

**MINUTES**  
**CITIZENS BOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, July 12, 2005**  
**JOE C. THOMPSON CENTER, RM. 1.110**  
**6:00 PM**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Diane Akers	Steve Martin
Dr. Charles Akins	Richard Moya
Glenn Coleman	Nell Penridge
Jim Davis	Leslie Pool
David Hartman	Rod Reyna
Leonard Huber	Sal Valdez
Perry Lorenz	

**TRAVIS COUNTY STAFF AND GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Doyne Bailey	Belinda Powell
Charles Bergh	Mark Richardson
Joyce Best	Wendy Scaperotta
Jo Carol Bradshaw	Stacey Scheffell
Lisa Brown	Beth Ann Sprengel
Neil Cable	Mike Trimble
Art Cardenas	Roy Turley
Trek English	Robert Turner
Ken Gaede	Gretchen Vaden
Joe Gieselman	Joe Vela
Scott Isgett	Charlie Watts
Peggy Hill	Martin Zamzow
Pete McKae	

- 1. Citizens Communication:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman Moya at 6:05 p.m. Chairman Moya asked if there were any citizens in the audience that had comments or questions.

Joyce Best, a citizen from Travis County, spoke in favor of Drainage Project #6 and against the inclusion of Arterial A (Project #1). Chairman Moya made the comment that these projects may not be included on the list of CBAC recommended projects, and Mr. Gieselman clarified that statement by stating that these projects (#6 and #1) are on the list of original candidate projects.

Citizen Communications continued with Scott Isgett stating his support for the Reimer's Ranch project. He said that it's a one-time opportunity to save the land.

Trek English spoke next in favor of Drainage Project #6 and against the inclusion of Arterial A (Project #1). She says that six homes are in danger and subject to flooding and people's lives are at stake.

**2. Review And Consider Approval Of Minutes Of The June 22, 2005 and June 23, 2005**

**Meetings:** Chairman Moya gave the committee a few minutes to review the minutes from June 22, 2005 and June 23, 2005. Dr. Akins motioned that the June 22<sup>nd</sup> minutes be approved as written; it was seconded by Glen Coleman, and unanimously approved by the committee. Next, Sal Valdez motioned that the minutes from June 23<sup>rd</sup> be approved as written. It was seconded by Leonard Huber, and unanimously approved by the committee.

**3. Review And Consider Information About the Proposed Projects During Subcommittee**

**Meetings for the following topics:** Chairman Moya asked if the subcommittees needed additional meeting time before reporting, or if any of them were ready to make a report at this time. Mr. Coleman stated that the Mobility and Drainage subcommittee was ready to report. Ms. Akers stated that Parks & Open Space subcommittee needed time to meet. Chairman Moya acknowledged her request, but suggested that they go ahead and vote on the subcommittees that were ready first. He also said that it is important that we try to approve the project list soon due to the scheduled report to Commissioners' Court that following Tuesday.

Mr. Coleman presented his report for the Drainage & Mobility by first thanking all the subcommittee members for their hard work, doing the best they could for all of Travis County with limited funds. In regards to the report, he said the projects were not ranked. They began with approximately \$240 million dollars worth of projects and resolved early to be as disciplined as they could be, removing projects from the candidate list that they didn't feel were absolutely essential. Mr. Coleman presented a total of \$62 million for mobility and drainage projects of which \$55 million dollars were mobility related. Again, he said the projects were not ranked, and "...if it made our list, it is important." He also said that if it's essential, they could go back and rewrite these, but he would ask for the general committee's indulgence in letting these stand as a package. Mr. Coleman gave a brief explanation of their selection process, stating that they looked more at each specific project and the needs of that specific project, and were less attentive to the projects location and precinct. Mr. Coleman then offered to entertain any questions and/or comments the committee may have had.

Ms. Pool asked if Mr. Coleman would address Trek English's (Citizen) comments concerning the Walnut Creek issues. Mr. Coleman stated that there was a matrix of factors they looked at with regards to drainage. One was public safety, another accessibility, and also the availability of funds via FEMA. He also said for Walnut Creek to have made our list, the project would have had to leap frog over several other projects that did not make the list. He stated that the subcommittee took the ones that they thought were critical and wished they had more funds available so they could have included more projects in their list.

