

City Council Chamber, City Hall, Monday, October 9, 2000

A Special Meeting of the Houston City Council was held at 8:30 p. m. Monday, October 9, 2000, with Mayor Lee P. Brown presiding and with Council Members Bruce Tatro, Carol M. Galloway, Mark Goldberg, Jew Don Boney, Jr., Rob Todd, Mark A. Ellis, Bert Keller, Gabriel Vasquez, John E. Castillo, Annise D. Parker, Gordon Quan, Orlando Sanchez, Chris Bell and Carroll G. Robinson; Mr. Anthony Hall, City Attorney, Mr. Al Haines, Chief Administrative Officer, Mayor's Office; Ms. Marty Stein, Agenda Director, Ms. Karen Kelley, Agenda Office present.

At 8:38 p.m. Mayor Brown called to order the meeting of the City Council and invited the Chair of the Mayor's Ministerial Advisory Committee, Reverend Donald Burges to offer the prayer and Mayor Brown led everyone in the pledge of allegiance.

Mayor Brown requested the City Secretary to call the roll.

Mayor Brown requested the City Secretary to announce the purpose of the meeting, and Ms. Anna Russell stated that it was for considering the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal offered by Council Members Parker, Quan and Vasquez and a copy had been distributed to each Council Member at the table and the first item would be to hear from the public.

Mr. James Partsch-Galvan, 1611 Holman, Houston, Texas 77004 (713-528-2607) appeared and stated that first of all they were still a little bit late so how could they run the City if they started the meeting late, that he had read all the information that he had gotten from the internet and the odd piece by the Houston Chronicle and the thing that stood out in the proposal it said that they would take up motions and he stated that he entered a motion that they reconvene the meeting until 12:01 a.m. and let the default rate take effect because that would be more money for the taxpayers, that as the Chronicle stated it was just a puny one, that he was present because (1) he knew that there would be some excitement and some fighting starting soon, that if they thought the Middle East was now fighting, he bet that later on they would be fighting, that (2) he was present because he was not satisfied with the police services, that he saw all the police officers present but if the police officers would have done their job back in December and January, with Mr. James Honey, who vandalized his house, that he was scared to go back to his house, that he had not been living in his house, that he was staying with his parents, that if the police officers would have done their jobs Mr. James Honey would have been in jail by now and nothing had still been done about that, that they were harassing him on his house instead of helping him, that they had no respect for him, that they did not even announce him, that he was the Libertarian Candidate for Texas Representative 147, that they would think that since he was a candidate those police officers could protect him a little bit better and he was still very angry about that, that as he stated he looked at it as a college course, that he had to force himself to be present, that he read it all, that the thing that stood out was to establish a \$5 million dollar fund, that they did not need to establish a \$5 million dollar fund, they needed to be doing better with the funds they had now, that where was the \$5 million dollars going to be put, that the Chronicle had reported that when a hurricane or other disaster inevitably came, that "other" was too general, that how about, like former Mayor Bob Lanier, who was the most corrupt Mayor in the City of Houston, that Mayor Brown would decide that in the General Fund he would want to take the \$5 million dollars with him, that he did not think they should be establishing a \$5 million dollar fund, that the exemption targeted tax relief for

seniors it sounded good, but how about targeted tax relief for people with HIV, give them a tax relief, that if they were dying to put a freeze on their taxes. Council Member Boney absent.

Mayor Brown stated that the matter before them was to consider the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal offered by Council Members Parker, Quan and Vasquez.

Council Member Vasquez stated he had a point of order, that he would like to outline and make a suggestion to Mayor Brown and a recommendation about the process in the sense that they would like to consider the plan first and the tax levy second, that their interests was that the plan be considered and voted on as a whole and not voted on by each point, that obviously there were some people who would like to offer amendments, but they would like to vote on the plan as a whole.

Council Member Vasquez moved to consider the plan first, seconded by Council Member Parker.

Council Member Parker stated that the three of them who authored the compromise proposal voted against any cut in taxes and they had not changed their opinion on that and offered the one cent tax compromise reluctantly and hoped that the package they prepared was accepted by Council and then in turn vote on the tax levy that they had also put in as part of their plan., that they heard their colleagues express sentiments during the debate on the tax rollback, that the rollback was never to force more accountability and Council control over what was admittedly a very cumbersome and murky budget process, that they too were very frustrated by the recent shortfalls in revenue and believed the City needed to get its economic house in order during what were really good financial times, that they had attempted to do some of that through their Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal, that it had immediate impact, that they heard Council Members say that the City could cut more spending in addition to the \$15 million already imposed by Council and that was in the proposal, that they knew the City was sometimes inefficient in collecting fees and fines, while remedies were addressed in the budget, they strengthened those remedies in their proposal, that secondly their Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal would change next years budget, that many Council Members stated that though the administration agreed to an experimental zero based budgeting they wanted a wholesale change and that was in the proposal, that several of them had always asked for a true cash rainy day fund and that was in the proposal and finally their proposal gave goals for the future, that most of them supported increasing the homestead exemption for needy seniors and that was in the proposal, that if the taxpayer dividend proposal made sense for Houston they had a chance to explore it because that was in the proposal, that it was a compromise among the three of them who presented it, that they did not agree on everything and had to work out the details, that it was conceived as a package and they hoped to see it passed as a package and knew that there would probably be amendments proposed for it, but again they intended to see it emerge at the end as a package and if the rollback effort was really about getting a better grasp on the process of forcing more fiscal accountability they thought that now they had a chance to show that, they hoped they were offering a scalpel for the budget and an olive branch instead of what they perceived as a cleaver.

Council Member Boney stated in the proposed ordinance she referenced in terms of the budgeting process zero based or performance based budgeting, that some

departments may not be best managed or evaluated through the so called zero based approach as opposed to the performance based approach and Council Member Parker stated they wanted to leave that flexibility in there.

Council Member Sanchez that he read the captions and Ordinance 2000-813, which failed, and they were identical and asked if he could get from the Legal Department the thought process that went behind the opinion that it was not a violation of Council rules by bringing the matter back up, that his question was if in the future if an item failed and then the administration brought it back the following week only tweaking the sums but in essence the same ordinance would that be appropriate. Council Member Boney absent.

