

Randi Shade

From: Laura Morrison [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2009 9:01 AM
To: [REDACTED]; 'Lorri Michel'
Cc: 'Marti Bier'
Subject: RE: AAC Resolution

Ditto on the thanks to you, Lorri. The work you have done has really helped this city move forward!

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2009 8:28 AM
To: Lorri Michel; Laura Morrison
Cc: Marti Bier
Subject: Re: AAC Resolution

Thanks Lorri. The new members on the Commission are really making a difference already. Thanks again!

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

From: "Lorri Michel"
Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2009 05:34:33 -0600
To: Randi Shade<[REDACTED]> [REDACTED]
Subject: AAC Resolution
Randi and Laura,

I wanted to thank you both for sponsoring the AAC Resolution. It is an important step toward ending the killing of our homeless pets. Thank you both again very much and happy new year.

Lorri
Michel Law Firm, P.C.
812 San Antonio, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78701
Phone: (512) 477-0200
Fax: (512) 477-6636
Cell: (512) 431-9465

Do justice, love mercy and walk humbly with your God. Micah 6:8

Randi Shade

From: Brian Rodgers [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2009 12:15 PM
To: 'Laura Morrison'; 'Randi Shade'; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us
Subject: Statesman Reporter

Hi Council Members Laura, Randi and Lee,

It seems that the reporter Marty Toohey may be playing us off each other a bit. I heard he may have used my name trying to stir up controversy where there was none.

The first time I ever spoke with Marty was 3 days ago, Wednesday the 14th. Linda in my office called me to say Marty wanted to talk to me but his deadline was 4 pm. I forgot and called him at 4:30 pm. We introduced ourselves, talked about incentives in general, where did Katie Humphries go, and miscellaneous. He asked me about the new resolution on incentives and I told him I had seen a draft and that it was a "massive improvement" over the ad hoc behind the scenes process we had seen in the past. I explained to him that the resolution had a narrow scope and was specifically concerned with a public, transparent, and believable cost/benefit analysis with public hearings, and that it wasn't supposed to be the final word on incentives or address who is eligible, or compliance or penalty provisions if goals are not met. I gave him ideas on how that might all look if addressed later.

He then said, "Let me take the other side of the fence. The chamber might say that the openness will jeopardize the secrecy needed to attract these companies and could hurt Austin's economy". I told him that it was nonsense and that any economic developer or site selection specialist will tell you that the most important factors in site location are quality of life, workforce, schools, proximity to suppliers, cost of living, etc.. and that incentives are only an afterthought. The only reason for secrecy is so that cities can be played off each other if and when incentives are broached. Most times, the decision to locate has already been made and there are no other cities even in the running. The companies are just seeking icing on the cake. Regardless, it's public money and we have a right to know.

Anyway, if I need to have a sit down with Marty, please let me know.

Thanks,

Brian Rodgers
366-5000

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG.

Version: 7.5.552 / Virus Database: 270.10.8/1898 - Release Date: 1/16/2009 3:09 PM

Randi Shade

From: Laura Morrison [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 18, 2009 12:14 AM
To: 'Brian Rodgers'; 'Randi Shade'; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us
Cc: LauraCC Morrison
Subject: RE: Statesman Reporter

Brian – Thanks for the clarification.
Laura

From: Brian Rodgers [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2009 12:15 PM
To: 'Laura Morrison'; 'Randi Shade'; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us
Subject: Statesman Reporter

Hi Council Members Laura, Randi and Lee,

It seems that the reporter Marty Toohey may be playing us off each other a bit. I heard he may have used my name trying to stir up controversy where there was none.

The first time I ever spoke with Marty was 3 days ago, Wednesday the 14th. Linda in my office called me to say Marty wanted to talk to me but his deadline was 4 pm. I forgot and called him at 4:30 pm. We introduced ourselves, talked about incentives in general, where did Katie Humphries go, and miscellaneous. He asked me about the new resolution on incentives and I told him I had seen a draft and that it was a “massive improvement” over the ad hoc behind the scenes process we had seen in the past. I explained to him that the resolution had a narrow scope and was specifically concerned with a public, transparent, and believable cost/benefit analysis with public hearings, and that it wasn't supposed to be the final word on incentives or address who is eligible, or compliance or penalty provisions if goals are not met. I gave him ideas on how that might all look if addressed later.

He then said, “Let me take the other side of the fence. The chamber might say that the openness will jeopardize the secrecy needed to attract these companies and could hurt Austin's economy”. I told him that it was nonsense and that any economic developer or site selection specialist will tell you that the most important factors in site location are quality of life, workforce, schools, proximity to suppliers, cost of living, etc.. and that incentives are only an afterthought. The only reason for secrecy is so that cities can be played off each other if and when incentives are broached. Most times, the decision to locate has already been made and there are no other cities even in the running. The companies are just seeking icing on the cake. Regardless, it's public money and we have a right to know.

Anyway, if I need to have a sit down with Marty, please let me know.

Thanks,

Brian Rodgers
366-5000

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG.

Version: 7.5.552 / Virus Database: 270.10.8/1898 - Release Date: 1/16/2009 3:09 PM

Randi Shade

From: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2009 6:45 PM
To: greg.meszaros@ci.austin.tx.us
Cc: marc.ott@ci.austin.tx.us; rudy.garza@ci.austin.tx.us; will.wynn@ci.austin.tx.us; brewster.mccracken@ci.austin.tx.us; Randi Shade; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us; mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us; Slusher, Daryl; Watson, Matt; Marty Toohey
Subject: Clarification, questions, and request for action on water conservation and WTP4
Attachments: ltr to Meszaraos 1-29-09.doc

Dear Mr. Meszaros,

Please accept the attached letter. I look forward to speaking with you on this matter.

Very best regards,

Bill Bunch



January 27, 2009

Greg Meszaros, Director
Austin Water Utility
City of Austin
Austin, Texas

Re: Water conservation, peak day demands, Water Treatment Plant No. 4 and the
Statesman coverage of January 25, 2009

Dear Mr. Meszaros:

In the interests of accuracy and open communication, I wanted to follow up on the *Statesman*'s story of last Sunday to both correct the record and ask for further clarification from you. I also ask that you and appropriate members of your staff meet with me and other representatives of the environmental community to discuss specifics of the City's water conservation efforts and preparations for WTP4.

In seeking clarification on AWU information provided to the *Statesman*, I ask that you or your representative explain clearly why the Utility has recently switched to speaking about peak day "pumpage" instead of peak day demands, or usage. It was only a few months ago that Mr. Dan Strub of your staff explained to me how the utility had been reporting peak "pumpage" figures as peak "usage," but that in order to be more accurate your staff went back and, consulting your records on the draining and filling of storage tanks, had adjusted your previous "peak day usage" figures to accurately report actual peak day usage. Mr. Strub gave me the corrected figures, and I have been using them in numerous settings with AWU staff present. No one has challenged the use of these figures.

Now AWU has begun speaking to the public and the press about peak "pumpage" figures, and confusing these figures with peak day demands. From the outside it appears that the only explanation for this switch is to conceal the fact that actual *demands* peaked in 2001, and thus we have seven subsequent years (not the "single year" you referenced in the *Statesman*) showing that peak day demands are flat or declining, not increasing.

The AWU switch to speaking of peak pumping rather than peak use also conceals the fact that our peak day *demand* last summer was 219 MGD, not 229 MGD.

Save Springs Alliance

(512) 477-2320 voice
(512) 477-6410 fax

P.O. Box 684881 • Austin, Texas 78768
221 East 9th Street, Suite 300 • Austin, Texas 78701

<http://www.sosalliance.org>
email: sosinfo@sosalliance.org

Since the utility can control when it refills its tanks (or, conversely, allows them to be drawn down) I can't see any reason for the city to now use peak day pumping figures for planning purposes or for communicating to the public as to our peak day demands. If there is any professional literature, memoranda, or operations standards that explain and support this view, please provide them so that I and other interested citizens can understand this important change in perspective and procedures.

Also, to set the record straight, the *Statesman* incorrectly reported that I claimed that AWU's population served increased 100,000 people between 2005 and 2008. I never said that. I said that it increased 100,000 from 2001 to 2008. (The exact figure, from AWU records, is just under 100,000.) I did not want you and your staff to have the false impression that I was providing incorrect information to the press and the public.

While we may disagree on the conclusions that may be drawn, I hope that AWU representatives and conservation representatives can work more closely together to assure accurate information and to narrow the issues of disagreement to as few as possible.

We do again urge you and your staff to reconsider your rush to build WTP4. I understand the difficulty of any organization, especially large ones like AWU, to step back and objectively assess the pros and cons of continuing with an established course of action, especially one that is decades and tens of millions of dollars in the making. Certainly there are many AWU employees who have worked on WTP4 for years and are understandably committed to seeing their work completed. There are private contractors with whom AWU has longstanding relationships who stand to earn many hundreds of millions of dollars more if WTP4 goes forward.

However, AWU has repeatedly put WTP4 on hold, recognizing that there were better, more affordable options – and also recognizing that conservation efforts meant that there was no need to rush forward on expanding capacity. Also, both you and Mr. Ott have made commitments to making significant improvements to AWU management. You, and the City, have made similar public commitments to conservation and sustainability. These are qualities that can be measured. Austin is no where near being as efficient in our use of water – on average or on peak – as we could be and as other cities are. By taking actions that cost a fraction of building WTP4, the recent data, sound management, and AWU's own standards for assuring adequate treatment capacity all support postponing WTP4 for at least a few years while we focus efforts on conservation, reuse, and evaluating all options through the City's comprehensive planning process.

The only down side to this approach is the (extremely) remote possibility that we might have to implement Austin's drought management plan a few extra days for one summer or two down the road. That hardly compares to the up side of postponing. We gain no water security from expanding treatment capacity. To the contrary, we endanger our water future. Both water security and affordability come from moving deliberately toward being a leader in water conservation – and pushing those who share our water resources to make similar commitments to conservation and reuse.

Conversely, spending another \$400 million on WTP4 at this time will directly discourage conservation efforts for decades to come. Since our neighbors (fortunately or unfortunately) look to Austin to set the “green” standard, our foot-dragging and water waste will ripple out across the region and the state at precisely the time water providers everywhere should be investing in conservation and reuse, not massive infra-structure projects that both assume decades of water waster and demand such waste in order to pay off their debts.

With both water and money in short supply, AWU should further embrace demand side management to deliver both water and money savings to the citizens of Austin. Along the way, we make our water supply more secure and help protect the recreational economy and enjoyment of Lake Travis.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bill Bunch

Cc: Marc Ott, City Manager
Rudy Garza, Assist. City Manager
Daryl Slusher, Assist. Director, AWU
Marty Toohey, Reporter, Austin American-Statesman
Mayor Will Wynn and Members of Council
Ken Kramer, Lone Star Chapter, Sierra Club
Roy Waley, Austin Group, Sierra Club
Norman Johns, National Wildlife Federation
David Foster, Clean Water Action
Luke Metzger, Environment Texas
Christy Muse, Hill Country Alliance
Connie Ripley, DELTA
Judi Gracy, DELTA

Randi Shade

From: Meszaros, Greg [Greg.Meszaros@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 5:43 PM
To: Bill Bunch
Cc: Ott, Marc; Garza, Rudy; Wynn, Will; McCracken, Brewster; Randi Shade; Leffingwell, Lee; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Morrison, Laura; Cole, Sheryl; Slusher, Daryl; Watson, Matt; Marty Toohey
Subject: RE: Clarification, questions, and request for action on water conservation and WTP4

Bill, we will follow up with you on these matters. Regards, Greg.

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Bunch [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2009 6:45 PM
To: Meszaros, Greg
Cc: Ott, Marc; Garza, Rudy; Wynn, Will; McCracken, Brewster; Randi Shade; Leffingwell, Lee; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Morrison, Laura; Cole, Sheryl; Slusher, Daryl; Watson, Matt; Marty Toohey
Subject: Clarification, questions, and request for action on water conservation and WTP4

Dear Mr. Meszaros,

Please accept the attached letter. I look forward to speaking with you on this matter.

Very best regards,

Bill Bunch

Randi Shade

From: Ryan Clinton [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2009 11:53 PM
To: Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Randi Shade; Leffingwell, Lee; Sheryl Cole; Brewster McCracken; Laura Morrison; marc.ott@ci.austin.tx.us
Subject: What Austin Pets Alive's Success Really Says

Dear Mr. Mayor, Council Members, and Mr. City Manager,

By now I hope that each of you has read the Statesman's recent article about Austin Pets Alive, a new charity in Austin that is using proven, cost-effective, no-kill methods to save dogs and cats straight from the kill list at Austin's pound, Town Lake Animal Center. APA, led by Dr. Ellen Jefferson, deserves immense credit for what they have accomplished in a very brief period of time.

But it's important to understand what lessons should be taken from APA's success. The real lesson is not, as TLAC director Dorinda Pulliam would argue, that TLAC is doing right by Austin's dogs and cats. No, the real lesson is that APA is tearing down the myths, dispelling the excuses, and exposing the remarkable failure of Pulliam to enact basic programs that have dramatically reduced shelter killing in other cities.

You see, APA is doing what TLAC should have been doing years ago. The strategy is simple: take the animals to the people; don't expect the people to go to the animals. By taking dogs each day that TLAC deems "unadoptable" and driving them down the street and getting them adopted--- within days and for twice TLAC's adoption fee--- APA is proving wrong every one of Pulliam's favorite myths.

Myth #1: "Nobody wants the dogs we kill." APA is proving that's not remotely true. It's about getting the dogs to the people and asking the public for help. When you do, the public will reward you. APA is proving that the dogs Pulliam "sends to God" (her words, not ours) are wonderful, adoptable pets who will thrive in loving homes.

Myth #2: "It doesn't matter where the shelter is because people will go anywhere to adopt a shelter animal." That was one of Pulliam's favorite things to say during 2008's shelter-move controversy. She couldn't be more wrong. Again, APA is taking dogs and cats that Pulliam believes need to be "sent to God" for being "unadoptable" and then adopting them right down the street. If people would "go anywhere to adopt a shelter animal," then why is it that they aren't going to the shelter now? And why is it that they'll adopt a dog Pulliam finds "unadoptable" right down the street from the shelter? Location matters.

Myth #3: "Off-site adoptions won't work in Austin because we have plenty of traffic at the shelter." The argument that off-site adoptions don't work is just inane at this point. APA is taking TLAC dogs and getting them adopted in high-traffic, high-visibility areas minutes away from TLAC. Off-site adoptions work, and it is nothing short of astonishing that to this day, Pulliam refuses to allow dozens of TLAC dogs to head to off-site locations each day and return at the end of the day if they go unadopted.

Myth #4: "TLAC is doing everything it can to save animals." We wish this were true, but it isn't remotely true. Not only is TLAC still not doing its own off-site adoptions (see Pulliam, supra), but they also aren't letting APA make use of the more than 100 cages that TLAC leaves empty and unused every day--- despite killing adoptable dogs in the mean time. TLAC could help save more dogs and cats tomorrow if they would either use the empty cages, or allow APA to do so.

Myth #5: "TLAC can't afford to do off-site adoptions." If that were true, then APA--- a group without TLAC's \$5 million budget--- couldn't afford to do them either. But as APA's success proves, off-site adoptions can

actually be revenue positive because they dramatically increase donations and adoptions. And besides, just this week, Pulliam announced her decision to spend \$300K of TLAC's donations fund on a variety of hand-picked items. Off-site adoptions didn't make the list.

So what does all of this tell us? It tells us that Pulliam's old-guard, old-fashioned, 1950's style shelter management belongs in the 1950's. The world has moved on and left her methods and excuses behind. It's far past time for Pulliam to be replaced by a shelter manager who rejects excuses and embraces no-kill methodology in its entirety.

