reinvent a couple times and it's prevented a couple good projects from moving forward as quickly as they might have because of that cost associated. So I hope we got that answered, but if it's not

[5:08:16 PM]

what I just described, I want to know what the project is that I described that we had gotten an email about where that was the methodology. I think that should be the methodology going forward. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I believe we've handled everything. Thanks for the presentation, thank you for the work. We'll go ahead and end the meeting here at 5:08. This meeting is adjourned. Remember, we have the group meeting tomorrow on project connect and then the council meeting on Thursday. Hopefully we'll be able to handle it all on Thursday and not extend over until Friday as all meetings can. But let's see if we can get done on Thursday. I think we probably can. With that, we'll see you later. >> Tovo: Sorry to be tedious, my staff mentioned the one where the methodology was what I just described was 2201 grove boulevard. So if that's not the

[5:09:18 PM]

methodology that was used in the transfer of the building for financial service -- from ae to financial services, I would like an explanation of why. >> Can you say the address again? >> Tovo: 2201 grove boulevard. The original -- >> Mayor Adler: Maybe the best way to get that information to us is in that memo where you address that topic, the answer. With that this meeting is adjourned.