Mr. Coleman made a motion to approve \$62,2693 million for the subcommittee's Drainage & Mobility Projects, which include Slaughter Lane's full cost of constructing the road. Mr. Valdez seconded the motion.

Ms. Pool addressed the chairman noting that the Committee had just received these numbers and hadn't had time to consider them in relation to the other projects they're reviewing. She wanted an explanation of what the impact of approving the Mobility and Drainage subcommittee's recommendation would be, asking whether endorsing the subcommittee's recommendation that night implied that there is no further action to be taken on that recommendation. Mr. Coleman

clarified his motion by stating that the motion is to adopt the recommendation of the Drainage & Mobility subcommittee in the amount of \$62 million and change.

Chairman Moya stated that there is a meeting scheduled with the Commissioner's Court the following Tuesday, and that he would like to present amounts for all three categories at that time, and then have public hearings on their recommendation to include particular projects in the bond program. Public hearings could be at the same locations that were used before for the public meetings. After the public hearings are held, the Committee will meet to reconsider their recommendations given the additional input they get from the hearings. The Committee's final recommendations will then be made to the Commissioner's Court for their approval.

Ms. Pool stated that she would be more comfortable if the subcommittees were allowed to proceed with their work, to finalize their recommendations, prior to approving the Drainage and Mobility amount. She noted that she has just seen what their numbers were, and since she has been thinking about parks and open space projects for the last few months, she would like some time to be able to consider these other numbers. She's hesitant to vote because she hasn't had enough information or time to think about it.

Mr. Reyna agreed with Ms. Pool's position and said that he too just received the reports today and it would be good to have the time to digest the facts and read the subcommittee report that they're submitting as a group. He said that this way they could compare the numbers from the individual subcommittees and see if they add up to \$100 million or more, and then work as a committee to review individual projects if required. Mr. Reyna expressed again that everyone had just received the figures and that he's not ready to vote so quickly. He wanted more time.

Mr. Coleman asked if they could have that discussion now. Chairman Moya stated that there was a motion and a second motion on the floor that needed to be addressed. Ms. Penridge asked if they were determining the \$100 million total right now, or whether this was just an initial amount. Chairman Moya said that, with the timeline they had for meeting the bond election deadlines, they were required to finalize something that night. Mr. Gieselman stated that they would need to have a report to the Commissioner's Court on the following Tuesday consisting basically of what they adopted that night. The Committee could then make their final recommendations after the hearings were held.

Ms. Pool said, in light of Mr. Gieselman's comments, she would like to make a substitute motion that the Committee receive the reports from the three subcommittees that night, in the state that they're in. These subcommittee reports would form the report to the Commissioner's Court next week.

Mr. Davis interjected that he was disappointed that the street he lives on was not on the list of recommended Mobility Projects. He said that he got caught up working on the Jail subcommittee, and didn't have a chance to see the other projects. Mr. Coleman asked Mr. Davis if he would like him to add his street to the list of projects, and Mr. Davis said yes.

Chairman Moya stated that they could make amendments to the motion presented, and then vote on the original motion. He asked if anyone had an amendment. Ms. Pool stated that she had made a substitute motion, and repeated it. Mr. Gieselman stated that, from what he understood from Ms. Pool's substitute motion, the Committee would gather all of the subcommittee's recommendations that night, and make that their Committee report. He noted that they may or may not meet the

\$100 million dollar limit but they had some latitude to make changes after the public hearings. Chairman Moya said the problem that with the substitute motion is that they would be going to the public hearings with no *Committee* recommendations, i.e., they would be going to the public hearings with *subcommittee* recommendations. He noted that if they had more time, they could have held another meeting the following Tuesday but "...the Public Hearings are upon us."

Mr. Coleman noted that this is just their current recommendation, and that these things evolve and will be subject to negotiation. Mr. Hartman said subcommittees were tasked to scrutinize the numbers and come up with respective best project lists, and he encouraged Committee members to respect that process, considering the time constraints they had on completing their work. Ms. Pool said that she agrees with what Mr. Hartman said and that it captured the essence of what she was saying.