It is absolutely inevitable that Austin will one day join the growing ranks of American cities that no longer kill non-aggressive animals at their open-admission pounds. The question is when, not whether. And perhaps more pressingly, by whom. Someone on Austin's council will be the hero that effects change at Austin's pound. I sincerely hope that it will be one of you--- and sooner rather than later.

Thank you and best regards,
Ryan Clinton
294-5003

Randi Shade

From: Katherine Gregor [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2009 10:21 AM
To: Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Cc: Lei Lani De Santiago; Glen Coleman
Subject: WTP4 - Need comment today

Madam Council Members:

For an article being written today, can I please get a comment from you about whether you're interested in exploring the possibility of forestalling the WTP4 construction schedule, given the success of our water conservation program in 2008?

(Re SOS & cohorts 12/11/08 letter to council). I can walk you through the question if that's helpful.

Deadline: 2 pm

Thanks, Katherine

Katherine Gregor

Staff Writer, Austin Chronicle
512.707.1442
www.austinchronicle.com

Randi Shade

From: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 01, 2009 2:50 PM
To: will.wynn@ci.austin.tx.us; marc.ott@ci.austin.tx.us; rudy.garza@ci.austin.tx.us;
greg.meszaros@ci.austin.tx.us; Slusher, Daryl; Randi Shade; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us;
mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us;
brewster.mccracken@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us
Cc: Rush, Barbara; Watson, Matt; 'Coleman, Glen'; Duncan, Roger; Moore, Andrew;
robert.levinski@ci.austin.tx.us
Subject: Yet another cheap way to save a lot of water

Mayor, Members of Council, Mssrs. Ott, Garza, Meszaros, and Slusher:

Please take a minute to read this story from yesterday's New York Times.

Then think about how much more we could reduce our peak day water demands, along with our overall residential water and energy demands, by adopting this simple, almost free strategy of customer education.

With the City's current billing practices, we're already half way there.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/31/science/earth/31compete.html? r=2&hp>

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Bunch

Randi Shade

From: Shade, Randi [Randi.Shade@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 4:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Coleman, Glen; Morrison, Laura; Levinski, Robert; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Guernsey, Greg; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: About Last Night

Thanks Bill and Mary for the follow up direction you have each provided. I look forward to working with you and Council Member Morrison on each item you have suggested. Belated thanks to Steve Beers and Sarah Baker for the extra help they've provided these last few weeks. Happy President's Day weekend to all.

-Randi

From: Bill Bunch
To: Shade, Randi
Cc: Coleman, Glen; Morrison, Laura; Levinski, Robert; colin clark ; Sarah Baker ; roy waley ; Mary Arnold ; Robin Rather ; Brigid Shea ; Kedron Jerome Touvell ; Guernsey, Greg; annkitchen-austin.rr.com ; Jeff Jack ; Lehmanck-aol.com
Sent: Fri Feb 13 10:00:00 2009
Subject: Re: About Last Night
Councilmember Shade,

Thank you very much for your thoughtful words. We also do very much appreciate your work on this case. We will share your message with our supporters and email news list.

Also, we would very much like to work with you, Councilmember Morrison, and city staff to see if we might articulate some standards for measuring what is "superior" for water quality, land use, transportation, parks, utilities, and public process. We struggled a great deal with City staff's recommendation in favor of the PUD -- which seemed to come with enormous commitments of staff time dedicated to responding to the demands of the applicant, but with very, very little substantive analysis of the proposal. Given that Planning Director Greg Guernsey and key watershed protection and development review staff were personally and directly involved in the many months of work on the Bradley Agreement, it is hard to understand staff's karst-like review (i.e. riddled with large voids and faults).

It's troubling to think about how other, lower profile cases are reviewed (or not) by staff. Are we seeing rare aberrations, or is this normal? How is it that staff mistakes always seem to favor the applicant -- and quite often result in a violation of council-adopted ordinances and policies?

We do recognize that you and your staff did a great deal of very important work on this case. While we disagree on the postponement, we respect your vote and very much appreciate that without your help the project would have likely been approved.

We also very much appreciate your commitment to doing better in the continuing challenge to protect Barton Springs. We look forward to working with you on this challenge.

Thank you,

Bill

Shade, Randi wrote:

Bill,

As I said to you last night I regret not having said something from the dais during the postponement discussion.

Had I done so here's what I would have said. Feel free to share with anyone; I am copying some of the people I remember seeing there last night but know I am forgetting lots of folks.

While I would not have voted for the PUD as it would have been proposed last night had we heard the case, I chose to support the postponement because that postponement came with significant conditions. Specifically, a revised proposal will not come back to Council unless it meets the new PUD ordinance requirements rather than the old PUD ordinance requirements as was the case prior to last night's action. Furthermore, the proposal will not come back to Council without additional public process via the Environmental Board and ZAP. This is an extremely complicated case and there has been a lot of confusion and there have been several conflicting "facts." The postponement also came with the direction that staff evaluate the PUD proposal, including the proposed land uses, open space dedication, protection of critical environmental features and water quality treatment facilities, to determine if it results in improved water quality or provides other hydrological benefits to the Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone, as compared to the plan that complies with current zoning and the Bradley Settlement Agreement. I and the community will benefit from this evaluation and again, the proposal will not come back to Council without it.

I have learned a lot over the course of these last several weeks while grappling with this challenging case, and I didn't come to my decision about last night easily. I know it is difficult to rally the troops week after week and year after year. The lack of certainty in this process impacts everyone, but whether this proposal was postponed or killed last night, I know I don't need to tell you that as long as there are private land owners there will always be proposals for re-development and new development over the aquifer. We won't ever get to do a touchdown dance or cross some sort of finish line. We can and must, however, continue to strive for better -- better than what would have been considered last night, but also better than the Bradley Agreement, and better than the SOS Ordinance. The conditions of this postponement may or may not result in the "something better" I am talking about but I stand by my decision to see if it does.

-Randi

Randi Shade

From: Mario Espinoza [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 28, 2009 2:23 PM
To: Bill Bunch; Castillo, Michael [AWU]
Cc: Angie Taylor Rubottom; Dan Wilcox; Jeff Covington; Joy Smith; Kristan Arrona; Lanetta Cooper; Myra Salas; Nguyen Stanton; Tom Graves; Anders, David; Blake Bornkessel; Chuck Loy; Cobern, Rusty; Dreyfus, Mark; Little, Ann; Maenius, Rusty; Mark Richardson; Nelisa Heddin; Nelisa Heddin 2nd email; Randy Chapman; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; Randi Shade; brewster.mccracken@ci.austin.tx.us; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us; mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us; will.wynn@ci.austin.tx.us; robert.levinski@ci.austin.tx.us; Coleman, Glen; Sarah Baker; Jennifer Walker; Amy Hardberger; roy waley; Christy Muse; ms >> Mary Sanger; Robin Rather; Lehmanck-aol.com; colin clark; Bill Spelman; Norman Johns; Watson, Matt
Subject: RE: Austin Water Utility Cost of Service Study Update

Michael and Rusty: Thank you for the update and for working past 5:00 on a Friday afternoon. Not many others would do that on any given Friday. I will look for the on-line survey and will complete it as requested.

Mario

From: Bill Bunch [mailto:REDACTED]
Sent: Sat 2/28/2009 11:52 AM
To: Castillo, Michael [AWU]
Cc: Angie Taylor Rubottom; Dan Wilcox; Jeff Covington; Joy Smith; Kristan Arrona; Lanetta Cooper; Mario Espinoza; Myra Salas; Nguyen Stanton; Tom Graves; Anders, David; Blake Bornkessel; Chuck Loy; Cobern, Rusty; Dreyfus, Mark; Little, Ann; Maenius, Rusty; Mark Richardson; Nelisa Heddin; Nelisa Heddin 2nd email; Randy Chapman; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; Randi Shade; brewster.mccracken@ci.austin.tx.us; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us; mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us; will.wynn@ci.austin.tx.us; robert.levinski@ci.austin.tx.us; 'Coleman, Glen'; Sarah Baker; Jennifer Walker; Amy Hardberger; roy waley; Christy Muse; ms >> Mary Sanger; Robin Rather; Lehmanck-aol.com; colin clark; Bill Spelman; Norman Johns; Watson, Matt
Subject: Re: Austin Water Utility Cost of Service Study Update

Water Utility Cost of Service Folks,

Perhaps I'm not fully understanding this message of yesterday (see below), but coming out at 5:30 on a Friday tells me very clearly that it is news someone is hoping no one notices.

By now everyone should be crystal clear that we can save \$400 million for ALL of our ratepayers by significantly increasing summer peak rates for water wasters, esp. multi-family and single family water wasters, and thus knocking back the peak summer water waste that is driving the purported "need" to build WTP4 any time in the foreseeable future

Another almost cost-free technique for saving enormous amounts of water (esp. peak summer use water) is a few hours of programming time with the billing system to compare water users to their neighbors, thus encouraging conservation and discouraging waste. The effectiveness of this readily-implementable idea was recently featured in the New York Times:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/31/science/earth/31compete.html?emc=eta1>

To say our billing system is bogged down in a multi-year change over really isn't defensible. We have the data, we have the systems in place. The technology is available, off the shelf. (See NY Times story.) This really is something that could and should have been done in very short order last year. Since it wasn't it should be done now, before this summer, not later.

Meanwhile, rates for essential human needs of drinking, bathing, cooking, and washing dishes should be kept low. They should also be kept low for commercial users who have demonstrated aggressive conservation efforts, with measurable reductions over time, and those whose water use is flat throughout the year (and thus do not play a role in driving up peak demand).

This message is very disturbing in several respects. Of course, in my humble opinion,

Bill Bunch

Castillo, Michael [AWU] wrote:

It's been a while since we provided an update on the status of the Cost of Service Study. Our consultant, Red Oak, is continuing to work on their Final Report and should have that completed shortly. We will post that report on the Cost of Service Study Website when it's completed and let each of you know when it's available.

You should receive an email link to an on-line survey within the next two or three weeks. Although each of you shared your comments about the process we went through to develop the Cost of Service Study at the last PIC meeting, we felt it would be worthwhile to also provide you with an opportunity to provide anonymous feedback through an on-line survey. Please let me know if you have any questions about the survey or experience any difficulty with the survey website.

The Utility's Executive Team recently made a decision regarding the timing of the implementation of the study's results. Given the current economic uncertainty, they do not feel it is prudent to implement the proposed changes this April. Rather, we intend to postpone the implementation until at least November 2009. We plan to include information about the Cost of Service Study and the proposed changes when we brief the City Council regarding our Five Year Forecast later this spring. And, unless the Council or City Manager directs us to do otherwise, we will develop rates that include most of the proposed Cost of Service changes as part of our FY2009-10 Proposed Budget. We plan to also include information regarding the Cost of Service Study during the Proposed Budget briefings we provide to various boards and commissions this summer. The City Council will also conduct a public hearing on any proposed rate changes prior to adopting next year's budget. We will notify you once these meetings are scheduled and you are welcome to attend and provide comments or feedback regarding the proposed changes.

Our current plan is to move ahead next fall with the implementation of the Cost of Service results in all but two areas. Those are: 1) Elimination of the residential class subsidy for water service in Year 1, and 2) Excess Use Rates.

We plan to propose water rates for 2009-10 that move us closer to having all classes at their true Cost of Service, but we expect to transition the phase out the subsidy over the next few years. Therefore, the current

plan is to develop rates for 2009-10 that fully implement the proposed Wastewater changes and transition toward the eventual elimination of the residential water subsidy.

As I'm sure each of you will remember, we started down the path of implementing Excess Use Rates for customers in the Commercial and Multi-Family classes in response to a Citizens' Water Conservation Task Force recommendation. Excess Use Rates will represent a significant change for both customers and our customer service employees. We recognize that implementing Excess Use Rates will require an extensive outreach and education program. We do not believe this is the right time to undertake such a program, with the significant financial challenges facing our customers. We suspect these customers have enough uncertainty to deal with right now, without us adding a complicated new water rate program to the mix. You may recall the City of Austin is working on a multi-year project to replace its current utility billing system, and our initial Excess Use Rate plans called for an accelerated implementation using the current billing system. Now that the Excess Use Rate project has been delayed, we may have to wait until the new billing system is in place. Please do not interpret this delay as an unwillingness to comply with the Citizens' Water Conservation Task Force's recommendation. The Utility's Executive Team still supports moving to an Excess Use Rate design...once the timing is right and a comprehensive public involvement process is undertaken.

Thank you all for your continued interest in and support for the Utility's Cost of Service project, and please take a few minutes to complete the on-line survey once it's available.

Questions or Comments:

Michael Castillo, Utility Financial Manager

(512) 972-0332

Rusty Cobern, Utility Budget & Financial Manager

(512) 972-0394

Randi Shade

From: Ryan Clinton [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2009 5:33 PM
To: Lumbreras, Bert
Cc: Ott, Marc; Lurie, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED];
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Randi
Shade; Laura Morrison
Subject: Re: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?

Bert,

Thank you for taking the time to respond, but your e-mail does not answer the question that I asked--- a question that City Manager Ott clearly understood and directed to you (as indicated in his e-mail included below). I would greatly appreciate it (and I assume Mr. Ott would too) if you wouldn't mind answering the question that I posed:

If the Department of Health and Human Services has performed a preliminary analysis on the potential adverse effects of an animal incinerator on area children's health, could you please furnish me with a copy of that analysis?

Your response sidesteps that question in favor of assurances of future inquiries and decisions. Assuming that you sidestepped the question intentionally because your Department has not performed such an analysis, don't you think that's a bit odd given the level of detail that your staff has already planned for the new shelter? For example, don't you find it odd that your staff has picked out the paint colors for cat statues at the new shelter, and the type of vines that will be incorporated into the new adoption-area overhangs, but hasn't yet decided how it will dispose of the 10,000 pets the shelter plans to kill? Please feel free not to answer my rhetorical questions, but I would greatly appreciate if you would answer the question I initially posed.

Finally, as an aside, I noticed that you are trumpeting the new data from the shelter. I've analyzed the numbers and the story they tell is far from the one that you are embracing. Specifically, the data demonstrates that if it weren't for Austin Pets Alive's efforts in saving impounded animals that TLAC plans to kill, TLAC's data would show a net negative in the number of animals saved this year over last year. As a result, while TLAC's numbers certainly look better this year, the improvements are overwhelmingly due to the work of area non-profits whose work would be unnecessary if TLAC management abandoned its reliance on killing as its primary method of animal control.

Thank you,
Ryan

On Wed, Mar 4, 2009 at 11:54 AM, Lumbreras, Bert <Bert.Lumbreras@ci.austin.tx.us> wrote:
Mr. Clinton,

On behalf of City Manager Ott, I am responding to your email inquiry dated February 25, 2009.

We will be reviewing options associated with the disposal of euthanized animals at our new animal services facility scheduled to open in 2011. While the HHSD campus does provide for the modest space necessary for an on-site cremation unit, no decision has been made at this time. All related options will be fully assessed prior to a decision.

A review of this issue will reflect consideration of several options, including a survey of practices in other communities, landfill use, and contracting with animal crematories already located in Austin. All related factors will be considered in our review, including environmental issues. Also, all necessary regulatory and permitting requirements would be addressed. Any required studies would be made available for public review.

Our primary goal is to continue our progress in significantly reducing euthanasia; therefore, the need for disposal.

I hope I have been responsive to your inquiries. Take care.

Bert Lumbreras
Assistant City Manager

From: Ott, Marc
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 9:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lumbreras, Bert; Lurie, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED];
Subject: Re: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?

If such an analysis have been done, I see no reason why we shouldn't share it.

Marc

Bert, please follow up.