Mr. Hall stated that he outlined the question for reconsideration of an item, that the rules specifically stated that the same question could not be reconsidered by Council for a period of 90 days and then only by motion made by one who was on the prevailing side, that there had been a long history of rulings that said essentially that if the change was not de minimis it was not the same question, that in this instance, in his judgement, was not even a close question, the tax rate that was proposed before and the item that Council considered was essentially \$8 million dollars difference in its revenue production to that City, that the difference between 66.5 and 65.5 was hard to argue that it was de minimis, that a tenth of a penny change or one tenth of one cent change would represent about \$750,000 to the City itself and in their judgement the thought was that probably would be difficult to argue that it was de minimis, but it would be a close call at that level, that at 66.4 it would be closer to being the same question, and Council Member Sanchez asked where was the line where it was appropriate and inappropriate to violate Council rules, and Mr. Hall stated that it was never appropriate to violate Council rules, that Council rules indicated that when the same question was to again be brought up it had to be done under reconsideration, that it was not a reconsideration, that as he indicated it was difficult to draw bright lines because always they were not dealing with numbers, they were in this case, but most often they were not, that obviously for most the question of how much constituted a different item was the issue that was raised by how much the number difference was because the intent of the rule was obviously not to have them vote on the same issue over and over again, that it was difficult to argue that the \$8 million dollars that it represented was the same item to the City, that it was easier to argue that if one had changed it just by one tenth of one penny that it would not have been the same question.

Council Member Robinson asked if the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposals were binding on the administration and Council Member Parker stated that it was her belief that they were, but perhaps that question should be addressed to the administration, but they should note that there were items that had immediate impact and then items that would deal with next years budget, and then there were a couple of items that were into the future, that they could not bind future Council's.

Council Member Robinson asked if they passed an ordinance and it took effect then any future Council would be free to change it, but until they took an affirmative vote to change the ordinance they were bound by it, and Mr. Hall stated that was the general rule, and asked what was the binding nature of those things that were not set out in ordinance before them, and Mr. Hall stated that his understanding of the proposal offered was that it was Council's adoption of a plan that it expected to implement, obviously some

of them contingent on other things happening, that a vote by Council would be directives, that it was nothing binding.

Council Member Vasquez stated that they raised a very good question about the issue of binding, that both he and Council Member Parker viewed it as binding, that if there was an amendment they would like to offer to the total package and formally binding it in some capacity and adding it to the agenda next week or in the future after hopefully passing it today and they wanted more formality to binding it he would think that Council would be open to that if it passed as well, and Council Member Robinson stated that they would actually have to have the ordinance, so unless somehow tonight's vote was an expression that was going to be converted into an ordinance and brought back before Council then he did not know the binding nature other than somebody's word.

Council Member Vasquez stated that the question they were talking about was the order by which they were going to consider the two proposals, that the three of them asked that the order be the plan first and the tax levy second.

Mayor Brown stated that it would be his position that if the majority of Council approved the proposal then that would be the will of Council and it would be implemented by the administration.

Council Member Tatro asked if the Legal Department had drafted up any of the proposal in legal language, and Mr. Hall stated they had not and that they would be prepared to prepare, and Council Member Tatro suggested that they do take them separately, that they should not take them as a package, that he had some significant concerns with three of them and the fact that they were not binding, that with the per cent rollback it could be exempted from any department but did not specify, and it would probably be the administration stating which departments could be exempted, that the rainy day fund was a two year window and very difficult to lock another Council and another budget cycle into any of those, and the targeted tax relief on the homestead exemption was contingent on the Metro transfer which would not be for another two years, that it was pushing things off into the future, that he would like to see some cleanup of the specific language if they were going to pass them.

Council Member Bell stated he was a little bit confused when the Mayor stated he would respect the majority will of Council in its action this evening, that it contrasted rather vividly with the reaction to what was the majority vote of Council a month ago when they voted against, by a majority of 8, the proposed tax rate, that for the past month certain people had been looking for a way around that vote to try to undo that vote, that he commented his colleagues for their well meaning and sincere effort to try to find some compromise, that it was a proposal not a plan, that if they read them closer they could describe what was being called flexibility as an out in almost everyone of the proposals, an out for the administration where they really did not have to do anything and could say that they complied with the will of the majority, that he did not think they were present in Chambers legally, that he agreed with Council Member Sanchez, that on September 28, 2000 he requested from Mr. Hall, City Attorney, that he would like to request any and all legal opinions that had been issued by the City Attorney's office within the last 15 years that made reference to the issue of reconsideration of agenda items by Council, that they did respond and sent him 3 opinions all having to do with reconsideration but none of them having to do with the particular question before them today as to what actually

constituted the question, that he was now confused because Mr. Hall had stated that there was a litany of opinions on the particular subject dealing with what constituted a change or a significant change, but somehow all of those opinions were left out of the stack that he received, that he was told about an opinion not too long ago from Mr. Benjamin Hall, who used to be the City Attorney.

Council Member Keller asked if they were talking about the plan first and then amendments second, that whatever it was proposal, plan or package it all sounded great and thought they could have that and have the effective rate, that with the permutations they were talking about and per decimal point they could possibly have up to about a million different numbers that they could vote on, and asked if Health, Library, the Courts, etc., were in jeopardy if they lowered it two cents, then if they voted to raise it two cents would the services double.

Mayor Brown stated of course they would not double with two cents, that if they would recall during the course of their extended budget deliberations they pointed out that there were some items they had to address during the course of the year and that was one of the reasons he directed his staff to have a very conservative projection on the revenue, items such as Health Care Benefits, Workman's Compensation, PIP Program, Meet and Confer for Police and Fire, that yes those items were still out there that they had to address somewhere along the line. Council Member Castillo absent.

Council Member Ellis stated that it was his understanding that they could not vote on the tax rate along with other items, that it must be separated, and Council Member Parker stated that they would vote on the tax rate, but the things associated with the rest of the plan they would vote as a package, and Council Member Ellis asked if they severed the proposal and started to look at each of the different items and they wanted to vote on all the items together as they stood, would they still have the opportunity to amend it. Council Member Castillo absent.

Mr. Hall stated that the document was certainly amendable, that it was presented as a proposal and in order to separate they would have to move and get a majority vote to divide the question. Council Member Castillo absent.

Council Member Parker stated that they would prefer to see if they were going to make amendments that they amend the totality, that they would take the tax rate separately. Council Member Castillo absent.

Mayor Brown stated that the motion on the floor was to vote on the plan first and the tax rate second and that was what they were discussing. Council Member Castillo absent.

Council Member Todd asked if they voted on the plan and the motion was already on the floor would a motion to sever be out of order at this point, and Mr. Hall stated he was not familiar with any motion to sever, that there was a motion to divide the question which would divide some of the components. Council Member Castillo absent.