Ms. Pool then **reiterated** her substitute motion, and Ms. Akers seconded the **substitute** motion. Mr. Moya asked for any discussion on that motion. Mr. Gieselman stated that the recommendation of the full Committee is a compilation of subcommittee reports, and what hasn't been done yet is a trade off between each subcommittee. Mr. Huber said that it is imperative that the Committee come up with a recommendation and not just use the subcommittees' recommendations. He's willing to wait until he hears the other subcommittee reports, but he will not endorse submitting three subcommittee reports to the Commissioner's Court above \$100 million dollars.

Mr. Reyna made the comment that he wasn't sure if all the subcommittees received enhanced or revised numbers from County staff yet. He wanted to know if they were voting on something before they had the revised numbers that they were promised. Chairman Moya knew that the Jail committee was waiting on numbers from County staff. Mr. Reyna informed him that the Parks & Open Space subcommittee was waiting for revised numbers as well.

Ms. Penridge asked Mr. Coleman to explain the importance of having the three individual subcommittee reports go to the Commissioner's Court on Tuesday and then the public hearings. Mr. Huber replied to Ms. Penridge's question, stating that the committee was charged with allocating \$100 million dollars and they haven't done that if they send a report to the Court that is more than a million dollars.

Mr. Reyna suggested that they meet in subcommittees, as shown in the agenda, so they could talk with other subcommittee members. Chairman Moya explained that he has a substitute motion on the floor that needed to be addressed and asked if everyone was ready to vote. Ms. Pool withdrew her substitute motion **on the condition that subcommittees meet in advance of the full committee voting on all three subcommittee reports**, and Ms. Akers seconded the motion to withdraw. Mr. Coleman also withdrew his original motion of \$62 million dollars toward the Drainage & Mobility projects, and Mr. Valdez seconded the motion to withdraw **the substitute motion**. At that time the members broke into subcommittees for discussion at 6:35pm. Meeting resumed at 7:30 pm called to order by Chairman Moya.

- 4. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on Subcommittee Recommendations, if any, for reducing the number or scope of proposed projects:** Mr. Moya asked for reports from each committee.

Drainage, Bridge And Mobility Projects: Mr. Coleman stated that their committee met and made two brief amendments: 1) Added a drainage project totaling \$1.7 million dollars, and 2) are

requesting that the Court adopted guidelines pertaining to private/public participation be imbedded in the bond covenant. This motion to approve the subcommittee's recommended project list, totaling \$63.7 million dollars, and adding the language adopted by the Court regarding private/public participation to the bond covenant, was seconded by Ms. Pool, and unanimously approved by the CBAC.

Parks and Open Space Projects: Ms. Akers stated that the subcommittee was in agreement on project priorities and costs, as follows: SW Metro Park/Reimer's Ranch- \$7 million, East Metro Phase II – \$6.5 million, NE Metro (including a skate park) - \$4.5 million, SE Improvement - \$2.8 million, Water Quality - \$3.4 million, Arkansas Bend (w/improvements) - \$6.5 million. They also recommended eliminating the Onion Creek project. Ms. Akers stated that they cut the project budget from \$45 million to \$30.5 million. The recommended amount of \$30.5 million dollars was seconded by Mr. Coleman, and unanimously approved by the CBAC.

Jail Facility Project: Mr. Martin made a recommendation of \$20 million dollars for Jails, and explained how the subcommittee arrived at this figure.

He said the initial cost projection, which included variance beds, was approximately \$127 million dollars, whereas the most recent cost projection, which was presented that day in more detail, was around \$86 million dollars. Mr. Martin continued, saying that the \$86 million dollars includes variance beds, for which \$40 million has already been approved, so \$43 million is the amount that needs to be funded by the bond package.

Mr. Martin said the committee is recommending \$20 million, however, and explained why it's a valid recommendation: it will force the staff, who are very capable planners, to revisit some issues.

He said that one issue is whether all of those buildings proposed to be torn down need to be torn down. The subcommittee doesn't believe they do. Although most of the buildings merit demolition, there are three particular buildings that they believe have useful life for another "...3 years out, 5 years or 7 years", which amounts to an approximately 300+ capacity.

Another issue is that the subcommittee thinks the estimated \$40, \$35, or \$30 thousand estimate to replace each bed is a too high.