Thanks

From: Ryan Clinton
To: Ott, Marc
Cc: Lumbreras, Bert; Lurie, David; Susana Almanza ; daniel llanes ; Lorri Michel ; Bill Aleshire
Sent: Wed Feb 25 19:07:36 2009
Subject: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?
Mr. Ott,

Given that Mr. Lurie confirmed today the Department of Health and Human Services's continued openness to the possibility of building an animal incinerator at the relocated East Austin animal shelter, I feel it's safe to assume that the Department has conducted at least a preliminary study of the potential adverse human-health impacts on area children breathing in fumes from the burning of 10,000+ animal bodies each year. I am personally concerned about such impacts because I live just one exit away from the proposed shelter site. If the Department has done any such analysis, would you mind sharing the results with me?

Thank you,
Ryan Clinton
5320 Krueger Lane
Austin, Texas 78723

--
Give Austin's Homeless Pets a Chance at Life
www.FixAustin.org

Randi Shade

From: Eugene Sepulveda [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2009 9:28 AM
To: Will Wynn; Brewster McCracken; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Sheryl Cole; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Subject: Chestnut TOD

Hi all, just wanted to confirm that proximity to the TOD and chestnut neighborhood will always score highest points for remaining \$1mm in affordable housing monies. Rudy Green, Mike Cook and I have agreed we will leverage (by factor of at least 4x, likely more) these monies for deep affordability (read 60% MFI. & below) in Central East Austin. We have brought in the northern boundary to 38th st, to bottom of Robert Mueller to 183. East boundary remains 183. Southern boundary brought up 5th st (in case options near Saltillo) and western boundary I-35.

Foundation Communities' project very interesting. EF has granted FC several grants, most recently \$100,000. I personally engaged on FC's behalf with Sen Watson. Not that we wouldn't like supporting this project. But, if Walter can make it work without this \$1,000,000 we'd be inclined to leverage this money as seed capital, attract addition public & private dollars and develop an addition, Central East Austin affordable housing project with access to transportation & jobs.

While I know the long term, elderly, low income residents of Chestnut have appreciated the \$250,000 grant to Habitat for renovation of their owned residences. EF matched the \$250,000 with an additional \$50,000 to fund operational costs. Using Habitat's volunteer and materials discount model, I am sure the \$250,000 grant is being leveraged into \$350k to \$400k.

We plan to leverage the remaining \$1mm to at least \$4mm or \$5mm.

Regret that it has been unproductive to hold talks including Scott Way. In my most recent meeting with him, he slandered and otherwise insulted the Merediths, threatened me and regrettably provided no compromise beyond giving the Chestnut Revitalization Authority control of the monies. This is not an option. Shawn, Susan and Marion were more forthcoming.

You all know, it's never been my objective to exempt affordable housing from TODs. In fact, I submit the 64 units we developed should be considered as affordable - they have been purchased by teachers, nonprofit professionals, UT staffers and other young professionals. And, the generated the \$1.3mm.

Regardless, council has elected to allow fee in lieu options. In consideration of this option, Mr Meredith should certainly be able to include these monies within those options. I believe each of you know me, Mike Cook and/or Rudy Green well enough to trust our ambitions for Central East Austin affordable housing. As an aside, EF has donated \$250k in the last 15 months alone to support leveraged affordable housing projects with Habitat and Foundation Communities.

I am out of the country and, regrettably, unable to be there this afternoon. I do, however, strongly ask for your support of the \$1.3mm counting as fee in lieu monies. I promise we'll achieve enviable results with this grant for deep, Central East Austin home affordability.

Please call me at 512.970.9400 if any questions. I am 6 hours ahead of you guys (9:26am here now)

Thanks for the heard work and dedication.

Best,

Eugene

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T
Please forgive typos - tiny little keys!

Randi Shade

From: Morrison, Laura [Laura.Morrison@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 9:32 AM
To: Lumbreras, Bert; Ryan Clinton
Cc: Ott, Marc; Lurie, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Randi Shade
Subject: RE: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?

Bert and Ryan,

Thank you for the continuing conversation. I'll look forward to the further community dialogue. Please keep me posted on the date.

Laura

Laura Morrison
Austin City Council, Place 4
512-974-2258
512-974-1886 (Fax)
Laura.Morrison@ci.austin.tx.us
<http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/council/morrison.htm>

From: Lumbreras, Bert
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2009 1:19 PM
To: 'Ryan Clinton'; Lumbreras, Bert
Cc: Ott, Marc; Lurie, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Randi Shade; Morrison, Laura
Subject: RE: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?

Ryan,

To specifically answer your question, no human health study has been conducted related to a cremation unit specific to the HHSD site.

Permitting of this equipment is regulated by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). They have conducted what they indicate, a comprehensive health effects review for pet crematories. This was a review of the potential adverse health effects in members of the general public, including sensitive subgroups (i.e. children, the elderly, or those with existing respiratory conditions). Based on our very preliminary review of permitting requirements, we were able to get this information from the attached TCEQ document for your reference.

I wish to reemphasize we have not made a determination as to the recommended method, if any, for disposal of euthanized animals at the new center to open in 2011. While the initial HHSD campus site plan does provide for the modest space necessary for an on-site cremation unit, no decision has been made at this time. All options and related impacts will be fully assessed prior to a decision.

Without a doubt, the overall improvement in the euthanasia rates is very much a direct result of the good work of many of our community partners. We don't discount that at all, especially when we have great partners who understand the community issue at hand, step up to the plate and work with us to develop a very beneficial solution.

For your information, we are planning community dialog meetings soon to discuss specific design elements and give neighborhood residents in East Austin an opportunity to offer input. I certainly see this as a good time to lay out our overall design and get feedback. We will share more.

Thanks.

Bert

From: Ryan Clinton [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, March 04, 2009 5:33 PM
To: Lumbreras, Bert
Cc: Ott, Marc; Lurie, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Randi Shade; Morrison, Laura
Subject: Re: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?

Bert,

Thank you for taking the time to respond, but your e-mail does not answer the question that I asked--- a question that City Manager Ott clearly understood and directed to you (as indicated in his e-mail included below). I would greatly appreciate it (and I assume Mr. Ott would too) if you wouldn't mind answering the question that I posed:

If the Department of Health and Human Services has performed a preliminary analysis on the potential adverse effects of an animal incinerator on area children's health, could you please furnish me with a copy of that analysis?

Your response sidesteps that question in favor of assurances of future inquiries and decisions. Assuming that you sidestepped the question intentionally because your Department has not performed such an analysis, don't you think that's a bit odd given the level of detail that your staff has already planned for the new shelter? For example, don't you find it odd that your staff has picked out the paint colors for cat statues at the new shelter, and the type of vines that will be incorporated into the new adoption-area overhangs, but hasn't yet decided how it will dispose of the 10,000 pets the shelter plans to kill? Please feel free not to answer my rhetorical questions, but I would greatly appreciate if you would answer the question I initially posed.

Finally, as an aside, I noticed that you are trumpeting the new data from the shelter. I've analyzed the numbers and the story they tell is far from the one that you are embracing. Specifically, the data demonstrates that if it weren't for Austin Pets Alive's efforts in saving impounded animals that TLAC plans to kill, TLAC's data would show a net negative in the number of animals saved this year over last year. As a result, while TLAC's numbers certainly look better this year, the improvements are overwhelmingly due to the work of area non-profits whose work would be unnecessary if TLAC management abandoned its reliance on killing as its primary method of animal control.

Thank you,
Ryan

On Wed, Mar 4, 2009 at 11:54 AM, Lumbreras, Bert <Bert.Lumbreras@ci.austin.tx.us> wrote:
Mr. Clinton,

On behalf of City Manager Ott, I am responding to your email inquiry dated February 25, 2009.

We will be reviewing options associated with the disposal of euthanized animals at our new animal services facility scheduled to open in 2011. While the HHSD campus does provide for the modest space necessary for an on-site cremation unit, no decision has been made at this time. All related options will be fully assessed prior to a decision.

A review of this issue will reflect consideration of several options, including a survey of practices in other communities, landfill use, and contracting with animal crematories already located in Austin. All related factors will be considered in our review, including environmental issues. Also, all necessary regulatory and permitting requirements would be addressed. Any required studies would be made available for public review.

Our primary goal is to continue our progress in significantly reducing euthanasia; therefore, the need for disposal.

I hope I have been responsive to your inquiries. Take care.

Bert Lumbreras
Assistant City Manager

From: Ott, Marc
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2009 9:15 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lumbreras, Bert; Lurie, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?

If such an analysis have been done, I see no reason why we shouldn't share it.

Marc

Bert, please follow up.

Thanks

From: Ryan Clinton
To: Ott, Marc
Cc: Lumbreras, Bert; Lurie, David; Susana Almanza ; daniel llanes ; Lorri Michel ; Bill Aleshire
Sent: Wed Feb 25 19:07:36 2009
Subject: Human Health Impact of Animal Incinerator?
Mr. Ott,

Given that Mr. Lurie confirmed today the Department of Health and Human Services's continued openness to the possibility of building an animal incinerator at the relocated East Austin animal shelter, I feel it's safe to assume that the Department has conducted at least a preliminary study of the potential adverse human-health impacts on area children breathing in fumes from the burning of 10,000+ animal bodies each year. I am personally concerned about such impacts because I live just one exit away from the proposed shelter site. If the Department has done any such analysis, would you mind sharing the results with me?

Thank you,
Ryan Clinton
5320 Krueger Lane
Austin, Texas 78723

--
Give Austin's Homeless Pets a Chance at Life
www.FixAustin.org

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 9:55 AM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Cc: Nancy Williams; Larry Schooler
Subject: Questions about the website item.

Hi all. I hope ya'll will consider asking some of these questions at the meeting tomorrow, or before. For what it's worth, after reviewing the RFP, I'm a little skeptical about the item.

QUESTIONS:

Why are we not able to do more of this work internally? What work on the project is already contemplated to be internal?

Why does staff believe we were not able to find more qualified vendors for this project in Austin?

What specific criteria of the RFP does staff believe may have eliminated proposers - especially local proposers - and can any of those criteria be amended?

For example, why does the RFP specify a Zope/Plone content management system, instead of being platform neutral?

(I understand that this is actually the second RFP that went out on this project, and that the first had NO respondents? And that this one had only three respondents? Especially at a time like this, that seems a little crazy. Why does staff believe there were no respondents the first time and so few the second time? What changes were made from version #1 to version #2 of the RFP?)

To which Austin companies were notifications actually sent?

How much have other cities recently spent on their websites of similar size and scope? (Not similarly-sized cities, but similarly-sized and similarly-functional websites).

Are travel and lodging expenses included in the cost of the recommended vendor's proposal?

Are there any local workers included in the recommended vendor's proposal?

The RFP says it has not been determined yet whether or not the Austin Energy and ACVB sites will be included in this project? Why? What are the cost implications of deciding to include those sites in this project, if that decision is made?

The RFP says the site consists of more than 40,000 pages and 80,000 files. Is there a document showing how these pages and files break down across the site? Where is the bulk of the content?

IMPORTANT: What are some specific examples of ways in which the redesigned site will be more user friendly? What specific new services or functions will the redesigned site deliver to users? Any?

IMPORANT: Will this project "decentralize" internal content management? That is, will more people be able to post content directly to the website, or will content management still continue to be controlled by IT and PIO?

The RFP only appears to call for system training for four people.

What public involvement has there been in this process after last year's "Town Hall" meetings to gather input? Has the Telecom Committee been involved?

(Once again, it seems to me that a big and potentially controversial item has just shown up on the Council agenda with no advance notice to people who might be interested.)

Nancy, can we get a copy of the proposal from the recommended vendor to review? Maybe that will shed more light.

Bottom line: After reading the RFP, I'm not clear how the new site is going to be better from the public's perspective, other than aesthetically.

I understand how it could be better from COA's perspective, especially if the updated CMS will decentralize content management (and I can see how this would be of some public benefit to, by facilitating the faster flow of information online), but I'm still not understanding exactly what the citizens going to get.

Thanks, Mark.

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 10:52 AM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Cc: Nancy Williams; Larry Schooler
Subject: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

FYI.

----- Forwarded Message

From: Colin Rowan <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:35:29 -0500
To: "<Undisclosed-recipients: ;>"
Subject: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Following is a statement from Brewster McCracken regarding this week's vote on the City's website project.

McCracken is available for interviews today. Please call me at 512-799-6400 to arrange.

Thanks,

Colin Rowan
Brewster McCracken for Austin Mayor

Statement from Brewster McCracken:

"Investing taxpayer funds for web operations only makes sense if the investment dramatically improves government efficiency and stimulates the local economy. I am not satisfied that the website redesign proposal before Council meets either objective. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposal to spend over \$700,000 on a website redesign.

"My specific concerns include:

- a new website must make it possible for citizens to pay their bills online, including by credit card
- a new website must make it possible for citizens to obtain any service online for which they currently have to drive to a government office or conduct by telephone
- any new website proposal must be part of a comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort
- given Austin's significant local talent pool in website architecture and software, any new website solicitation must include aggressive outreach to local companies. If at all possible and financially feasible, we should tap local talent and support the local economy."

Colin Rowan
Partner
I&O Communications
327 Congress, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78701
p 512.288.4054
m 512.799.6400

www.iandocom.com <<http://www.iandocom.com/>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 11:22 AM
To: Mark Nathan; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Cc: Nancy Williams; Larry Schooler
Subject: Re: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks for forwarding.

A couple of quick points:

- this item tomorrow is not the be-all and end-all of the city website. It's a way to migrate content to a system where many more users than just IT and PIO can work with it, and where it's much easier for citizens to find what they need because old content is gone and existing content is much better organized. It's a critical step in the process. What BM is talking about (paying bills online, etc.) is not part of this. If it were, we'd be looking at more than a few million dollars--probably upwards of \$10 million. The bids just for this project (from the two local firms) were up in the \$1.5-\$5 million range--just for content management.
- the new website IS, indeed, part of a "comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort." As Lee has said all along, it's part of an open government initiative aimed at enabling citizens to interact with government more easily--paying bills, getting information about agenda items/budget, making comments, etc. But you have to deal with content management in order to get to what he's talking about.
- on the local vendors, they did, indeed, reach out and got two local firms to bid, but they way overbid. So we could spend more on this phase to stay local.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 11:51 AM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison
Cc: Nancy Williams , Larry Schooler
Subject: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

FYI.

----- Forwarded Message

From: Colin Rowan <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:35:29 -0500
To: "<Undisclosed-recipients: ;>"
Subject: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Following is a statement from Brewster McCracken regarding this week's vote on the City's website project.

McCracken is available for interviews today. Please call me at 512-799-6400 to arrange.

Thanks,

Colin Rowan
Brewster McCracken for Austin Mayor

Statement from Brewster McCracken:

"Investing taxpayer funds for web operations only makes sense if the investment dramatically improves government efficiency and stimulates the local economy. I am not satisfied that the website redesign proposal before Council meets either objective. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposal to spend over \$700,000 on a website redesign.

"My specific concerns include:

- a new website must make it possible for citizens to pay their bills online, including by credit card
- a new website must make it possible for citizens to obtain any service online for which they currently have to drive to a government office or conduct by telephone
- any new website proposal must be part of a comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort

- given Austin's significant local talent pool in website architecture and software, any new website solicitation must include aggressive outreach to local companies. If at all possible and financially feasible, we should tap local talent and support the local economy."

Colin Rowan

Partner

I&O Communications

327 Congress, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78701

p 512.288.4054

m 512.799.6400

www.iandocom.com <<http://www.iandocom.com/>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 11:38 AM
To: Larry Schooler; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Nancy Williams; Bill Spelman
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks Larry.

Without the Council having had any discussion, at least that I'm aware of, about exactly what new services and functionality we want the redesigned City website to ultimately deliver, and what those would really (not perhaps) cost, I think it's difficult to say "well, this is just the first step." While I agree in principle with what you are saying - that the first step probably has to be to update the CMS and facilitate improved internal processes and information flow - I think it's difficult to defend without knowing what the subsequent steps are going to be.