Council Member Todd asked if there was any spot where all of the previous City Attorney opinions were bound, and Mr. Hall stated he was not aware of it, and Council Member Todd requested that in the future it would be a good thing for the Legal

Department to spend some time and piece together a library and bind those together, and Mr. Hall stated that they were electronically filed, that they were maintained in a numerical order electronically, and Council Member Todd requested that they be bound in the Code of Ordinance Book for future purposes since the City Attorney Opinions tended to be persuasive authority on what the Code of Ordinances and the Council Rules meant; that on the topic of the motion to reconsider itself, that he kept going back to Mr. Hall's interpretation of it and did not understand how it was not the same matter, that it boiled down to what the question was, was the question what should the tax rate be or was the question should the tax rate be a certain figure, and Mr. Hall stated that the answer was that the proposal voted on by Council was a tax rate of .665 cents in total, and Council Member Todd asked if the vote was held today and they did subsequently find a prior City Attorney opinion that contradicted Mr. Hall's opinion what effect did that have on the vote of Council and Mr. Hall stated none.

Upon further discussion by Council, Council Member Sanchez asked if the tax rate were .653 would it be acceptable to vote on or would it not be the same item, and Mr. Hall stated that if he would have to opine a million and a half difference in revenue to the City would probably be a different enough proposition based on its impact, and Council Member Sanchez asked Mr. Hall how he would rule if a Council Member wanted to tag the proposal today and Mr. Hall stated that it would obviously render what was proposed moot, that he had heard some discussion that there was a motion to take out the question of the tax rate from the proposal and if that was done then obviously they were not considering it at all, but if in fact it was as written, then it was the Council's expression of its sentiment to set the tax rate at that number they obviously could not do that past the deadline, that it was tagable if they took out the tax rate. Council Member Robinson absent.

Council Member Boney asked if it was tagable did it not render the matter moot since they would not pass a tax rate by midnight Tuesday then the default rate automatically came into play, and Mr. Hall stated it was true but as he understood it part of what was suggested was that they were taking the tax question completely out of it, that it was important to understand that the ordinance was a levy ordinance, it was a formal document that actually set the tax levy pursuant to the proposal, that if in fact all of that was to be considered as a package, obviously they could not set it past the deadline which would be more than 7 days which was what the tag would be effective for.

Council Member Bell stated that it was his understanding that they would not be able to consider the tax rate as a directive and Mr. Hall stated that what had been presented was a proposal that included the tax rate at what was proposed in the actual tax levy ordinance, that the technical ordinance they drafted obviously involved many more details than it included in the proposal, that it would not satisfy the legal requirements.

Council Member Vasquez stated that his motion was a motion of process as opposed to content, that passing the proposal or the plan they viewed it as a proposal, did not fulfill the legal requirement as set out by law so they were suggesting that they pass the proposal first and then meet the legal requirements by passing the ordinance, and Council Member Bell asked if he was willing to have the various tenants of the proposal voted on separately, and Council Member Vasquez stated that he would like to see the vote on the whole package, obviously however it was amendable and they would

like to consider there were amendments that Council Member Bell had suggested and others that he had heard about, but obviously those amendments should be considered.

Council Member Bell moved to call the question on the motion by Council Member Vasquez to consider the plan first, seconded by Council Member Tatro and a roll call vote was requested.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting no.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting aye.	Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting no.	Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.	Council Member Quan voting no.
Council Member Boney voting no.	Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting no.	Council Member Bell voting aye.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting aye.	MOTION 2000-1224 FAILED.

Council Member Boney commended Council Members Vasquez, Parker and Quan for a very selfless and noble effort to try to build a consensus on Council that responded to all of the various positions that were laid out on the table during the budget and tax rate, that the reason that Council Member Vasquez suggested that the vote come first on the fiscal accountability and budget structuring process was to show a good faith effort, that in reference to setting the tax rate, that whatever rate the tax was set they still had to deal with the issue if they were even going to consider increased compensation for police and fire or incentive pay options for civilian employees, that what the Council Members leadership was attempting to establish was the flexibility to have the opportunity to have the dialog and debate at the end of the budget year when they knew how much fuel costs had risen, that they did know that health care employee benefits would cost between \$20 million and \$25 million, that he would suggest that Council Members vote the entire package up or down on its merits, and suggested that they adopt the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal and then adopt the compromise tax rate which would provide some flexibility but yet actually cut revenue based upon the tax rate and move forward to the next issue and get into the future processes they had about fiscal management and budgeting.

Council Member Galloway asked if they were really present about the business at hand or the City of Houston, were they present about their own personal reasons and gains, that she was present to represent the entire City, that they had a Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal that was sound and was moving towards many things that Council Members had expressed around the table, that it was right to give the citizens of Houston what they wanted, that they needed to set a tax rate and move on, and urged her colleagues to move on and get the business taken care of and vote on the proposal. Council Member Keller absent.

Council Member Quan stated that they were simply trying to capture what they felt was a real sense of Council from all of the budget hearings they had gone to and all the proposals from different Council Members, but thought they needed to get on with the business at hand, that a legal opinion had been given, that they knew that it was something different and tried in good faith to come up with something that was

reasonable, and they had the commitment from the administration who was fully aware that if they were to renege on the commitment that there was certainly a lot of political debt to pay, that they tried to come up with something that addressed the needs of the City in general without jeopardizing any programs, that it forced the administration to come out and say where the reductions would be so they would not have a press conference by either side saying how bad the City was, but to say lets be honest with the tax payers and this was the tax rate and what they were going to get.

Upon further discussion by Council, Council Member Ellis stated that even though it was brought forth by 3 Council Members they were not part of the prevailing party and it still went back to that it was a motion to reconsider even though Mr. Hall stated it was not so, and asked Mr. Hall if they were to separate the tax rate could there be motions made to amend the ordinance brought before Council, the tax rate of .655, and Mr. Hall stated they could do it whether they separated it or not, and Council Member Ellis asked if he made a motion to amend the tax rate was it tagable or would it make it a moot point, and Mr. Hall stated no they could not tag the motion to change the tax rate because what they were changing would have obviously been passed and they would not have another opportunity. Council Member Galloway absent.

Upon further discussion by Council, Council Member Vasquez stated that the proposal was presented as a package and recognizing that the legal requirements of setting the tax rate would not be fulfilled by just passing the package.

Council Member Boney stated that part of what he heard was not an attempt to find common ground so as to be able to support the tax rate, that he did not see groups trying to reach towards each other in some of the debate, he saw efforts in some of the discussion to try to scuttle the whole thing, and that was why he would support it being considered as a package now and then consider the tax rate after that.