Mr. Martin also said they believe that some of the funds allocated for the variance beds could be used on something other than temporary improvements. He stated that approximately \$20 to \$23 million dollars could be saved and put towards other uses.

The recommended amount of \$20 million dollars was seconded by Ms. Pool, and unanimously approved by the CBAC.

- 5. Discuss and Take Appropriate Action on 2<sup>nd</sup> Report to Travis County Commissioners Court.** Chairman Moya will send a copy of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Report to the Committee members before it is submitted to Commissioner's Court.
- 6. Discuss Proposed Schedule for Public Hearings (Week of July 25<sup>th</sup> and August 1<sup>st</sup>).** See attachment for Chairs of each meeting and subcommittee representative.
- 7. Review and Discuss Next Meeting Agenda**

Chairman Moya announced that the date of the next CBAC meeting is tentative, and they will not meet until further notice.

Mr. Lorenz addressed Chairman Moya, wanting to talk about the proposition to buy natural areas. Mr. Lorenz stated that members might recall that Chairman Moya and himself made their first presentation of the group's ideas to the Commissioner's Court, mentioning that the Parks & Open Space subcommittee asked the Commissioner's to consider a stand-alone proposition to buy natural areas. He said the support for the proposition has been determined by a poll that was paid for by Hill Country Conservancy, The Nature Conservancy and Trust for Public Land. The data has come back and he has made it available to the subcommittee. He also noted that the County Commissioners are aware of it and are very open to the idea. The poll, he said, shows that the Travis County voters approve or look at favorably, by margin 2 to 1, to spending \$60 million for the purpose of buying Open Space.

Another thing to consider is voters' willingness to vote to raise their taxes by \$16 dollars per year for the average family homeowner for the purpose of buying \$60 million dollars worth of natural areas. Mr. Lorenz stated that Reimers Ranch would not be a part of this package, and that the funds would be at the discretion of the Commissioners Court on how to spend it.

Mr. Moya wanted to be absolutely clear about the proposition and stated that there will be several propositions to vote up or down -- are voters "...for the roads and against the parks, or for the parks and against the jail..." -- but the open space proposition is different because it will be a vote to raise taxes. Mr. Tom Nuckols, County Attorney, stated the Commissioner's Court could do it however they want to. For example, they could have one proposition for the whole \$100 million, making it all or nothing, but typically their practice is to break it down by subject matter. Mr. Reyna asked are the committees charged to give them a recommendation on how we would like that presented. Mr. Nuckols said that Mr. Gieselman pointed out that there are different kinds of debt so the propositions would have to be done separately. He said that there is some flexibility in how it's done, and yes there is a possibility that one or more of these projects could be voted for or against on an individual basis. Mr. Lorenz stated that his intention is that the \$100 million dollars of projects will be revenue neutral but this stand-alone proposition will be tied to a tax increase. Ms. Akers asked whether the \$3.4 million dollars allocated to the Water Quality project in their subcommittee's recommendation be included in the Open Space proposition. Mr. Lorenz said no.

The motion was approved unanimously by the CBAC for "The proposition to buy Natural Areas"

## **8. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 7:58 pm.

## **Attachment**

### **Public Hearings (2005 CBAC Sign-Up Sheet) July 22, 2005**

#### **Northern Travis County (Pflugerville)– Monday, July 25, 2005 (7:00 PM)**

Rod Reyna - Chair  
Glen Coleman  
Leslie Pool  
Nell Penridge (possible)

#### **Downtown Austin (Commissioners' Courtroom) - Tuesday, July 26, 2005 (6:00 PM)**

Perry Lorenz - Chair  
Leslie Pool  
Diane Akers  
Nell Penridge  
Glen Coleman (possible)

#### **Southeast Travis County (Baty Elementary School) - Thursday, July 28, 2005 (6:30 PM)**

Richard Moya - Chair  
Jon Hockenyos  
Sal Valdez

#### **East Travis County (Satellite One) - Wednesday, August 3, 2005 (6:30 PM)**

Dr. Charles Akins - Chair  
Diane Akers  
Jim Davis

#### **West Travis County (Precinct Three Office Complex, Building A)- Thursday, August 4, 2005 (6:30 PM)**

David Hartman - Chair  
Leonard Huber  
Rod Reyna  
Nell Penridge