Pardon the lame analogy, but to me it seems like building the foundation for a new house without having decided for sure what you want the new house to look like. Is that a faulty analogy?

Or am I perhaps wrong that there has been no discussion and / or decision-making about subsequent functionality for the City website?

Thanks, MN.

From: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:21:35 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>, Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>, Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks for forwarding.

A couple of quick points:

- this item tomorrow is not the be-all and end-all of the city website. It's a way to migrate content to a system where many more users than just IT and PIO can work with it, and where it's much easier for citizens to find what they need because old content is gone and existing content is much better organized. It's a critical step in the process. What BM is talking about (paying bills online, etc.) is not part of this. If it were, we'd be looking at more than a few million dollars--probably upwards of \$10 million. The bids just for this project (from the two local firms) were up in the \$1.5-\$5 million range--just for content management.
- the new website IS, indeed, part of a "comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort." As Lee has said all along, it's part of an open government initiative aimed at enabling citizens to interact with government more easily--paying bills, getting information about agenda items/budget, making comments, etc. But you have to deal with content management in order to get to what he's talking about.
- on the local vendors, they did, indeed, reach out and got two local firms to bid, but they way overbid. So we could spend more on this phase to stay local.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 11:51 AM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison
Cc: Nancy Williams , Larry Schooler
Subject: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

FYI.

----- Forwarded Message

From: Colin Rowan <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:35:29 -0500
To: "<Undisclosed-recipients: ;>"
Subject: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Following is a statement from Brewster McCracken regarding this week's vote on the City's website project.

McCracken is available for interviews today. Please call me at 512-799-6400 to arrange.

Thanks,

Colin Rowan
Brewster McCracken for Austin Mayor

Statement from Brewster McCracken:

"Investing taxpayer funds for web operations only makes sense if the investment dramatically improves government efficiency and stimulates the local economy. I am not satisfied that the website redesign proposal before Council meets either objective. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposal to spend over \$700,000 on a website redesign.

"My specific concerns include:

- a new website must make it possible for citizens to pay their bills online, including by credit card
- a new website must make it possible for citizens to obtain any service online for which they currently have to drive to a government office or conduct by telephone
- any new website proposal must be part of a comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort
- given Austin's significant local talent pool in website architecture and software, any new website solicitation must include aggressive outreach to local companies. If at all possible and financially feasible, we should tap local talent and support the local economy."

Colin Rowan
Partner
I&O Communications
327 Congress, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78701
p 512.288.4054
m 512.799.6400

www.iandocom.com <<http://www.iandocom.com/>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 11:52 AM
To: Mark Nathan; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Nancy Williams; Bill Spelman
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Points well taken. I think it's been too long for most to remember that Council, and the public, have talked about what new services and functionality on the new website, though I don't know that cost has been discussed. See below. Hope this is somewhat helpful. I know this dialogue very much is. Thanks.

<http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=109967>

<http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=109845>

LL from Dais on November 1 2007:

Leffingwell: MAYOR, I'D JUST LIKE TO CALL ATTENTION TO ITEM NUMBER BE 37 ON THE AGENDA TODAY. WHICH IS AN OPEN GOVERNMENT INITIATIVE. WITH THIS ITEM THE CITY WILL BE COMMENCING A YEAR LONG PROCESS TO MAKE OUR WEBSITE MORE USABLE AND PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION. OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT YEAR WE'LL BE CONDUCTING TOWN HALL MEETINGS, WE'LL BE CONVENING FOCUS GROUPS WITH PARTICULAR INTERESTS IN INFORMATION ON THE WEBSITE. AND WE ACTUALLY HAVE POSTED NOW A WEB SURVEY THAT CITIZENS CAN USE. IT'S AT WWW.AUSTINGO.ORG AND YOU CAN LOG ON RIGHT NOW AND GIVE US YOUR COMMENTS. THAT'S WHAT WE'LL BE DOING OVER THE NEXT YEAR IS GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT HOW TO MAKE OUR WEBSITE THE VERY BEST ONE IN THE COUNTRY.

Martinez from dais same day:

37, COUNCILMEMBER LEFFINGWELL ALREADY MENTIONED, BUT I AM GLAD TO BE SUPPORTIVE OF THIS ITEM AS WELL IN THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE REVAMPING OUR ENTIRE WEBSITE SO THAT FOLKS CAN HAVE MORE OPEN, PARTICIPATORY GOVERNMENT ONLINE. WE REALLY NEED INPUT, THOUGH. I CAN'T EMPHASIZE THAT ENOUGH. NONE OF THE REDESIGN REALLY IS REALLY GOING TO OCCUR UNTIL WE HAVE PUBLIC INPUT. WE HAVE PAPER SURVEYS YOU CAN FIND AT THE ONE STOP SHOP AND SEVERAL ACTIVITY CENTERS, BUT YOU CAN ALSO GO ONLINE AND GIVE YOUR INPUT. WE NEED THAT FEEDBACK TO CREATE THE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION THAT CITIZENS WOULD REALLY LIKE TO SEE. NOT JUST THINGS LIKE RENEWING YOUR LIBRARY CARD ONLINE

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan

Sent: Mar 25, 2009 12:37 PM

To: Larry Schooler , Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Nancy Williams , Bill Spelman

Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks Larry.

Without the Council having had any discussion, at least that I'm aware of, about exactly what new services and functionality we want the redesigned City website to ultimately deliver, and what those would really (not perhaps) cost, I think it's difficult to say "well, this is just the first step." While I agree in principle with what you are saying - that the first step probably has to be to update the CMS and facilitate improved internal processes and information flow - I think it's difficult to defend without knowing what the subsequent steps are going to be.

Pardon the lame analogy, but to me it seems like building the foundation for a new house without having decided for sure what you want the new house to look like. Is that a faulty analogy?

Or am I perhaps wrong that there has been no discussion and / or decision-making about subsequent functionality for the City website?

Thanks, MN.

From: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:21:35 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>, Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>, Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks for forwarding.

A couple of quick points:

- this item tomorrow is not the be-all and end-all of the city website. It's a way to migrate content to a system where many more users than just IT and PIO can work with it, and where it's much easier for citizens to find what they need because old content is gone and existing content is much better organized. It's a critical step in the process. What BM is talking about (paying bills online, etc.) is not part of this. If it were, we'd be looking at more than a few million dollars--probably upwards of \$10 million. The bids just for this project (from the two local firms) were up in the \$1.5-\$5 million range--just for content management.
- the new website IS, indeed, part of a "comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort." As Lee has said all along, it's part of an open government initiative aimed at enabling citizens to interact with government more easily--paying bills, getting information about agenda items/budget, making comments, etc. But you have to deal with content management in order to get to what he's talking about.
- on the local vendors, they did, indeed, reach out and got two local firms to bid, but they way overbid. So we could spend more on this phase to stay local.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 11:51 AM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison
Cc: Nancy Williams , Larry Schooler
Subject: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

FYI.

----- Forwarded Message

From: Colin Rowan [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:35:29 -0500
To: "<Undisclosed-recipients: ;>"
Subject: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Following is a statement from Brewster McCracken regarding this week's vote on the City's website project.

McCracken is available for interviews today. Please call me at 512-799-6400 to arrange.

Thanks,

Colin Rowan
Brewster McCracken for Austin Mayor

Statement from Brewster McCracken:

"Investing taxpayer funds for web operations only makes sense if the investment dramatically improves government efficiency and stimulates the local economy. I am not satisfied that the website redesign proposal before Council meets either objective. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposal to spend over \$700,000 on a website redesign.

"My specific concerns include:

- a new website must make it possible for citizens to pay their bills online, including by credit card
- a new website must make it possible for citizens to obtain any service online for which they currently have to drive to a government office or conduct by telephone
- any new website proposal must be part of a comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort
- given Austin's significant local talent pool in website architecture and software, any new website solicitation must include aggressive outreach to local companies. If at all possible and financially feasible, we should tap local talent and support the local economy."

Colin Rowan
Partner
I&O Communications
327 Congress, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78701

p 512.288.4054

512.288.4054

www.iandocom.com <<http://www.iandocom.com/>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 1:00 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler; Nancy Williams
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

The operative language I see in these documents is "significantly increasing the number of online services and transactions available to the public" and "add an increased number of online service offerings and enhanced delivery of those services" - but as far as I can tell this item doesn't do that.

What kind of documentation is there reflecting all of the public input from last year? Where is the list of things that the citizens asked for from the website redesign? Can you share those documents with us, Larry?

Pending the answers to some of the questions I posed earlier, I'm inclined at this point to offer my free, unsolicited advice that you NOT move forward with this item on Thursday, and instead move quickly to define the full scope of new services and functionality that you ultimately want the City to deliver with a redesigned website (based on the public input), and then rebid the thing in a way that hopefully results in more respondents, perhaps specifying that you want to approach the project in phases.

After talking with some Telecom Committee members, I'll concede that the full expertise needed to redesign the site architecture and launch a new CMS system is probably NOT available internally, and that some outside help is probably going to be necessary, but I think it makes sense to do everything possible to maximize the internal responsibilities, and to go as local as possible with the vendor selection.

I know it's been 18 months since this thing started, and that you may have some reluctance to delay it further. But I think it's all the more reason to make sure you are on the right course now.

Thanks, MN.

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED] >
Reply-To: Larry Schooler [REDACTED] >
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:51:56 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>, Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>, Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>, Bill Spelman <spelman@mail.utexas.edu>
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Points well taken. I think it's been too long for most to remember that Council, and the public, have talked about what new services and functionality on the new website, though I don't know that cost has been discussed. See below. Hope this is somewhat helpful. I know this dialogue very much is. Thanks.

<http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=109967>

<http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=109845>

LL from Dais on November 1 2007:

Leffingwell: MAYOR, I'D JUST LIKE TO CALL ATTENTION TO ITEM NUMBER BE 37 ON THE AGENDA TODAY. WHICH IS AN OPEN GOVERNMENT INITIATIVE. WITH THIS ITEM THE CITY WILL BE COMMENCING A YEAR LONG PROCESS TO MAKE OUR WEBSITE MORE USABLE AND PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION. OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT YEAR WE'LL BE CONDUCTING TOWN HALL MEETINGS, WE'LL BE CONVENING FOCUS GROUPS WITH PARTICULAR INTERESTS IN INFORMATION ON THE WEBSITE. AND WE ACTUALLY HAVE POSTED NOW A WEB SURVEY THAT CITIZENS CAN USE. IT'S AT WWW.AUSTINGO.ORG AND YOU CAN LOG ON RIGHT NOW AND GIVE US YOUR COMMENTS. THAT'S WHAT WE'LL BE DOING OVER THE NEXT YEAR IS GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT HOW TO MAKE OUR WEBSITE THE VERY BEST ONE IN THE COUNTRY.

Martinez from dais same day:

37, COUNCILMEMBER LEFFINGWELL ALREADY MENTIONED, BUT I AM GLAD TO BE SUPPORTIVE OF THIS ITEM AS WELL IN THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE REVAMPING OUR ENTIRE WEBSITE SO THAT FOLKS CAN HAVE MORE OPEN, PARTICIPATORY GOVERNMENT ONLINE. WE REALLY NEED INPUT, THOUGH. I CAN'T EMPHASIZE THAT ENOUGH. NONE OF THE REDESIGN REALLY IS REALLY GOING TO OCCUR UNTIL WE HAVE PUBLIC INPUT. WE HAVE PAPER SURVEYS YOU CAN FIND AT THE ONE STOP SHOP AND SEVERAL ACTIVITY CENTERS, BUT YOU CAN ALSO GO ONLINE AND GIVE YOUR INPUT. WE NEED THAT

FEEDBACK TO CREATE THE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION THAT CITIZENS WOULD REALLY LIKE TO SEE.
NOT JUST THINGS LIKE RENEWING YOUR LIBRARY CARD ONLINE

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan

Sent: Mar 25, 2009 12:37 PM

To: Larry Schooler , Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Nancy Williams , Bill Spelman

Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks Larry.

Without the Council having had any discussion, at least that I'm aware of, about exactly what new services and functionality we want the redesigned City website to ultimately deliver, and what those would really (not perhaps) cost, I think it's difficult to say "well, this is just the first step." While I agree in principle with what you are saying - that the first step probably has to be to update the CMS and facilitate improved internal processes and information flow - I think it's difficult to defend without knowing what the subsequent steps are going to be.

Pardon the lame analogy, but to me it seems like building the foundation for a new house without having decided for sure what you want the new house to look like. Is that a faulty analogy?

Or am I perhaps wrong that there has been no discussion and / or decision-making about subsequent functionality for the City website?

Thanks, MN.

From: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:21:35 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>, Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>, Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks for forwarding.

A couple of quick points:

- this item tomorrow is not the be-all and end-all of the city website. It's a way to migrate content to a system where many more users than just IT and PIO can work with it, and where it's much easier for citizens to find what they need because old content is gone and existing content is much better organized. It's a critical step in the process. What BM is talking about (paying bills online, etc.) is not part of this. If it were, we'd be looking at more than a few million dollars--probably upwards of \$10 million. The bids just for this project (from the two local firms) were up in the \$1.5-\$5 million range--just for content management.
- the new website IS, indeed, part of a "comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort." As Lee has said all along, it's part of an open government initiative aimed at enabling citizens to interact with government more easily--paying bills, getting information about agenda items/budget, making comments, etc. But you have to deal with content management in order to get to what he's talking about.
- on the local vendors, they did, indeed, reach out and got two local firms to bid, but they way overbid. So we could spend more on this phase to stay local.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan

Sent: Mar 25, 2009 11:51 AM

To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison

Cc: Nancy Williams , Larry Schooler

Subject: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

FYI.

----- Forwarded Message

From: Colin Rowan <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:35:29 -0500

To: "<Undisclosed-recipients: ;>"

Subject: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Following is a statement from Brewster McCracken regarding this week's vote on the City's website project.

McCracken is available for interviews today. Please call me at 512-799-6400 to arrange.

Thanks,

Colin Rowan
Brewster McCracken for Austin Mayor

Statement from Brewster McCracken:

"Investing taxpayer funds for web operations only makes sense if the investment dramatically improves government efficiency and stimulates the local economy. I am not satisfied that the website redesign proposal before Council meets either objective. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposal to spend over \$700,000 on a website redesign.

"My specific concerns include:

- a new website must make it possible for citizens to pay their bills online, including by credit card
- a new website must make it possible for citizens to obtain any service online for which they currently have to drive to a government office or conduct by telephone
- any new website proposal must be part of a comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort
- given Austin's significant local talent pool in website architecture and software, any new website solicitation must include aggressive outreach to local companies. If at all possible and financially feasible, we should tap local talent and support the local economy."

Colin Rowan
Partner
I&O Communications
327 Congress, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78701
p 512.288.4054
m 512.799.6400
c [REDACTED]
www.iandocom.com <<http://www.iandocom.com/>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 1:21 PM
To: Mark Nathan; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler; Nancy Williams
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/austingo/project_info.htm

See the first couple of items in particular--the public involvement report and survey report.

Hope that helps. I'll see if I can find the other information you mentioned.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 1:59 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler , Nancy Williams
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

The operative language I see in these documents is "significantly increasing the number of online services and transactions available to the public" and "add an increased number of online service offerings and enhanced delivery of those services" - but as far as I can tell this item doesn't do that.

What kind of documentation is there reflecting all of the public input from last year? Where is the list of things that the citizens asked for from the website redesign? Can you share those documents with us, Larry?

Pending the answers to some of the questions I posed earlier, I'm inclined at this point to offer my free, unsolicited advice that you NOT move forward with this item on Thursday, and instead move quickly to define the full scope of new services and functionality that you ultimately want the City to deliver with a redesigned website (based on the public input), and then rebid the thing in a way that hopefully results in more respondents, perhaps specifying that you want to approach the project in phases.