Council Member Robinson stated he could not understand why they were afraid to hear each other's honest comments about public policy, that they were going to have to learn to agree to disagree, that they had heard that prior City Attorney's opinion meant nothing and if that was the case then Council Members ought to know that, that if the proposal had been out there for so long then how come only one thing got converted to a ordinance and that was the tax rate, that even if there had been no tax cut to all of the officers in blue they had to understand that the Mayor had said that there was \$27 million dollars in unaccounted for expenses; then why should the airport or any other department be exempt from zero based budgeting let them stand up to the scrutiny and accountability.

Council Member Goldberg stated that if they did not start sticking to the question at hand they would not make the midnight deadline, and it was his understanding that they were voting on whether or not they should vote on the proposal minus the second paragraph, and Council Member Vasquez stated that the motion before them was a motion of process, they would like to consider the proposal in its entirety as a vote first and then they would like to fulfill the legal requirements, which was the ordinance second. Council Member Robinson absent.

Council Member Goldberg asked if they voted on the proposal and it passed would they have then voted on the tax rate, and Council Member Parker stated that they would

have given a statement of intent as to how they would vote on the actual ordinance language for the tax levy, and Council Member Goldberg stated they should call the question and they should take up a different proposal and that was to consider each element separately and that way they could continue the conversation more specifically to each paragraph in the proposal.

Council Member Goldberg moved to call the question, seconded by Council Member Quan. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1225 ADOPTED.

Council Member Vasquez stated that his motion was to consider the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal first and then address the legal requirements of the ordinance on the tax rate. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1226 ADOPTED.

Council Member Boney moved to adopt the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal as presented by Council Members Quan, Parker and Vasquez as a whole without dividing the question, seconded by Council Member Galloway.

Upon further discussion by Council, Council Member Vasquez stated that the proposal was presented as a package, that the first three were issues that dealt with the current budget and addressed current needs of the City and the next three dealt with systemic change and reform to the budget process, and the last two items were issues that dealt with tax relief or tax programs, and the way the proposal was presented in its three parts were specifically designed to begin to look at this year's situation while at the same time begin to lay the groundwork for actually reforming the system, that it was designed as a whole and packaged as a whole and thought it did the City and its citizens some justice because the overall goal was to begin to address the budget problems they were currently experiencing and to reform the system as a whole, and would encourage his colleagues to vote on it as a package.

Council Member Bell stated that he would strongly disagree, that when they were talking about eight proposals, some of which addressed the most controversial issues discussed around City Hall during the past several years, he would have thought that Council Member Vasquez would have expected and anticipated that others would like a chance to amend and might have some ideas to offer regarding the amendments. Council Member Galloway absent.

Council Member Boney stated he believed they would do themselves a disservice by trying to amend the carefully crafted document at the table, that some of the things that one might consider controversial or agree or disagree with might in fact keep them from meeting the deadline and getting a rate done, that they had to post a Council meeting with 72 hours notice and if they did not decide on a tax rate at this meeting then they would automatically go to the default tax rate because they could not post it in time. Council Member Galloway absent.

Council Member Vasquez stated that by addressing it as a package they could still put forth amendments, and suggested that they take it as a package and consider the amendments that they brought to the table. Council Member Galloway absent.

Council Member Todd stated it was important to consider each initiative one by one, and asked if other than time was there a reason that they did not want the items

considered separately, and Council Member Boney stated that he thought that the effort by Council Members Parker, Quan and Vasquez was to try to reach an accommodation to develop a broader consensus. Council Members Galloway and Castillo absent.

Council Member Tatro stated he did not see how they could take them all together, that when he read them they imposed very little on the administration and left the back door open for an out on basically every item, and did not see how they could be considered because of their lack of specificity, that they were broad based without accountability to Council and with very little accountability on behalf of the administration. Council Members Galloway, Todd and Robinson absent.

Council Member Sanchez stated that Council Members Boney's motion was in contradiction to what he heard earlier in that the tax levy and the collection of ad valorem taxes would not be considered in the item and if so then his motion would be out of order would it not, and Mr. Hall stated that in itself it would not enact the tax levy so it could be left in there, and Council Member Sanchez stated that former Council Member Roach as part of the budget process wrote in an amendment to an ordinance which dictated that the City Controller conduct financial audits of departments to see how efficient the departments were running, and he was trying to find the memo that in essence there was a conflict between the Controller's office and the administration inasmuch as the administration had sent out a memo, a directive, instructing the department heads not to share information with the auditors and he brought that up simply because in the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal one need not look further than the first proposal, which was reduce departmental budgets while maintaining services, however if the reduction would significantly affect the services of a single department then the department may be exempt, then where was the guarantee to the proposers of the item, then in other words all it would take was for the Mayor to articulate that yes that had a significant affect on the department and therefore the department could be exempt, so he did not know what in the clause would compel the administration to abide by a reduction of 1%.

Council Member Parker stated that they did not intend it to be complicated, that they never stated that everyone had to agree to everything, that when they stated they wanted to pass it as a package the tax rate of .655 was the predicate on which the rest of it rested, that she was not going to vote for the item in whatever form they wanted to mold them and bind the administration to a lot of actions that she would dearly like to see them do and then turn around and cut the rate more than one cent, that was the bottom line, that if all of the discussion about dividing the question was about passing all the nifty little items and then sticking it to them on the tax rate then just vote it down and go home, than when they stated it was a package the bottom line was that they thought a one cent tax cut was worth having all of the other things that they had asked for over and over again, and asked that Council Member Boney amend his motion and allow for amendments with the understanding that amendments to the tax rate were not on the table. Council Members Ellis and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Boney stated that he would accept Council Member Parker's motion as a friendly motion if Council Members who had any amendments that they wanted to put on the table would give a gentlemen's agreement to agree with the tax rate. Council Member Sanchez absent.

Council Member Robinson asked if they could amend the package to include that the recommendations or however they wanted to describe them would be reduced to ordinance and brought back to Council at some point agreeable to them. Council Member Sanchez absent.

Council Member Vasquez stated that was an amendment that he could be supportive of, that they brought up the issue of binding and thought that was a workable solution, that if there were other amendments then by all means put them on the table, that he would not accept any proposal that was one sided to one side or the other and believed that it should be voted on as a package and then consider amendments and that was what he would prefer. Council Member Sanchez absent.