After talking with some Telecom Committee members, I'll concede that the full expertise needed to redesign the site architecture and launch a new CMS system is probably NOT available internally, and that some outside help is probably going to be necessary, but I think it makes sense to do everything possible to maximize the internal responsibilities, and to go as local as possible with the vendor selection.

I know it's been 18 months since this thing started, and that you may have some reluctance to delay it further. But I think it's all the more reason to make sure you are on the right course now.

Thanks, MN.

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED] >
Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:51:56 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell [REDACTED] >, Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison [REDACTED] >, Nancy Williams [REDACTED] >, Bill Spelman <spelman@mail.utexas.edu>
Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Points well taken. I think it's been too long for most to remember that Council, and the public, have talked about what new services and functionality on the new website, though I don't know that cost has been discussed. See below. Hope this is somewhat helpful. I know this dialogue very much is. Thanks.

<http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=109967>
<http://www.cityofaustin.org/edims/document.cfm?id=109845>

LL from Dais on November 1 2007:

Leffingwell: MAYOR, I'D JUST LIKE TO CALL ATTENTION TO ITEM NUMBER BE 37 ON THE AGENDA TODAY. WHICH IS AN OPEN GOVERNMENT INITIATIVE. WITH THIS ITEM THE CITY WILL BE COMMENCING A YEAR LONG PROCESS TO MAKE OUR

WEBSITE MORE USABLE AND PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION. OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT YEAR WE'LL BE CONDUCTING TOWN HALL MEETINGS, WE'LL BE CONVENING FOCUS GROUPS WITH PARTICULAR INTERESTS IN INFORMATION ON THE WEBSITE. AND WE ACTUALLY HAVE POSTED NOW A WEB SURVEY THAT CITIZENS CAN USE. IT'S AT WWW.AUSTINGO.ORG AND YOU CAN LOG ON RIGHT NOW AND GIVE US YOUR COMMENTS. THAT'S WHAT WE'LL BE DOING OVER THE NEXT YEAR IS GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT HOW TO MAKE OUR WEBSITE THE VERY BEST ONE IN THE COUNTRY.

Martinez from dais same day:

37, COUNCILMEMBER LEFFINGWELL ALREADY MENTIONED, BUT I AM GLAD TO BE SUPPORTIVE OF THIS ITEM AS WELL IN THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE REVAMPING OUR ENTIRE WEBSITE SO THAT FOLKS CAN HAVE MORE OPEN, PARTICIPATORY GOVERNMENT ONLINE. WE REALLY NEED INPUT, THOUGH. I CAN'T EMPHASIZE THAT ENOUGH. NONE OF THE REDESIGN REALLY IS REALLY GOING TO OCCUR UNTIL WE HAVE PUBLIC INPUT. WE HAVE PAPER SURVEYS YOU CAN FIND AT THE ONE STOP SHOP AND SEVERAL ACTIVITY CENTERS, BUT YOU CAN ALSO GO ONLINE AND GIVE YOUR INPUT. WE NEED THAT FEEDBACK TO CREATE THE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION THAT CITIZENS WOULD REALLY LIKE TO SEE. NOT JUST THINGS LIKE RENEWING YOUR LIBRARY CARD ONLINE

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan

Sent: Mar 25, 2009 12:37 PM

To: Larry Schooler , Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Nancy Williams , Bill Spelman

Subject: Re: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks Larry.

Without the Council having had any discussion, at least that I'm aware of, about exactly what new services and functionality we want the redesigned City website to ultimately deliver, and what those would really (not perhaps) cost, I think it's difficult to say "well, this is just the first step." While I agree in principle with what you are saying - that the first step probably has to be to update the CMS and facilitate improved internal processes and information flow - I think it's difficult to defend without knowing what the subsequent steps are going to be.

Pardon the lame analogy, but to me it seems like building the foundation for a new house without having decided for sure what you want the new house to look like. Is that a faulty analogy?

Or am I perhaps wrong that there has been no discussion and / or decision-making about subsequent functionality for the City website?

Thanks, MN.

From: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>

Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 12:21:35 -0400 (EDT)

To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>, Mike Martinez

<[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>, Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Thanks for forwarding.

A couple of quick points:

- this item tomorrow is not the be-all and end-all of the city website. It's a way to migrate content to a system where many more users than just IT and PIO can work with it, and where it's much easier for citizens to find what they need because old content is gone and existing content is much better organized. It's a critical step in the process. What BM is talking about (paying bills online, etc.) is not part of this. If it were, we'd be looking at more than a few million dollars--probably upwards of \$10 million. The bids just for this project (from the two local firms) were up in the \$1.5-\$5 million range--just for content management.

- the new website IS, indeed, part of a "comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort." As Lee has said all along, it's part of an open government initiative aimed at enabling citizens to interact with government more easily--paying bills, getting information about agenda items/budget, making comments, etc. But you have to deal with content management in order to get to what he's talking about.

- on the local vendors, they did, indeed, reach out and got two local firms to bid, but they way overbid. So we could spend more on this phase to stay local.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan

Sent: Mar 25, 2009 11:51 AM

To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison

Cc: Nancy Williams , Larry Schooler

Subject: FW: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

FYI.

----- Forwarded Message

From: Colin Rowan <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 10:35:29 -0500

To: "<Undisclosed-recipients: ;>"

Subject: McCracken statement on City Website Vote

Following is a statement from Brewster McCracken regarding this week's vote on the City's website project.

McCracken is available for interviews today. Please call me at 512-799-6400 to arrange.

Thanks,

Colin Rowan
Brewster McCracken for Austin Mayor

Statement from Brewster McCracken:

"Investing taxpayer funds for web operations only makes sense if the investment dramatically improves government efficiency and stimulates the local economy. I am not satisfied that the website redesign proposal before Council meets either objective. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposal to spend over \$700,000 on a website redesign.

"My specific concerns include:

- a new website must make it possible for citizens to pay their bills online, including by credit card
- a new website must make it possible for citizens to obtain any service online for which they currently have to drive to a government office or conduct by telephone
- any new website proposal must be part of a comprehensive government efficiency improvement effort
- given Austin's significant local talent pool in website architecture and software, any new website solicitation must include aggressive outreach to local companies. If at all possible and financially feasible, we should tap local talent and support the local economy."

Colin Rowan
Partner
I&O Communications
327 Congress, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78701
p 512.288.4054
m 512.799.6400

[REDACTED]
www.iandocom.com <<http://www.iandocom.com/>>

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 2:53 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler; Nancy Williams
Subject: Website item

The Statesman is also writing a story.

Does anybody have any feedback?

http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/Austin_to_vote_on_major_website

<http://www.bizjournals.com/austin/stories/2009/03/23/daily22.html>

http://www.austin360.com/blogs/content/shared-gen/blogs/austin/digitalsavant/entries/2009/03/25/city_of_austin.html

<http://geekAustin.org/2009/03/25/city-of-austin-website-ditch-the-hills-head-for-california/>

<http://geekAustin.org/2009/03/25/brewster-mccracken-issues-statement-on-the-city-of-austin-website-contract/>

<http://twitition.com/umx8r>

Randi Shade

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 3:13 PM
To: Mark Nathan; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler; Nancy Williams
Subject: Re: Website item

It's fairly predictable, though the Austin360 post actually makes me think we should move forward--the Austin firms' disappointment notwithstanding. And the guy who wrote that, Omar Gallaga, is a nationally-recognized tech guy, and his take is pretty thoughtful, I think.

Especially in light of the statement BM put out, it now seems even more worthwhile to consider moving forward. BM bills himself as a tech/new media candidate but he wants to both halt the website redesign AND potentially undo a lot of work already done with Plone on the city's internal intranet, which would cost us a lot of money. I know questions may remain, but I think BM actually dug himself a hole with his statement and we should consider the ramifications of jumping in that hole by opposing the item or postponing it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 3:52 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler , Nancy Williams
Subject: Website item

The Statesman is also writing a story.

Does anybody have any feedback?

http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/Austin_to_vote_on_major_website

<http://www.bizjournals.com/austin/stories/2009/03/23/daily22.html>

http://www.austin360.com/blogs/content/shared-gen/blogs/austin/digitalsavant/entries/2009/03/25/city_of_austin.html

<http://geekaustin.org/2009/03/25/city-of-austin-website-ditch-the-hills-head-for-california/>

<http://geekaustin.org/2009/03/25/brewster-mccracken-issues-statement-on-the-city-of-austin-website-contract/>

<http://twitition.com/umx8r>

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 3:21 PM
To: Larry Schooler; Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman; Nancy Williams
Subject: Re: Website item

If the Council's will is to move forward, I hope that you can at least get some questions asked of the vendor about whether or not the infrastructure they would be putting in place with this contract would be sufficient to house any of a range subsequent services you may ultimately want to deliver via the website.

From: Larry Schooler [REDACTED]
Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 16:13:01 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>, Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>, Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>, Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>, Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>, Bill Spelman <spelman@mail.utexas.edu>
Cc: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>, Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Website item

It's fairly predictable, though the Austin360 post actually makes me think we should move forward--the Austin firms' disappointment notwithstanding. And the guy who wrote that, Omar Gallaga, is a nationally-recognized tech guy, and his take is pretty thoughtful, I think.

Especially in light of the statement BM put out, it now seems even more worthwhile to consider moving forward. BM bills himself as a tech/new media candidate but he wants to both halt the website redesign AND potentially undo a lot of work already done with Plone on the city's internal intranet, which would cost us a lot of money. I know questions may remain, but I think BM actually dug himself a hole with his statement and we should consider the ramifications of jumping in that hole by opposing the item or postponing it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 3:52 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler , Nancy Williams
Subject: Website item

The Statesman is also writing a story.

Does anybody have any feedback?

[http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/Austin to vote on major website](http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/Austin%20to%20vote%20on%20major%20website)

<http://www.bizjournals.com/austin/stories/2009/03/23/daily22.html>

http://www.austin360.com/blogs/content/shared-gen/blogs/austin/digitalsavant/entries/2009/03/25/city_of_austin.html

<http://geekaustin.org/2009/03/25/city-of-austin-website-ditch-the-hills-head-for-california/>

<http://geekaustin.org/2009/03/25/brewster-mccracken-issues-statement-on-the-city-of-austin-website-contract/>

<http://twitition.com/umx8r>

Randi Shade

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 3:47 PM
To: Mark Nathan; Larry Schooler; Lee Leffingwell; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman; Nancy Williams
Subject: Re: Website item

Enough already

Stop chasing this down a fox hole. Ask questions, if it feels right, vote on it, if you don't like it...postpone it and bring it back later.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

From: Mark Nathan
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 15:21:04 -0500
To: Larry Schooler<[REDACTED]>; Lee Leffingwell<[REDACTED]>; Mike Martinez<[REDACTED]>; Randi Shade<[REDACTED]>; Laura Morrison<[REDACTED]>; Bill Spelman<spelman@mail.utexas.edu>; Nancy Williams<[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Website item

If the Council's will is to move forward, I hope that you can at least get some questions asked of the vendor about whether or not the infrastructure they would be putting in place with this contract would be sufficient to house any of a range subsequent services you may ultimately want to deliver via the website.

From: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Reply-To: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 16:13:01 -0400 (EDT)
To: Mark Nathan <[REDACTED]>; Lee Leffingwell <[REDACTED]>; Mike Martinez <[REDACTED]>; Randi Shade <[REDACTED]>; Laura Morrison <[REDACTED]>; Bill Spelman <spelman@mail.utexas.edu>
Cc: Larry Schooler <[REDACTED]>; Nancy Williams <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Website item

It's fairly predictable, though the Austin360 post actually makes me think we should move forward--the Austin firms' disappointment notwithstanding. And the guy who wrote that, Omar Gallaga, is a nationally-recognized tech guy, and his take is pretty thoughtful, I think.

Especially in light of the statement BM put out, it now seems even more worthwhile to consider moving forward. BM bills himself as a tech/new media candidate but he wants to both halt the website redesign AND potentially undo a lot of work already done with Plone on the city's internal intranet, which would cost us a lot of money. I know questions may remain, but I think BM actually dug himself a hole with his statement and we should consider the ramifications of jumping in that hole by opposing the item or postponing it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Nathan
Sent: Mar 25, 2009 3:52 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell , Mike Martinez , Randi Shade , Laura Morrison , Bill Spelman
Cc: Larry Schooler , Nancy Williams
Subject: Website item

The Statesman is also writing a story.

Does anybody have any feedback?

http://www.kxan.com/dpp/news/Austin_to_vote_on_major_website

<http://www.bizjournals.com/austin/stories/2009/03/23/daily22.html>

http://www.austin360.com/blogs/content/shared-gen/blogs/austin/digitalsavant/entries/2009/03/25/city_of_austin.html

<http://geekAustin.org/2009/03/25/city-of-austin-website-ditch-the-hills-head-for-california/>

<http://geekAustin.org/2009/03/25/brewster-mccracken-issues-statement-on-the-city-of-austin-website-contract/>

<http://twitition.com/umx8r>

10

Randi Shade

From: Mark Nathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2009 3:52 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade
Cc: Nancy Williams; Larry Schooler
Subject: FW: Questions on the CIGNEX Website Redesign contract

FYI. Barbara correctly suggested that I discontinue initiating an email dialogue with 4 CMs. So here are additional questions that Kedron has forwarded to Laura's office. Barbara says Laura is pulling this and plans to request a postponement. Thanks, MN.

----- Forwarded Message

> From: Kedron Jerome Touvell <[REDACTED]>
> Date: Wed, 25 Mar 2009 15:46:29 -0500
> To: "Rush, Barbara" <Barbara.Rush@ci.austin.tx.us>, "Morrison, Laura"
> <laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us>
> Subject: Questions on the CIGNEX Website Redesign contract
>
> Barbara,
>
> Here are a few questions I've come up with. As I mentioned, I'm
> working on a list of features I think need to be implemented that I'll
> try to get out ASAP.
>
> FEATURES
>
> We have a long list of requested features that were compiled as part
> of the internal and external input process. Which of those features
> are we planning to implement?
>
> Which of those features are we going to get as a result of this project?
>
> How much will it cost to implement the remaining features? Will they
> be implemented using internal staff or an external contractor?
>
> If we added these remaining features to the current RFP, how much do
> you think the price would increase to?
>
> To what extent will this project decentralize the process of content
> management? Will approved content-creators be able to publish
> directly to an externally-facing web page? How much training of
> content creators will be provided with this contract? How much
> training is needed?
>
> Can you give us a more detailed description of the process workflow
> changes that will occur from this contract? How much will that
> improve the city's efficiency?
>
>
> CONTRACT ISSUES
>
> Why do you think we were only able to get 2 qualified responses to the
> RFP? Was the project too narrowly defined or too vague?
>
> How has the decision to choose a Zope/Plone CMS affected the number of

> responses? Is the Plone ecosystem as healthy as an alternative system
> such as Drupal? How much of the system have we already implemented in
> Plone and how much investment does that represent? How much would it
> cost to change CMSs?
>
> Did your outreach to potential applicants include enlisting the city's
> economic development office to reach out to prospective vendors? They
> have great contacts in the field that could be put to use.
>
> What is the total person-months estimated for this project from the
> winning bidder?
>
> Are there any recent contracts we can compare this bid to from other
> cities' web site projects?
>
> If we did a rebid, how much longer would that delay the project?
>
>
> PROCESS
>
> How have you kept the public (and the Council for that matter) aware
> of the status of this project? Do you think there is room for
> improvement in that area?

----- End of Forwarded Message

Randi Shade

From: Ryan Clinton [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2009 10:08 AM
To: Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Laura Morrison; Randi Shade; spelman@mail.utexas.edu; Leffingwell, Lee
Cc: Chris Riley; Perla@voteperla.com
Subject: Greening Urban Alleys

I stumbled across this very interesting article in USA Today. It's about other cities' efforts to put urban alleys to use in ways that are more consistent with modern values--- like using them for common areas, bike paths and green space. Having lived in Hyde Park and knowing how little the alleys there are used, I think this would be a great project for Austin.

Here is the article: http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2009-04-08-urban-alleys_N.htm?csp=usat.me

Best,
Ryan

Randi Shade

From: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 1:15 PM
To: will.wynn@ci.austin.tx.us; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; Randi Shade; brewster.mccracken@ci.austin.tx.us; mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us
Cc: Hensley, Sara; LHG
Subject: Request on Barton Springs trees

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

Please do not allow any large trees at Barton Springs to be removed without prior hearing and discussion before, at minimum, the Parks Board.

Please consider my request along these lines to Ms. Hensley, as set out below.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Bill Bunch

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Barton Springs trees

Date: Wed, 15 Apr 2009 13:09:06 -0500

From: Bill Bunch <[REDACTED]>

To: Hensley, Sara <Sara.Hensley@ci.austin.tx.us>

CC: LHG [REDACTED]

Ms. Hensley,

I was just informed of your memo of yesterday to City Council indicating your plans to remove 28 or more trees at Barton Springs immediately. I respectfully ask that you refrain from cutting any trees until there can be some public discussion of the issue.

I recognize that PARD's consultant has made the recommendation on the tree removal. However, I do think it important that the report be subject to public review and comment at the Parks Board before any action is taken. I have been generally aware that the report was commissioned and completed, however I have not reviewed the report. There are a lot of qualified tree folks in Austin who also care about Barton Springs. I am sure they would like an opportunity to review and comment on the report and plan.

This public review and discussion would be facilitated and expedited by PARD posting the relevant reports on the City website immediately and inviting comment and review.

I also recognize that PARD must be concerned about public safety. However, since the tree survey was done in the November to January time frame, certainly there is not at this moment an "emergency" requiring immediate action by PARD. We do not want a repeat of the needless confrontation that occurred when trees at Deep Eddy were cut down without any prior notice or public discussion and review.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Bunch

Save Our Springs Alliance

cc: Barton Springs e-group

City Council

Linda Guerrero, Chair, Parks Board

Randi Shade

From: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2009 10:40 AM
To: Morrison, Laura; Rush, Barbara; Bill Spelman; Chris Riley; Jeff Jack; Mark Yznaga; Robin Rather; Sarah Baker; robert.levinski@ci.austin.tx.us; Chris Herbert; Mary Sanger; [REDACTED]; Amy Hardberger; Randi Shade; 'Coleman, Glen'; roy waley; colin clark; Mary Arnold
Subject: I'm sure this same thing is happening at AWU

. . . which means WTP4 is even more indefensible than it was previously.

Key quote from below:

"On the positive side, significant reductions in demands for power would give Austin Energy "some breathing room" in building new generating facilities or purchasing electricity from new biomass or wind power plants, according to Duncan. "

From Today's Infact Daily:

Forecast shows recession lowering electric usage

By Bill McCann

Austin Energy is seeing the effects of the national recession in its latest forecast of electric power use in Austin and on Austin Energy's projected future revenues.

The 2009 forecast, issued Tuesday, shows peak power demand by Austin Energy customers dropping 65 megawatts below last year's forecast for 2009, and 277 gigawatt-hours below previously forecasted energy sales. (A gigawatt is a billion watts.) The lower projections are due mainly to current and expected cutbacks in the industrial sector, especially the semiconductor industry.

The lower projections would translate into \$159.7 million less revenue than anticipated for the utility from fiscal years 2010 through 2014, according to the forecast. The lower revenues would be offset in part by a reduction in the cost of fuel needed to generate the power.

The 2009 forecast covers a 12-year period to 2020, and assumes that the impact of the recession would affect peak demand, power sales and revenues throughout the period. While peak demand, energy sales and revenues would continue to increase during the 12 years, the increases would be less than previously projected.

Despite the downturn, **Austin Energy's General Manager Roger Duncan** said there will be no immediate impact on the utility or its services. Duncan presented the latest forecast at a meeting of the **Resource Management Commission** Tuesday. The City Council is scheduled to get a briefing on April 30.

"At this point, there is nothing to worry about here," Duncan told *In Fact Daily*. "We do not expect any impact on this year's budget and no rate increase in next year's budget. Also, we do not expect any changes in services this year or next."

Duncan emphasized that the forecast, especially the later years, represents a “rough estimate of what to expect based on what we know now,” and could change significantly in the future.

“If the economy roars back, we could make up that load and revenue pretty quickly,” he said.

The forecast projects an average rate increase of about 2 percent per year during the period. On the positive side, significant reductions in demands for power would give Austin Energy “some breathing room” in building new generating facilities or purchasing electricity from new biomass or wind power plants, according to Duncan.

The 2009 forecast shows peak power demand by Austin Energy customers dropping 113 megawatts below the 2008 forecast in 2014 and 135 megawatts below in 2020. Peak demand is important because the utility has to have enough generating facilities available to produce power at the times of highest customer demand, typically on a hot summer afternoon when air conditioners are humming.

Similarly, the 2009 forecast shows overall energy demand dropping 947 gigawatt-hours below the 2008 forecast in 2014 and 1,193 gigawatt-hours below in 2020.

If the demand for electricity grows more slowly than expected, the utility could delay acquiring or purchasing new generation. For example, the utility could delay construction of planned natural gas-fired plants, reduce its purchase of biomass energy by 50 megawatts and reduce its acquisition of wind energy by 25 megawatts, according to the forecast.

Randi Shade

From: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 03, 2009 4:50 PM
To: Hensley, Sara
Cc: LHG; 'Danette Chimenti'; Passmore, Walter; will.wynn@ci.austin.tx.us; brewster.mccracken@ci.austin.tx.us; lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us; Randi Shade; Rush, Barbara; robert.levinski@ci.austin.tx.us; 'Coleman, Glen'
Subject: Tree Memo Incorrect; please do not act in haste
Attachments: 2009_Memo_MayorCouncil_PARD_Trees - Zilker Playground.pdf

Dear Ms. Hensley,

I am writing in response to your Friday afternoon memo concerning the need to take expedited action to remove a tree in the Barton Springs playground marked as "Davey" tree no. 6 (marked with a metal tag no. 4). (For ease of reference a copy of your memo is attached.)

We believe this memo is in error. This tree is identified as a "healthy" tree in the Davey report. It should not be removed and certainly not on an expedited basis. Marking this tree for expedited removal further calls into question the thoughtfulness and care given by PARD staff in its recommendations concerning the Barton Springs trees.

What we believe may actually be the tree of concern for PARD is the tree marked Davey tree No. 7, growing out of the "pirate ship" in the playground. Davey's report on this, however, is not clear. It claims the root structure is minimal. It states there is "minor dieback" in the crown. It notes limited grow space, a lean, and a covered base. Our consulting arborist, Don Gardner, agrees that this tree needs further study -- specifically to excavate around the base to further assess the health of the roots. It's not clear if Davey actually did this; if they did, they should NOT have covered the base of the tree back up with sand. Mr. Gardner notes that the solidness of the trunk of the tree is also not clear and should be further examined. This is a big beautiful tree providing important shade to the playground. If further study reveals that, in fact, it is too far gone and cannot be made safe, then Mr. Gardner agrees that it should be removed. As he has written in his report -- posted on our website -- "the jury is still out" on this tree.

A third tree at the playground deserves further attention. This tree was not studied by Davey, but appears to be on PARD's removal list. It is referenced as "Tree C" on page 12 of Mr. Gardner's report. It is just to the north of Tree No. 7. It is a large American elm with significant crown dieback. In Mr. Gardner's professional opinion, neither pruning nor root work can save this tree. As with Tree No. 7, this tree provides significant shade to the playground. If both this tree and Tree 7 are removed, there will be significantly less shade for the northeast part of the playground.

Speaking more generally, we remain concerned about the overall approach of PARD staff. We do appreciate very much that you are taking time to gain more information and hear from the community. Thank you so very much. We do hope that the orientation shifts in favor of preserving as many trees as possible while reducing risks to parks visitors. Part of our continuing concern stems from Mr. Passmore's statement at the public hearing that "trees don't heal." This is both demonstrably false and reflects a perspective that suggests all trees with any problem should be cut down. As with people, and every other living thing, trees have evolved to heal from various afflictions. It's an essential result of natural selection. (For example, quite often if a tree is completely blown over in a storm, but some of its roots remain intact, what were formerly branches will reorient and grow vertically to become "trunks.") That said, there are diseases and injuries that are or can be fatal, or for

which there is no "healing." But even then, while a tree may be "over mature" or suffering from some ailment, it can be managed to live for years and even decades. Many of the oldest trees on earth are mostly dead and have been for centuries, yet they live on.

Some of the older trees at Barton Springs do have some rot and dieback, as is normal for older trees. Quite often, however, this does not mean they are unsafe. To the contrary, these areas provide important sources of food and habitat for insects and wildlife. As just one example; there is a very nice woodpecker hole in one of the cottonwoods.

Further it is important to remember that the vast majority of tree failures occur during major storms -- times when few if any people will be at Barton Springs.

If PARD will continue with an "expedited" removal permitting of one or more trees, we would like to know which tree(s) and also be provided an opportunity to provide input before any decision is made. If the immediate concern is actually tree 7, not tree 6, then we ask that the further root and trunk examination recommended by Mr. Gardner be carried out before any decisions are made. We would further ask that Mr. Gardner be present and/or that he assist in such examination.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bill Bunch

Randi Shade

From: Coleman, Glen [Glen.Coleman@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2009 8:56 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Tree Memo Incorrect; please do not act in haste

Yes I willl -

- glen coleman

Policy Aide, Council Member Randi Shade
Austin City Council Place Three
512 974-1374

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2009 8:53 AM
To: Coleman, Glen
Subject: Fw: Tree Memo Incorrect; please do not act in haste
Importance: High

Would you please see to it that the right people know about the tact Sara and team are taking.....maybe check in with Bill to ensure he is on board and letting others know about the additional experts and about the tree by tree approach. Thanks.

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

-----Original Message-----

From: "Hensley, Sara" <Sara.Hensley@ci.austin.tx.us>

Date: Mon, 4 May 2009 08:19:05

To: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]; Danette Chimenti<[REDACTED]>; Passmore, Walter<Walter.Passmore@ci.austin.tx.us>; Wynn, Will<Will.Wynn@ci.austin.tx.us>; McCracken, Brewster<Brewster.McCracken@ci.austin.tx.us>; Leffingwell, Lee<Lee.Leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us>; Morrison, Laura<Laura.Morrison@ci.austin.tx.us>; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]<Mike.Martinez@ci.austin.tx.us>; Cole, Sheryl<Sheryl.Cole@ci.austin.tx.us>; Randi Shade<[REDACTED]>; Rush, Barbara<Barbara.Rush@ci.austin.tx.us>; Levinski, Robert<Robert.Levinski@ci.austin.tx.us>; Coleman, Glen<Glen.Coleman@ci.austin.tx.us>
Subject: RE: Tree Memo Incorrect; please do not act in haste

Bill: Thank you for pointing this out. I am double checking the number to clarify the correct tree. Please know, that I have asked our staff to recruit Don Gardner to inspect further the tree in question and others. We will not take any action on any tree until we have several "experts" agree upon the right prescription for health.

Bill: We plan on taking a tree by tree approach to make sure that we have completely worked with various experts on the plan to take care of the trees. We will only remove a tree if we have consensus to do so and

it is in the best interest of the tree and public safety. Thank you

again for pointing out the tree number and I appreciate your assistance and willingness to work with us. Sara

Sara L. Hensley, CPRP, Director
Austin Parks and Recreation Dept.
200 S. Lamar Blvd.
Austin, Texas 78704
Phone: 512-974-6717 Fax: 512-974-6703
sara.hensley@ci.austin.tx.us

Check out our Long Range Plan for the month of April

<http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/parks/longrangeplan.htm>

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Bunch [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, May 03, 2009 4:50 PM
To: Hensley, Sara
Cc: LHG; 'Danette Chimenti'; Passmore, Walter; Wynn, Will; McCracken, Brewster; Leffingwell, Lee; Morrison, Laura; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Cole, Sheryl; Randi Shade; Rush, Barbara; Levinski, Robert; Coleman, Glen
Subject: Tree Memo Incorrect; please do not act in haste

Dear Ms. Hensley,

I am writing in response to your Friday afternoon memo concerning the need to take expedited action to remove a tree in the Barton Springs playground marked as "Davey" tree no. 6 (marked with a metal tag no.

4). (For ease of reference a copy of your memo is attached.)

We believe this memo is in error. This tree is identified as a "healthy" tree in the Davey report. It should not be removed and certainly not on an expedited basis.

Marking this tree for expedited removal further calls into question the thoughtfulness and care given by PARD staff in its recommendations concerning the Barton Springs trees.

What we believe may actually be the tree of concern for PARD is the tree marked Davey tree No. 7, growing out of the "pirate ship" in the playground. Davey's report on this, however, is not clear. It claims the root structure is minimal. It states there is "minor dieback" in the crown. It notes limited grow space, a lean, and a covered base. Our consulting arborist, Don Gardner, agrees that this tree needs further study -- specifically to excavate around the base to further assess the health of the roots. It's not clear if Davey actually did this; if they did, they should NOT have covered the base of the tree back up with sand. Mr. Gardner notes that the solidness of the trunk of the tree is also not clear and should be further examined. This is a big beautiful tree providing important shade to the playground. If further study reveals that, in fact, it is too far gone and cannot be made safe, then Mr. Gardner agrees that it should be removed. As he has written in his report -- posted on our website -- "the jury is still out" on this tree.

A third tree at the playground deserves further attention. This tree was not studied by Davey, but appears to be on PARD's removal list. It is referenced as "Tree C" on page 12 of Mr. Gardner's report. It is just to the north of Tree No. 7. It is a large American elm with significant crown dieback. In Mr. Gardner's professional opinion, neither pruning nor root work can save this tree. As with Tree No. 7, this tree provides significant shade to the playground. If both this tree and Tree 7 are removed, there will be significantly less shade for the northeast part of the playground.

Speaking more generally, we remain concerned about the overall approach of PARD staff. We do appreciate very much that you are taking time to gain more information and hear from the community. Thank you so very much. We do hope that the orientation shifts in favor of preserving as many trees as possible while reducing risks to parks visitors. Part of our continuing concern stems from Mr. Passmore's statement at the public hearing that "trees don't heal." This is both demonstrably false and reflects a perspective that suggests all trees with any problem should be cut down. As with people, and every other living thing, trees have evolved to heal from various afflictions. It's an essential result of natural selection. (For example, quite often if a tree is completely blown over in a storm, but some of its roots remain intact, what were formerly branches will reorient and grow vertically to become "trunks.") That said, there are diseases and injuries that are or can be fatal, or for which there is no "healing." But even then, while a tree may be "over mature" or suffering from some ailment, it can be managed to live for years and even decades. Many of the oldest trees on earth are mostly dead and have been for centuries, yet they live on.

Some of the older trees at Barton Springs do have some rot and dieback, as is normal for older trees. Quite often, however, this does not mean they are unsafe. To the contrary, these areas provide important sources of food and habitat for insects and wildlife. As just one example; there is a very nice woodpecker hole in one of the cottonwoods.

Further it is important to remember that the vast majority of tree failures occur during major storms -- times when few if any people will be at Barton Springs.