Council Member Keller stated the he worked hard on the LCG with the administration to get the local government corporation done and started and supported it and still did, and burned a bridge with Council Members Bell and Tatro and put forth a package and was forced to vote on his package separately and then witnessed for the first time the first budget process and saw everybody put forth packages of amendments and they were all forced to be voted on separately, and asked if they were going to adopt from this point on that when people put forth packages that they all got voted on if they wanted at the same time, was that what they could do when they start, because he had not seen yet where they had not broken out a package on separate amendments, and asked if they had ever voted on any items in a package situation before, and Mayor Brown stated that if that was the will of Council then that was what would prevail. Council Members Vasquez, Castillo, Parker and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Robinson asked when would they make amendments, because he wanted to offer one, that they be brought in a form of ordinance by the end of the year with the appropriate effective dates included, and Council Member Boney stated that he did not have a problem with amendments but thought there were some things that needed to be worked through, and Council Member Robinson stated that he would like a vote piece by piece because there were actually some things in the proposal that he did not agree with based on the presentation and representation made by Mr. Haines to Fiscal Affairs. Council Member Sanchez absent.

Council Member Bell stated he agreed with as far as living with some and not with others, but took it that Council Member Boney saw all of them as basically non-binding recommendations, and Council Member Boney stated he saw them as framework and trusted the good faith effort of Council and administration to try to go through it as a framework and move through each one, that he was willing to put them on the table and allow the process to go forward, and suggested that Council Members Quan, Vasquez and Parker made a valiant good faith effort to develop a broad based framework for a compromised consensus and supported them in that effort. Council Member Sanchez absent.

Council Member Galloway recognized Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee who was present at the Council Chambers.

Council Member Galloway moved to call the question on Council Member Boney's motion, seconded by Council Member Boney.

Council Member Parker stated that she had asked for a friendly amendment and did not know if he had accepted and just wanted him to restate the motion and Council Member Boney stated that he would accept the friendly amendment in the spirit of what he thought that Council Members Quan, Parker and Vasquez did the work in and Council Member Parker stated that her friendly amendment was that there be amendments accepted to the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal except to the matter of the tax rate and Council Member Boney stated that it would be with a good faith understanding from the Council Members that if they proposed an amendment to the agreement then they would also support the tax rate that had been proposed by the agreement

Mayor Brown stated that what they had before them was a motion made by Council Member Boney to adopt the proposal without dividing the question and had accepted a friendly amendment from Council Member Parker to allow for amendments except for the tax rate.

A vote was called on Council Member Galloway's motion to call the question. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1227 ADOPTED.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Boney's motion to adopt the proposal without dividing the question, etc.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting no.	Council Member Castillo voting aye.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.	Council Member Parker voting aye.
Council Member Goldberg voting no.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting aye.	Council Member Sanchez voting no.
Council Member Todd voting no.	Council Member Bell voting no.
Council Member Ellis voting no.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting no.	MOTION 2000-1228 FAILED.

Council Member Vasquez moved to consider the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal as a package allowing for amendments, seconded by Council Member Robinson.

After further discussion by Council, Council Member Vasquez stated that the motion by Council Boney was that they consider the proposal as a package with amendments and eliminating for consideration the tax rate, that the motion he was making was that they consider the proposal with amendments.

Mayor Brown stated that the motion was to consider the entire package including the tax levy and allow for amendments on any aspect of the package.

Council Member Bell stated he thought it was basically the same motion, that it was clear that some of them would like to see the proposal divided and to discuss the various tenants of the proposal individually.

Council Member Vasquez stated that the difference between this motion and the previously defeated motion was that there was a friendly amendment by Council Member

Parker and in addition a friendly amendment by Council Member Boney, that the particular motion did not have those two and believed it was qualitatively different.

Council Member Sanchez asked if the motion was to put the proposal on the table severing the tax issue and allowing amendments and Council Member Vasquez stated that his consideration was to put the proposal as a package with amendments period, and Council Member Sanchez stated that they should offer motions that were agreeable to all Council Members so that there would be a degree of certainty that what Council decided tonight would in fact be implemented and stated that he had managed to secure a memo to Ms. Silvia Garcia from Mayor Brown dated October 6, 1998 as it related to the auditing of departments that was voted on by City Council as a matter of the budget process and he quoted "the City Charter provided that the duty of the Controller to supervise the Fiscal Affairs of the City of Houston and to manage and conduct the same as prescribed in the Chapter and Ordinances of the City of Houston, that the chapter further provides that all administrative work of the City government should be under the control of the Mayor, your communication to Dr. Kendrick indicates that you intend to audit the animal intake procedures of the Bureau Animal Regulation and Care, your communication further states the objectives", that the objectives were listed, that finally it stated that he had instructed all department directors to forward any requests for non financial performance audits to his office and to not dedicate any resources to such matters unless authorized by him, that unless Council got some sort of agreement that what Council ultimately voted on in the proposal for accountability and fiscal reform there was no guarantee that those proposals would actually be implemented by the administration, that was in response to an ordinance. Council Members Galloway, Parker and Robinson absent.

Mayor Brown stated that he wanted to correct Council Member Sanchez, that it was not in response to an ordinance, that the Council did not pass an ordinance on the Bureau of Animal Control, that was the reason he issued that memorandum, that what the Council passed the Controller was able to do, that the Council did not pass an ordinance on the Bureau of Animal Control so what Council Member Sanchez was stating was not accurate and meant that it was not true, that it was not the Controller's task. Council Members Galloway, Parker and Robinson absent.

Council Member Castillo requested a point of order and asked what was the status of the latest motion, and Mayor Brown stated that what was before them was a motion made by Council Member Vasquez to consider the entire package and allow amendments including amendments on the tax rate.

Council Member Castillo moved to call the question on Council Member Vasquez's motion, seconded by Council Member Robinson and a roll call vote was requested.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.	Council Member Vasquez voting aye.
Council Member Tatro voting no.	Council Member Castillo voting aye.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.	Council Member Parker voting aye.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting no.	Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting aye.	Council Member Bell voting aye.

Council Member Ellis voting aye.
Council Member Keller voting aye.

Council Member Robinson voting no.
MOTION 2000-1229 ADOPTED.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Vasquez's motion to consider the entire package and allow amendments on everything including the tax levy.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.
Council Member Tatro voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.
Council Member Goldberg voting no.
Council Member Boney voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting no.
Council Member Ellis voting no.
Council Member Keller voting no.

Council Member Vasquez voting aye.
Council Member Castillo voting aye.
Council Member Parker voting aye.
Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Sanchez voting no.
Council Member Bell voting no.
Council Member Robinson voting no.
MOTION 2000-1230 FAILED.

Council Member Bell moved to divide the question and take each of the proposals individually, seconded by Council Member Sanchez. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1231 ADOPTED.

Council Member Boney moved to accept the first paragraph, seconded by Council Member Parker, and Council Member Keller offered a friendly amendment to just do them consecutively, and Council Member Boney accepted the friendly amendment and stated that his motion was to take up item 1, but now that he had read item 1 he did not want to cut 1% out of the public safety budget.

Council Member Parker stated that they had said an across the board 1% cut but they did not want to take anything off the table or preempt the actions of the administration so they put in the second sentence to modify that, that they wanted 1% of the total budget and trusted the administration to make the best judgement in the best interest of public safety, and Council Member Boney stated that he would withdraw his motion, and Council Member Parker withdrew her second of his motion.

Council Member Boney moved to consider paragraph 2 first which was to Set Tax Rate and Prioritize Savings, seconded by Council Member Parker.

After discussion by members of Council, Mayor Brown stated that what passed was the motion to consider the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal first and then the ordinance on the tax rate, that they were not considering the ordinance, they were considering a paragraph of the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal, that the motion was in order, that it was to consider all items separately of the proposal, and Mayor Brown stated yes and the first one to be taken up was to set the tax rate and prioritize savings, and Council Member Castillo asked if they voted down paragraph 2 then they could go on to the rest of the proposal and come back to paragraph 2, and Council Member Robinson stated that it was his understanding to take the "Set the tax rate and prioritize savings" as the first item to be considered and if they vote it down as the first item to be considered they had not spoken to the merit they had just spoken to the order in which they would take the individual pieces of the package, that it was a procedural question, it was not the ordinance.

Council Member Tatro asked on procedural issue how could they consider paragraph 2 and then consider the ordinance which had been passed out and which was effectively setting the tax rate, and Mr. Hall stated that it was his position that it was the same thing they had done already, they had adopted a budget back in June that proposed to set a tax rate at a certain level, and Council Member Tatro asked how they could in one sentence say they would set the tax rate at .6550 and then go and consider the ordinance which set the tax rate at .6550 later, and Mr. Hall stated that because it was the same thing they did when they set the budget, that the proposal did not set a tax levy, that it was an intent to set a tax rate, that the only thing that actually levied taxes was the levy ordinance, that they could vote for the proposal now and vote against the levy, that the proposal had no binding affect in terms of setting a levy. Council Members Vasquez and Robinson absent.

Council Member Keller asked that since they did it as a separate motion and then voted to separate it was it tagable, and Mr. Hall stated that the proposal was not tagable because they could not consider it after Tuesday at midnight, that they were separate and they could not do either one after midnight tomorrow, because the law would enact the rate. Council Members Vasquez and Robinson.

Council Member Ellis moved to call the question on Council Member Boney's motion, seconded by Council Member Bell. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1232 ADOPTED.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Boney's motion to consider the "Set tax rate and prioritize savings", first.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.	Council Member Vasquez voting aye.
Council Member Tatro voting no.	Council Member Castillo voting aye.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.	Council Member Parker voting aye.
Council Member Goldberg voting no.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting aye.	Council Member Sanchez voting no.
Council Member Todd voting no.	Council Member Bell voting no.
Council Member Ellis voting no.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting no.	MOTION 2000-1233 FAILED

Council Member Bell moved to consider the Fiscal Reform and Accountability proposals in the order they appeared and move the "Set Tax Rate and Prioritize Savings" proposal to the end of the list, seconded by Council Member Tatro.

Upon discussion by Council, Council Member Boney stated they should vote against Council Member Bell's motion, that they were fast coming to realization that there was not really an attempt to compromise and build a consensus, and Council Member Sanchez stated that they should support Council Member Bell's motion, that nothing was saying that they were throwing it away, that if Council Members were able to make reasonable and prudent amendments to the seven items listed in the proposal and then remove the tax rate and prioritize savings to the end made good sense, and Council

Member Robinson stated he wanted to go through and discuss the issues and if they could be refined fine and if not he would tell them right up front.

A roll call vote was called on the motion by Council Member Bell to consider the proposals in order and the tax rate to the end of the list.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting no.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting aye.	Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting no.	Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting no.	Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting aye.	Council Member Bell voting aye.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.	Council Member Robinson voting aye.
Council Member Keller voting aye.	MOTION 2000-1234 ADOPTED.

Mayor Brown requested the City Secretary to call each of the items in sequence, except for the second one.

The City Secretary stated that the first item was to "Reduce Departmental Budgets While Maintaining Services: The Mayor will implement a reduction of not less than 1% in the Fiscal Year 2001 General Fund budget across all City departments by November 10. If the reduction would significantly affect services of a single department, then said department may be exempted. The Mayor will further provide a detailed written account of all reductions and the impact".

Council Member Boney moved to amend the first paragraph to eliminate Police and Fire from the 1% reduction, seconded by Council Member Quan.

Council Member Castillo stated he wanted to make a friendly amendment to include in the list of holding safe the Department of Solid Waste, and Council Member Boney accepted his friendly amendment.

Mayor Brown stated that what was before them was an amendment to adopt reducing the budget by 1% across the board excluding Police, Fire and Solid Waste.

Upon discussion by Council, Council Member Tatro stated that during the tax rate and budget process and debate they showed that the revenues for the City were basically going to remain equal to what they passed in the budget if not slightly more, and they showed there would not need to be a reduction in expenditures since revenues were going to be the same, so he did not know that a 1% reduction across the board or 5 or 6 departments was not going to be necessary, and Council Member Parker stated she agreed with him on that, that she was not wild about a 1% reduction and they clearly did not want to make some departments sacrosanct when they wrote it, and Council Member Robinson stated that he wanted to speak against the amendment and the entire item, that what he thought ought to be was that the Mayor would provide a detail written account of all reductions and the impact, that they ought to vote down the amendment by Council Member Boney and come back and strike all the language but for the last sentence and put a date certain when Council would be presented with at least a draft of what the

administration intended to do relative to \$27 million plus the value of whatever the tax rate was.

Council Member Vasquez stated that when the three of them started out it was to try and bring more of a good government approach and to try not to get caught up on either side and thought it was pretty clear that it had deteriorated today for whatever reason and encouraged Council Members to vote against it, that the proposal was presented as a package and was unfortunate that they had taken the road they had taken, that he respected all Council Members positions and may not agree, but did respect it.

Council Member Boney moved to call the question on his motion, seconded by Council Member Tatro. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1235 ADOPTED.

Mayor Brown stated that the amendment was to adopt the first item which was a 1% across the board reduction in departmental budgets with the exception of Police, Fire and Solid Waste.