If PARD will continue with an "expedited" removal permitting of one or more trees, we would like to know which tree(s) and also be provided an opportunity to provide input before any decision is made. If the immediate concern is actually tree 7, not tree 6, then we ask that the further root and trunk examination recommended by Mr. Gardner be carried out before any decisions are made. We would further ask that Mr. Gardner be present and/or that he assist in such examination.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bill Bunch

Randi Shade

From: Bob Lander [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 4:42 PM
To: lee.leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us; sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us; mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; [REDACTED]; Randi Shade; spelman@mail.utexas.edu
Cc: Garza, Rudy; sue.edwards@ci.austin.tx.us; Mark Tester
Subject: FW: Dallas Gets Convention Center Hotel

Did not know if you all were aware of this referendum but thought you would be interested. The announcement of this project proceeding will be a challenge to our efforts here in Austin. They have forecasted 3,000 construction jobs, 800 permanent hotel jobs and are quoting economic impact numbers in the billions. Perhaps further discussions with Mr. Bruce White, President of White Lodging, Marriott and Tim Finley could be revisited? Please let me know if you have any questions/suggestions. Bob

Bob Lander
President & CEO
Austin Convention & Visitors Bureau
V: (512) 583-7201 – F: (512) 583-7354

Visit the new austintexas.org

DISCLAIMER: This message may contain confidential or proprietary information and is intended only for the use of the individual or group named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this e-mail or any part of it. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete it and any attachments from your mailbox. The Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau (ACVB) does not accept liability for any statements that are clearly the sender's own opinion and not made on behalf of ACVB.

For Immediate Release

May 9, 2009

Dallas Approves Convention Center Hotel

Dallas residents delivered a victory for the planned convention center hotel tonight, giving the city of Dallas a long-awaited green light for construction of the project.

A referendum designed to prevent construction of this or future hotels that utilize public funds was defeated in today's city of Dallas elections. The referendum was placed on the ballot as a result of signatures collected by a political action committee created by a holding company with area hotel interests.

The "Vote NO!" campaign to build the hotel was championed by Dallas Mayor Tom Leppert, most members of the Dallas City Council, 30 publicly supportive Dallas hotels, civic leaders and more than 120 associations and companies.

"Our 30-year wait for an attached convention center hotel is finally over," Dallas Convention & Visitors Bureau President/CEO Phillip Jones said at the election night victory celebration. "Let's celebrate this monumental occasion tonight, but tomorrow morning, the work of booking more business for Dallas begins!"

In six months of selling the convention center hotel, the Dallas CVB has booked 400,000 room nights representing more than \$500 million in economic impact to the city of Dallas. "Those commitments that were contingent on the convention center hotel announcement are now definite," Jones said. "We have other groups representing 600,000 additional room nights waiting on tonight's announcement."

The city of Dallas will now proceed with the sale of tax-exempt revenue bonds to fund construction of the four-star, 1,000-room hotel connected to the Dallas Convention Center, to be completed in 2011. Matthews Southwest is the developer of the project, and Omni Hotels was selected as the hotel operator. The remaining four acres of the site surrounding the hotel are slated for dining, retail and other development.

"Mayor Leppert is an example of real leadership," Jones said. "He recognized the need for and benefits of a convention center hotel. He became the 'face' of the Vote No campaign to defeat the referendum and to support the hotel. He never wavered, working tirelessly for the greater good of the city of Dallas, its citizens and its future."

Randi Shade

From: Martinez, Mike [Council Member] [Mike.Martinez@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2009 4:49 PM
To: [REDACTED]; Leffingwell, Lee; Cole, Sheryl; Morrison, Laura; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; spelman@mail.utexas.edu
Cc: Garza, Rudy; Edwards, Sue; Tester, Mark
Subject: Re: Dallas Gets Convention Center Hotel

More than glad to discuss this Bob.
Just not sure tax incentives would work in this city and current economic environment.

But let's talk before we wipe anything off the table.

Mike

From: Bob Lander
To: Leffingwell, Lee; Cole, Sheryl; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Morrison, Laura; Riley, Chris; Randi Shade ;
spelman@mail.utexas.edu
Cc: Garza, Rudy; Edwards, Sue; Tester, Mark
Sent: Wed May 13 16:41:41 2009
Subject: FW: Dallas Gets Convention Center Hotel

Did not know if you all were aware of this referendum but thought you would be interested. The announcement of this project proceeding will be a challenge to our efforts here in Austin. They have forecasted 3,000 construction jobs, 800 permanent hotel jobs and are quoting economic impact numbers in the billions. Perhaps further discussions with Mr. Bruce White, President of White Lodging, Marriott and Tim Finley could be revisited? Please let me know if you have any questions/suggestions. Bob

Bob Lander
President & CEO
Austin Convention & Visitors Bureau
V: (512) 583-7201 – F: (512) 583-7354

Visit the new austintexas.org

DISCLAIMER: This message may contain confidential or proprietary information and is intended only for the use of the individual or group named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this e-mail or any part of it. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete it and any attachments from your mailbox. The Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau (ACVB) does not accept liability for any statements that are clearly the sender's own opinion and not made on behalf of ACVB.

For Immediate Release
May 9, 2009

Dallas Approves Convention Center Hotel

Dallas residents delivered a victory for the planned convention center hotel tonight, giving the city of Dallas a long-awaited green light for construction of the project.

A referendum designed to prevent construction of this or future hotels that utilize public funds was defeated in today's city of Dallas elections. The referendum was placed on the ballot as a result of signatures collected by a political action committee created by a holding company with area hotel interests.

The "Vote NO!" campaign to build the hotel was championed by Dallas Mayor Tom Leppert, most members of the Dallas City Council, 30 publicly supportive Dallas hotels, civic leaders and more than 120 associations and companies.

"Our 30-year wait for an attached convention center hotel is finally over," Dallas Convention & Visitors Bureau President/CEO Phillip Jones said at the election night victory celebration. "Let's celebrate this monumental occasion tonight, but tomorrow morning, the work of booking more business for Dallas begins!"

In six months of selling the convention center hotel, the Dallas CVB has booked 400,000 room nights representing more than \$500 million in economic impact to the city of Dallas. "Those commitments that were contingent on the convention center hotel announcement are now definite," Jones said. "We have other groups representing 600,000 additional room nights waiting on tonight's announcement."

The city of Dallas will now proceed with the sale of tax-exempt revenue bonds to fund construction of the four-star, 1,000-room hotel connected to the Dallas Convention Center, to be completed in 2011. Matthews Southwest is the developer of the project, and Omni Hotels was selected as the hotel operator. The remaining four acres of the site surrounding the hotel are slated for dining, retail and other development.

"Mayor Leppert is an example of real leadership," Jones said. "He recognized the need for and benefits of a convention center hotel. He became the 'face' of the Vote No campaign to defeat the referendum and to support the hotel. He never wavered, working tirelessly for the greater good of the city of Dallas, its citizens and its future."

Randi Shade

From: Ott, Marc [Marc.Ott@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2009 3:47 AM
To: Sylvia Benini
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Lee Nichols; Art Acevedo; Randi Shade; Shade, Randi; Laura Morrison; Mike Martinez; Lee Leffingwell; [REDACTED]; Sheryl N. Cole; Brewster McCracken; Will Wynn
Subject: Re: Death of Nathaniel Sanders III

Ms. Benini,

Thank you for taking the time to express your perspective and concern regarding the death of Mr. Sanders. We are all saddened by it.

Also, please know that we are all committed to accomplishing a thorough and transparent investigation. I welcome your ongoing monitoring as the investigation proceeds.

Sincerely,

Marc Ott

Sent from my iPhone

On May 13, 2009, at 3:47 PM, "Sylvia Benini" <[REDACTED]@[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Mayor Wynn, Honorable Council Members, City Manager Ott, and Chief Art Acevedo ,

We are contacting you to acknowledge another Austin tragedy, the death of yet another Austin youth of color during a police stop .

We believe that justice requires a full and complete and transparent investigation into this incident.

We the Austin Center for Peace and Justice will continue to monitor this investigation as it proceeds.

In service,

Peace and Justice,

Sylvia Benini
Interim Director , Austin Center for Peace and Justice
www.austinpeacecenter.org
512.799.5117

The 2009 Board Members of the Austin Center for Peace and Justice

Reverend Donald Bobb - President
Roscoe Overton - Treasurer
Renee Morris Larson
David Jenkins
Alex Casillas
Jim Crosby

Aileen Butler
Richard Franklin
Debbie Russell

Randi Shade

From: Randi Shade [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 8:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]; 'Will Wynn'; 'Brewster McCracken'; 'Sheryl Cole'; 'Mike Martinez'; 'Lee Leffingwell'; 'Laura Morrison'; 'Randi Shade'
Cc: 'Margo Weisz'; 'Tom Meredith'; 'Lynn Meredith'; 'Will Meredith'; 'Jack McDonald'; 'Steven Tomlinson'
Subject: RE: Thank you

Thanks for your note and for all you do!

-Randi

-----Original Message-----

From: Eugene Sepulveda [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2009 8:19 AM
To: Will Wynn; Brewster McCracken; Sheryl Cole; Mike Martinez; Lee Leffingwell; Laura Morrison; Randi Shade
Cc: Margo Weisz; Tom Meredith; Lynn Meredith; Will Meredith; Jack McDonald; Steven Tomlinson
Subject: Thank you

Can't thank you guys enough for the extraordinary support for PeopleFund/PeopleTrust and economic development for low & moderate income citizens as well as our affordable housing programs. Leveraged with the Meredith's extraordinary gift, the EDA grant and board members' financial gifts, we'll break ground in the next few months and create our home and East Austin Eco Development Community Center.

Thank you!

Eugene

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T
Please forgive typos - tiny little keys!

Randi Shade

From: Bill Bunch [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 2:49 PM
To: Morrison, Laura; Rush, Barbara; Bill Spelman; Chris Riley; Jeff Jack; Mark Yznaga; Robin Rather; Sarah Baker; robert.levinski@ci.austin.tx.us; Chris Herbert; Mary Sanger; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] Amy Hardberger; Randi Shade; 'Coleman, Glen'; roy waley; colin clark; Mary Arnold; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: More eye-popping benefits from water conservation
Attachments: intelligent utility article on SA conservation.pdf

Friends,

please take a few minutes to read the attached article from the trade publication Intelligent Utility i took the liberty to highlight key passages (so you don't even have to read the whole thing)

in discussing how much we save by avoiding building WTP4, we have not even looked at the savings to be had on the wastewater side; when those are factored in, the financial benefits to ratepayers (not to even mention the environmental benefits) are truly amazing

is there some reason we can't do this too? is there some reason we should not do this too?

i can't think of a single one;

thanks for your consideration,

bill

Randi Shade

From: Eugene Sepulveda [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2009 7:09 AM
To: Will Wynn; Lee Leffingwell; Brewster McCracken; Sheryl Cole; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Subject: Historical Land Commission

Hi all,

I understand there may be problems with the "good standing" of certain historical land commissioner appointments. Hoping you guys won't grant "quorum" exceptions and instead will proceed to reappointments or new appointments in order to fill the seats. I know you intend a balanced & accountable perspective on the commission, and, I am told, this is at threat.

Despite overwhelming support against historical zoning by owners and Aldridge Place neighbors (as well as a eventually a NUNA vote against) as well as a case of obvious façade and structural alterations – not to mention very dubious provenance - HLC staff recommended historical zoning for a property. [btw, Steven and I don't own the property (408 W. 32nd), we just live down the street]

Just want to make sure we don't end up with a majority of commissioners who value preservation over integrity of decision making and ask that you be careful in what staff recommendations you grant given our recent experience with the lack of accountability and integrity of process from staff.

Appreciatively,

Eugene

Eugene Sepulveda

<http://www.communitymatters.biz> - it's about community, politics, business and somethings just silly fun

Randi Shade

From: Brewster McCracken [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 6:10 PM
To: John Baker; Beatriz Perez; Jose Beceiro; Roger Duncan; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Isaac Barchas; Colin Rowan; Jim Marston; Michael Webber; Rachel Proctor May; Karl Rabago; Tom Edgar
Cc: Steve Tyndall; [REDACTED]
Subject: Call-in number for tomorrow's board meeting

Hi everyone, for those of you who can't make attend in person tomorrow morning's meeting to set up the Pecan Street Project corporation board meeting, here is the call-in info:

Teleconference No.: (888) 453-4271

Participant Passcode: 5123 2226 28

Steve and Wes will be sending updated corporate formation documents this evening.

See you in the morning.

Brewster

Randi Shade

From: Eugene Sepulveda [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 9:35 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Sheryl Cole; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; chris.riley@ci.austin.tx.us; bill.spelman@ci.austin.tx.us
Subject: Historical Land Commission
Attachments: Historic Landmark Comm'n 6-3-2009.pdf

Hi ALL,

Don't know what's up with the Historical Land Commission but seems out of control when a home owner, his immediate neighbors, all the neighbors of Aldridge Place and the North University Neighborhood Association are all in agreement that a home SHOULD NOT be designated historical. Yet, HLC votes to designate the home historical nonetheless.

Seriously, seems completely out of control, especially when there is no architectural integrity left to the home, engineer reports confirm it isn't salvageable and NO ONE but a couple of NUNA members who lost the broader neighborhood association vote but who are close to HLC members are in support.

Additionally, I am hearing that staff is proposing changing the rules for designation of neighborhoods as historical zones. Please don't 1) allow this ridiculous ruling to stand nor 2) alter the rules to allow historical zoning of neighborhoods by less than 60% of neighbors.

Hope you'll help us here. Feels really strange to have two rogue NUNA members who don't even live in Aldridge Place plus city staff imposing requirements the owner, his immediate neighbors, the neighborhood and the neighborhood association have voted against.

Please help.

Many thanks

Eugene Sepulveda

<http://www.communitymatters.biz> - it's about community, politics, business and sometimes just silly fun

Randi Shade

From: Eugene Sepulveda [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2009 7:59 AM
To: Lee Leffingwell; Mike Martinez; Sheryl Cole; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; chris.riley@ci.austin.tx.us; bill.spelman@ci.austin.tx.us
Cc: 'Daniel Leary'; 'Joe Arriaga'; 'John Rosato'; 'Laurie Limbacher'; 'Patti Hansen'; 'Terri Myers'; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Case No. C14H-2009-0017, 408 West 32nd Street

Hi again,

My bad - correcting the record: I'm told one Aldridge Place resident did support the historical zoning (Ms. Susan Morgan, 206 W. 33rd). Nevertheless, opposed by owner, neighborhood and NUNA

Eugene

<http://www.communitymatters.biz> - it's about community, politics, business and sometimes just silly fun

From: Eugene Sepulveda [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 9:35 PM
To: Lee Leffingwell (Lee.Leffingwell@ci.austin.tx.us); Mike Martinez (mike.martinez@ci.austin.tx.us); Sheryl Cole (Sheryl.cole@ci.austin.tx.us); Randi Shade (rshade@mba1992.hbs.edu); Laura Morrison (laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us); 'chris.riley@ci.austin.tx.us'; 'bill.spelman@ci.austin.tx.us'
Subject: Historical Land Commission

Hi ALL,

Don't know what's up with the Historical Land Commission but seems out of control when a home owner, his immediate neighbors, all the neighbors of Aldridge Place and the North University Neighborhood Association are all in agreement that a home SHOULD NOT be designated historical. Yet, HLC votes to designate the home historical nonetheless.

Seriously, seems completely out of control, especially when there is no architectural integrity left to the home, engineer reports confirm it isn't salvageable and NO ONE but a couple of NUNA members who lost the broader neighborhood association vote but who are close to HLC members are in support.

Additionally, I am hearing that staff is proposing changing the rules for designation of neighborhoods as historical zones. Please don't 1) allow this ridiculous ruling to stand nor 2) alter the rules to allow historical zoning of neighborhoods by less than 60% of neighbors.

Hope you'll help us here. Feels really strange to have two rogue NUNA members who don't even live in Aldridge Place plus city staff imposing requirements the owner, his immediate neighbors, the neighborhood and the neighborhood association have voted against.

Please help.

Many thanks

Eugene Sepulveda

<http://www.communitymatters.biz> - it's about community, politics, business and sometimes just silly fun

Randi Shade

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2009 12:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]; lee.leff@gmail.com; Mark Nathan
Subject: Fw: Rose Lancaster/Resignation

Katrina??