Mayor Brown stated that what was before them, Council Member Boney's amendment with a friendly amendment which he accepted as Item 1 to reduce departmental budgets while maintaining services, a 1% across the board reduction with the exception of Police, Fire and Solid Waste.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Boney's motion relative to paragraph one. Note: It was the interpretation of the City Secretary that it was the intent of the City Council that the vote was for an amendment only to paragraph one.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting no.	Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.	Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting aye.	Council Member Sanchez voting no.
Council Member Todd voting aye.	Council Member Bell voting aye.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting aye.	MOTION 2000-1236 ADOPTED.

Council Member Robinson asked if it was going to be a number that reflected the 27 plus whatever the value of the rollback impact was, and Mayor Brown stated that all it reflected was what it said and that was 1% of the Fiscal Year 2001 General Fund Budget which was passed by the Council on June 21, 2000, and Council Member asked when would they know what the cumulative value of the 1% rollback was so they could compare it to the \$27 million dollars plus \$7 million if it was one cent, or \$27 million plus \$15 million if it remained at the two cent, and Mr. Haines stated that based on the proposal before them it would be on or before November 10, 2000. Council Member Goldberg absent.

Council Member Bell presented a proposed amendment to paragraph one and moved to amend Item 1 to remove the sentence "If the reduction would significantly affect

services of a single department, then said department may be exempted”, and add the additional language that “The Controller is further requested to provide a detailed written account of all reductions and the impact.”, seconded by Council Member Tatro. Council Member Goldberg absent.

Upon further discussion by Council, Council Member Boney stated that he did not know how the Controller was going to be able to access the impact of a cut in the services for the Parks, Public Works or Health and Human Services in District D, that different districts had different needs. Council Members Goldberg, Todd and Castillo absent.

Council Member Sanchez stated that he would urge his colleagues to support Council Member Bell’s amendment, that he was the one who articulated that certainly all the administration had to do was to declare that the reduction would significantly affect services, that it did not even need to articulate that it would have a negative affect just said a significant affect, and reminded Council Members again about the memo that was put out by the administration on October 6, 1998 on the performance audits that were approved by Council, and Mayor Brown stated that it was not approved by Council and did not know why Council Member Sanchez kept saying that, when it was not true. Council Members Goldberg, Todd, Ellis and Castillo absent.

Mayor Brown stated that he was inclined to be supportive of the compromise proposal put forth by three Council Members and with the direction that they were going at now he certainly could not support the amendments. Council Members Goldberg, Todd, Ellis and Castillo absent.

Council Member Boney stated that when the tax rate was cut Council Members were asked what services they wanted to cut and none of the Council Members who were articulating in the debate now wanted to lay a single service on the table to cut, they said adjust revenue up higher, that was all they needed to do, that it was now clear that there were no services in District D that needed to be cut, that they needed more money in District D. Council Members Goldberg, Todd, Ellis and Castillo absent.

Council Member Quan asked how Council Member Bell planned on the Controller providing the detailed report on the impact, and Council Member Bell stated that he was basically using the same language that appeared in the first sentence that preceded it, that he was taking more in the terms of the overall impact on that particular department, that the Controller was charged with being the watchdog for the City and did not see any harm in adding checks and balances into the proposal and bringing the Controller into the process to look at where the cuts were being made and getting that opinion, that neither of those would be binding, but more information was better than less in making those types of decisions. Council Members Goldberg, Todd and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Parker urged the Council Members to vote down the motion, that she did not think they could prevent the Controller from putting out a statement on those items and fully expected to see one in the very near future, and if the cuts were to be implemented she thought the Controller in carrying out her office would want to let them know what she thought was happening, she certainly did it on a regular basis. Council Members Goldberg, Todd and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Boney asked Council Member Bell if he meant by his amendment to also cut the Controller's budget by 1% or was that department exempted, and was the Controller's Department included in the 1% reduction, and Council Member Bell stated he thought they would have to be, and Mayor Brown asked if Council Member's budgets were also included and Council Member Bell stated sure. Council Members Goldberg, Todd and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Vasquez stated that he would also urge the Council to vote it down, that he thought the Controller would put her two cents and three cents and nickel and dime in any of the proposals, but did think it was the purview and prerogative of the Mayor and administration to provide the reductions and the impact, and if the Controller wanted to spend her own time and money that was for her decision and did not need to be mandated into the particular item and amendment, and also would urge to vote it down because neighborhood services provided by Council offices were also very significant.

Council Member Bell asked where they envisioned the cuts coming from when they made the recommendation for the 1% across the board, and Council Member Vasquez stated they did not come from a perspective of having baggage or a concern of trusting the Mayor or not, that they recognized that it was the Mayor's and administration's prerogative to make some of the cuts, and Council Member Parker stated that when the three of them were discussing the item, Council Member Vasquez actually wanted to exempt Council offices and there was a compromise among all of them. Council Members Goldberg, Ellis and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Keller stated that he had heard the words cuts, slash, decrease and reduce and yet they were going to have a net increase in revenue from the previous year, and did not think they were in dire straits. Council Members Tatro and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Boney stated that he wanted to point out to Council Member Keller that they knew they were going to have a \$5 million dollar unbudgeted increase in Health Care expenses for employees this year, that they knew that the Health Care for employees in the following year would go up from \$20 million to \$25 million, that they had not figured out how they were going to pay for that yet, so there was no net increase in revenue, so it seemed to him to be the more prudent choice was to create the surplus and then at the end of the year collectively sit down and see how they could develop a consensus on how to allocate the funds to the various needs. Council Members Parker and Quan absent.

Council Member Galloway stated that she had a problem with Council Member Bell's amendments, that her district was certainly in need of a lot, that she had over a hundred miles in ditches, that most of the other districts had less than 20 miles in ditches, that she wanted money allocated to Public Works so they could give her some curbs and sidewalks in her little community, that was what her constituents wanted, and asked where they were headed, and hoped that they could come to a consensus and move on, that it was a good Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal. Council Member Tatro absent.

Mayor Brown stated that he agreed, that he had come in with the hope that they would reach a compromise which he could buy into and that those who wanted to rollback the tax rate could buy into, that it was quite clear to him from what was going on was that those who wanted to rollback the tax rate were not prepared to compromise and what they were not attempting to do was to change what the three Council Members put together, which he was willing to support, into a matter that he could no longer support because they were trying to change everything, that it was a disappointment to him, that he thought that they would take what was a reasonable compromise and get about the business of delivering services to the City of Houston, and was not convinced that it was not the agenda of everyone at the table.