-----Original Message-----

From: Office of the City Clerk
To: Lee Lefingwell
To: Mike Martinez
To: Shade, Randi
To: Morrison, Laura
To: Riley, Chris
To: Spelman, William
To: Cole, Sheryl
Cc: Williams, Nancy
Cc: Andy Moore
Cc: Bier, Marti
Cc: Coleman, Glen
Cc: Rush, Barbara
Cc: Leff, Lewis
Cc: Estrada, Deena
Cc: Gerbracht, Heidi
Cc: Wilson, Beverly (Council Place 6)
Subject: FW: Rose Lancaster/Resignation
Sent: Jun 30, 2009 11:54 AM

The following is a letter from Rose Lancaster resigning her position on the Travis County Healthcare District Board of Managers effective immediately. Please advise if additional information is required. Candy Parham Hinkle Boards and Commissions Coordinator Office of the City Clerk (512) 974-2497 (512) 974-2374 -- fax candy.parham@ci.austin.tx.us From: Susan Morris [mailto:[REDACTED]] Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2009 10:45 AM To: Parham, Candy Subject: Rose Lancaster/Resignation Ms. Rose Lancaster
1106 West 10th Street
Austin, Texas 78703
512-478-2386

June 29, 2009

The Honorable Lee Leffingwell
The Honorable Mike Martinez
The Honorable Sheryl Cole
The Honorable Laura Morrison
The Honorable Randi Shade
The Honorable Bill Spelman
The Honorable Chris Riley

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

With much regret, I am submitting my resignation from the Travis County Healthcare Board of Managers. Due to unresolved personal health issues, the resignation date is immediate.

I want to thank the Austin City Council for giving me the opportunity to serve Travis County as their representative as a board manager on an issue that means so much to me. My hope in selecting the next manager is that consideration is given to someone who has the understanding, the experience and some empathy towards the health care clinic system.

Please know, if I can assist in finding the next manager, I'm very willing to help search for that person.

Sincerely,

Rose Lancaster

Susan Morris 512-750-0558 Downtown churches and social service agencies joining together to improve the quality of life of the poor, the addicted, the mentally ill, the abused, the sick and the homeless who are our neighbors. www.austindowntowncluster.org A proud member of Austin Community Foundation's family of funds. <http://austincommunityfoundation.org>

Randi Shade

From: May, Rachel [Rachel.May@austinenergy.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 9:31 AM
To: Brewster McCracken; Baker, John; Beatriz Perez; Jose Beceiro; Duncan, Roger; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Isaac Barchas; Colin Rowan; Jim Marston; Michael Webber; Rabago, Karl; Tom Edgar; Coleman, Glen
Cc: Steve Tyndall; Wes Watts
Subject: RE: discussion item - possibility of CAPCOG membership

It also might create issues for private sector partners who would really prefer to have a governance role. (I don't know that any of them would actually prefer that, but it's within the realm of possibility.)

On the private side, we're drawing a distinction between membership and governance, and it seems we could do the same for public sector partners through a "public sector membership" arrangement. Something with well-defined deliverables and opportunities for Capcog to help steer the ship.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brewster McCracken [mailto: [REDACTED]@austinenergy.com]
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2009 6:00 PM
To: May, Rachel; Baker, John; Beatriz Perez; Jose Beceiro; Duncan, Roger; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Isaac Barchas; Colin Rowan; Jim Marston; Michael Webber; Rabago, Karl; Tom Edgar; Coleman, Glen
Cc: Steve Tyndall; Wes Watts
Subject: discussion item - possibility of CAPCOG membership

Hi everyone, I have visited with a few of you about this. CAPCOG has expressed interest in supporting the formation of the Pecan Street Project.

They are considering dedicating a federal Economic Development Administration grant to the Project. The amount would be \$300,000 over two years. The Project must identify \$110,713 in local matches from the public sector. The match can be a mix of direct funds and in-kind contributions. PSP ideally should also identify a regional component of our efforts - this is something we have already discussed from the early days of the project, so identifying a regional component would potentially be in keeping with the project's original goals.

This raises the question of whether CAPCOG should serve as a member of the board of directors. I have spoken to Brian Kelsey about this. He said he believes the organization would like to serve on the board, but he sees pros and cons, and I do, too.

Here, in my mind, are the pros and cons:

PROS:

1. CAPCOG would give the PSP an explicitly regional scope. It has strong ties with regional governments and regional stakeholders.
2. In many areas of the country, COG's are the lead planning body and the focal point for federal agency interactions. This is the case in the Dallas-Ft Worth metro area, for instance. CAPCOG's membership could therefore give the PSP added credibility with potential federal funding sources and help the project become aware of these opportunities.
3. CAPCOG has a strong economic development orientation, which would reinforce the PSP's commitment to creating economic opportunity in clean energy.

4. CAPCOG houses the Central Texas Clean Air Coalition, so it already has a history of providing technical planning assistance and playing a regional leadership role in environmental public policy efforts.

CONS:

1. CAPCOG has not been involved in the PSP to date.

2. Giving them a board seat could create an implied precedent that major public sector funders will receive board seats.

3. Giving CAPCOG a board seat could make it difficult to turn down board seats for any other public sector partners who seek to join the project at a later date.

Please let me, Steve and Wes know your thoughts so we can prepare the incorporation documents and related items accordingly. Thanks.

Brewster

Randi Shade

From: Brewster McCracken [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2009 3:53 PM
To: Rachel May; John Baker; Beatriz Perez; Jose Beceiro; Roger Duncan; Randi Shade; Laura Morrison; Isaac Barchas; Colin Rowan; Jim Marston; Michael Webber; Karl Rabago; Tom Edgar
Cc: Steve Tyndall; Wes Watts
Subject: schedule board meeting for Pecan St Project

Hi Governing Committee members, we have gotten comments back from everyone and need to schedule a board meeting to finalize the incorporation of the Pecan Street Project.

After talking to a few of you, I have a proposed date for the board meeting: **Tuesday, July 28, 8 am at Baker Botts**. An alternate date would be the next morning, Wed., July 29.

Please let me know if you cannot attend on Tuesday, July 28. If you can't attend but can designate a proxy, please let me, Steve and Wes know that as well.

At our last organizing meeting, the target date for each member executing their version of the corporate documents was Friday, July 24.

I will defer to Steve and Wes to provide you with the instructions on what to execute, etc.

Thanks.

Brewster

Randi Shade

From: Martinez, Mike [Council Member] [Mike.Martinez@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2009 9:05 AM
To: lee leffingwell; [REDACTED] Nathan, Mark
Subject: FW: Submitted from City Council web site - Health Care

Senator Watkins!?!?!?

Don't think you have much to worry about with this guy.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2009 3:29 PM
To: Leffingwell, Lee; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Riley, Chris; Shade, Randi; Morrison, Laura; Spelman, William; Cole, Sheryl
Subject: Submitted from City Council web site - Health Care

Date/Time Submitted: 1528 hours

From: Alex McLean

E-mail address: [REDACTED]

Subject: Health Care

Comments:

I am dissapointed in Mayor Leffingwells support of President Obama's attempt to nationalize health care.

I voted for the Mayor but now will work to replace you due to your alignment with Rep. Dogget and State Sen. Watkins.

That doesn't represent Travis County or Texas.

Randi Shade

From: Martinez, Mike [Council Member] [Mike.Martinez@ci.austin.tx.us]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 8:30 AM
To: Nathan, Mark; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Submitted from City Council web site - bannner

My response ;-)

-----Original Message-----

From: Martinez, Mike [Council Member]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 8:22 AM
To: [REDACTED]; Leffingwell, Lee; Riley, Chris; Shade, Randi; Morrison, Laura; Spelman, William; Cole, Sheryl
Cc: Garza, Bobby; Moore, Andrew; Williamson, Laura
Subject: RE: Submitted from City Council web site - bannner

Hey jamie!

Keep your racist, bigoted, homophobic drivel to yourself. We will gladly continue to hang the banners and support this Festival and more.

Have a nice day

Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, September 07, 2009 10:37 PM
To: Leffingwell, Lee; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Riley, Chris; Shade, Randi; Morrison, Laura; Spelman, William; Cole, Sheryl
Subject: Submitted from City Council web site - bannner

Date/Time Submitted: 2236 hours

From: James Mutz

E-mail address: [REDACTED]

Subject: bannner

Comments:

I will call over there to that office to address the banner I saw flying over one of these Texas streets (Travis, Bowie, Crockett) Gay and Lesbian Festival Take it down mayor lower case m. You are pathetic.

Captain USMC

James Mutz

512-739-4585
[REDACTED]

Theres a new sheriff in town. Remember that you spick.

Randi Shade

From: Debbie Russell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2009 9:25 AM
To: StephanieMcDonald; Sheryl Cole; Marcelo Tafoya; Nelson Linder; Wayne Vincent
Cc: [REDACTED]; Matt Simpson; Jim Harrington; Chris Riley; Mike Martinez; Randi Shade; Lee Leffingwell; Laura Morrison; Bill Spelman
Subject: Re: Media Advisory by Council Member Cole re: Call for Digital Dashboard Cameras in Patrol Vehicles

I spoke to APD's Lee Davila Friday and he said APD has been approved for "the" federal grant for the camera system. He reported that they will vet the proposed system through the PSC and various other boards/commissions and other outlets for community input before going forth...but that it should be a matter of a few months before we get a new system.

Are y'all hearing otherwise that this call is necessary?

If that is not the case, my thinking on the matter is that we should indeed work with local tech community and community leaders to find local funding and perhaps donated items to make this happen in the same timeframe.

Thanks, Debbie
573-6194

--- On **Fri, 11/6/09, McDonald, Stephanie** <Stephanie.McDonald@ci.austin.tx.us> wrote:

From: McDonald, Stephanie <Stephanie.McDonald@ci.austin.tx.us>
Subject: Media Advisory by Council Member Cole re: Call for Digital Dashboard Cameras in Patrol Vehicles
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Date: Friday, November 6, 2009, 4:08 PM

From: From the Public Information Office
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2009 3:41 PM
Cc: McDonald, Stephanie; Sabana, Anna
Subject: Media Advisory by Council Member Cole re: Call for Digital Dashboard Cameras in Patrol Vehicles

MEDIA ALERT

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Nov. 6, 2009

Contact: Stephanie Lee McDonald

Randi Shade

From: Richard Suttle, Jr. [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 11:30 AM
To: Leffingwell, Lee; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Sheryl Cole; Randi Shade; laura.morrison@ci.austin.tx.us; chris.riley@ci.austin.tx.us; bill.spelman@ci.austin.tx.us; william.spelman@ci.austin.tx.us
Cc: Andy Pastor; Will Marsh; Guernsey, Greg
Subject: Agenda Item 78

Dear Mayor and Council,

I represent the Southpark Meadows Shopping Center located on I-35 at Slaughter Lane. It is a large, multi phase shopping center in the Desired Development Zone that was started in 2005. 78 of 91 (approximately 86%) of the phases are complete and when finished the project will have approximately 1.6 million square feet of retail and other uses. The parking, utility and drainage infrastructure is in place. There are some remaining pad sites built but the buildings have not been completed. The site plan was set to expire this year and ZAP granted an extension to 2010.

This week you will consider setting a public hearing on our appeal of the ZAP Commission decision to grant a 7 month extension of the site plan to February of 2010 when the request was for a 3 year extension to 2012. ZAP was constrained by the Project Duration provisions of the Code and was advised by the staff that they could not grant a longer extension absent a Managed Growth Agreement or other relief that could only be granted by Council. The shorter extension was granted by consent. We appealed that decision in hopes of getting a longer extension by Council.

In order for you to consider a longer extension, I believe staff will advise that a Managed Growth Agreement or other relief will have to be granted.

The purpose of this correspondence is to request that in addition to setting the public hearing on the appeal, would you request staff to bring a Managed Growth Agreement for your consideration on the same date and in connection with the hearing on the appeal. Procedurally I believe that if you found merit in granting a longer extension to the site plan, you would have the proper items before you if both the appeal and a Managed Growth Agreement were posted and considered. Timing is important on this because the project is essentially stalled while this appeal is pending. We would like to conclude this in December.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments. I have attached the backup for this item below for your convenience.

Richard

Richard T. Suttle, Jr.
Armbrust & Brown, LLP
100 Congress, Suite 1300
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: 512-435-2310
Fax: 512-435-2360
Email: [REDACTED]

This communication is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If the reader is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender by telephone and return the original message to the listed email address.

Item(s) to Set Public Hearing(s) ITEM No. 78

RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Subject: Set a public hearing on an appeal by SP Meadows South, Ltd. of the Zoning and Platting Commission's decision to approve a site plan extension for a site located at 9900 S. IH-35 Svc. Road, SB, a project known as Southpark Meadows Shopping Center. (Suggested date and time: December 17, 2009, 6:00 p.m., at Austin City Hall, 301 W. Second Street, Austin, TX).

Additional Backup Material

(click to open)

No Attachments Available

For More Information: George Zapalac, 974-2725; Sue Welch, 974-3294; Sylvia Arzola, 974-6448.

This action will set a public hearing on an appeal of a site plan extension for a previously approved site plan for Southpark Meadows (SP-05-0568C.)

The current site plan was administratively approved on July 25, 2005 for three years. A one-year administrative extension was granted in 2008, extending the expiration date until July 27, 2009. The Zoning and Platting Commission subsequently approved an extension to February 7, 2010.

The site is subject to Section 25-1-535, Project Duration, and can only be extended a maximum of five years from the initial submittal date of February 7, 2005. The Project Duration provisions supersede any conflicting provisions of any other rules or regulations adopted under the Code or ordinances outside the Code.

The applicant is appealing the Zoning and Platting Commission's decision and requesting a three year extension, to February 7, 2012. The applicant indicates the Commission and staff did not base the extension request on the merits of the site plan extension listed in 25-5-62(c) of the Code.

Randi Shade

From: Patti Hansen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2009 10:35 AM
To: Randi Shade; Laura Morrison
Cc: Laurie Limbacher; Julie Hart
Subject: Heritage Grants Update

Greetings Randi and Laura,

We have a website! www.austinheritage.org provides the grant schedule, guidelines, procedures, and application form for the ACVB Heritage Grants program.

The Historic Landmark Commission Grants Committee held two meetings with Julie, the first included City attorney Leela Fireside going over the state law and local ordinance concerning the use of "bed tax". Then we got to work on setting the schedule and revising the Guidelines, Procedures, and Application. Several drafts later, we were all in agreement (including Leela) and the information is now posted to the new ACVB website. Letters will also be mailed to potential applicants, but in the future we hope that all will obtain their information from the website.

The below schedule will give you an overview of the timeframes, but I encourage you to check out the website because the forms may need some tweaking over the next year. As far as changes, the new guidelines/procedures emphasize repeatedly the need to justify the tourism impact, wording was tightened concerning incomplete applications, and it was noted that the applications were to be reviewed by City Attorney and City Manager. Now we just need to implement and see how it works in practice.

That's all for now,
Patti

Schedule:

February 15, 2010 Grant Applications Due

February 16 – 28, 2010 Applications will be reviewed for completeness and to ensure compliance with the tourism requirements. Applicants may be contacted at this time to provide additional information or clarification to their application.

March 1, 2010 The Grants Committee of the Historic Landmark Commission, along with representatives from the Austin Convention and Visitors Bureau, will review all applications in a work shop.

March 8, 2010 The Grants Committee of the Historic Landmark Commission will hold a public meeting to make final decisions on recommendations for grant awards.

March 9 – 12, 2010 The City of Austin Law Department will review applications recommended for award to confirm documentation of the benefit to tourism and that the use fits within the approved uses in the statute.

March 15 – 19, 2010 A summary report of all recommended grant awards will be reviewed by the City Manager's Office prior to award by the Historic Landmark Commission.

March 22, 2010 Grants are awarded by the HLC