Council Member Parker moved to call the question on Council Member Bell's motion to amend, seconded by Council Member Castillo. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1237 ADOPTED.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Bell's motion to amend to paragraph one.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting aye.
Council Member Galloway voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting no.
Council Member Todd voting aye.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.
Council Member Keller voting aye.

Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Quan voting no.
Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Bell voting aye.
Council Member Robinson voting no.
MOTION 2000-1238 FAILED.

Mayor Brown stated that the main item was the reduction of departmental budgets by 1% excluding Police, Fire and Solid Waste, that was what was before them, (paragraph one as previously amended) and a roll call vote was requested.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting no.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting aye.	Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting no.	Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting no.	Council Member Sanchez voting no.
Council Member Todd voting aye.	Council Member Bell voting aye.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting aye.	MOTION 2000-1239 FAILED.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was the paragraph titled "Increased Revenues: The Mayor will identify and implement initiatives to increase revenues including but not limited to the following areas:

- Outsourcing collections of ambulance fees, parking and traffic violations
- Cable television franchise fees.
- Electrical franchise fees.
- Implementation of revenue enhancing initiatives from the continuous management improvement effort.
- A solution to improve efficiency in the municipal court system.
- Fee study"

Council Member Vasquez stated that he knew there were some bullet points that people had issue with and obviously they were not naïve to the fact that the ambulance carried a high degree of poor and people who could not afford it, but the particular item was presented such that they could look at those items as a matter of policy and did not feel that any of the items should be eliminated from consideration, that some of them were already ongoing, but as a matter of policy when they began to look at those things they might find something within the ambulance fees or the performance of the EMS that would allow them to reduce the outlay of expenses, and encouraged Council Members to vote it in and quite frankly did not know that any discussion would make any difference and called the question.

Mayor Brown stated that he was reminded by the City Secretary that they had no motion on the floor.

Council Member Vasquez stated that his motion was to adopt Paragraph 3 titled Increased Revenues, seconded by Council Member Quan, and was tagged by Council Members Tatro and Todd.

Mr. Hall stated that there was nothing about the proposal that would make it moot, they could pass it next month, next year or in the next ten years.

Council Member Boney stated that he just wanted to point out to members of Council, in front of the public, that they were cutting the revenue, cutting expenditures and now they had just tagged the opportunity to look for possible other revenues.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was "Increase Fiscal Accountability: Establish the Finance and Administration Department as the administrative oversight over departmental budget units with responsibility for establishing standards of accountability pertaining to the budget. Further, the Finance and Administration Department will adopt and implement a Zero-based or Performance-based or a combination thereof budget process by the 2003 budget."

Council Member Castillo stated that his motion was to adopt the paragraph titled Increase Fiscal Accountability, seconded by Council Member Parker.

Council Member Bell moved to amend the paragraph titled Increase Fiscal Accountability to delete the language where it read "or performance based or a combination thereof", and also add FY and change it to 2002 Budget, seconded by Council Member Ellis, and was tagged by Council Member Vasquez.

The motion to adopt the paragraph titled Increase Fiscal and Accountability was tagged by Council Members Vasquez and Galloway.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was the "Rainy Day Fund: Mayor and Council shall establish a "rainy day" fund of not less than \$5 million. The fund shall be a cash account with the balance established over a two (2) year budget cycle beginning with the 2001-2002 budget or as compatible with financial conditions not to exceed three budget years henceforth. Further, in the event that a true rainy day fund is established, the General Fund Reserve will revert to the 5% legal limit."

Council Member Robinson stated that he had all the fun he could take for the night, that he came for what he thought were going to be serious discussions, that he did not mind staying if they were going to have a serious conversation, because he did not know when they were going to have the conversation if they were serious about the fiscal and budgetary matters of the City, that he did not think it was going to happen tonight because he simply did not think that everyone wanted to play fair and be honest and forthright, that the Mayor had put out a memo that stated that they had \$27 million dollars in unexpected expenditures so he was going to roll the rate back to .655 and they could stop all the games and go home.

Council Member Castillo stated that even though they did not always agree he could always respect the opinions of the other Council Members. Council Member Robinson absent.

Council Member Parker stated that if a certain Council Member who started the tags would remove his tag they could start all over again, but otherwise she was not inclined to play the game anymore either and would move to the tax rate as well. Council Members Sanchez and Robinson absent.

Council Member Parker stated that her motion was to adopt the paragraph titled Rainy Day Fund, seconded by Council Member Boney.

Upon discussion by Council, Council Member Parker stated that it was an item that she and Council Member Robinson had spoken about for a long time, that they were the ones who pushed for increasing the reserve from 5% to 7.5% but realized that it was not a true cash reserve it was simply unallocated revenues and they would like to see a true cash reserve created. Council Member Castillo absent.

Council Member Bell stated that he realized the process was a little bit frustrating but they only had four or five days to study it and look at the proposals and they were rather serious proposals that were worthy of discussion, that he did think that some of the measures had merit and would like to see the tags removed on the others so that they could get a fair say. Council Member Tatro absent.

Council Member Vasquez stated that the Council had actually had more than one week to consider the proposals because they were budget items and came up during the budget process during May, June, July, August and September, so they actually had some time, and they were proposals that had been floating around for more than just one week. Council Members Tatro, Galloway, Todd and Robinson absent.

Council Member Boney stated he supported the effort to establish a Rainy Day Fund and maybe wanted to add a little more money to the fund, so he supported the concept and moving toward it. Council Member Tatro, Galloway and Robinson absent.

Council Member Ellis stated he would be in support of the item because it gave more flexibility to the administration and reduced the 7.5% legal limit down to 5% and they set up a Rainy Day Fund of only \$5 million and asked Mr. Haines what 2.5% equated to, and Mr. Haines stated about \$25 million, and Council Member Ellis stated that they were freeing up about \$20 million by going into the process. Council Members Boney, Keller, Vasquez, Castillo and Robinson absent.

Council Member Parker stated she was going to call the question, and Mayor Brown stated there were no more speakers and called a vote on Council Member Parker's motion to adopt the paragraph titled Rainy Day Fund. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1240 ADOPTED.

Mayor Brown stated that they had just voted on the main item.

Council Member Vasquez stated that he thought that Council Member Parker had called the question, and Mayor Brown stated there were no other speakers, and Council Member Vasquez stated that he wanted clarification, that he thought they had passed the amendment to call the question, and Mayor Brown stated they voted on the main item, that she called for the question and there were no other speakers so they did not vote on call for the question.

Council Member Sanchez asked if the item passed and Mayor Brown stated yes.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was the paragraph titled "Fast-Track Fiscal Management Policies: The Mayor will fast-track efforts for the cash management and debt refinancing policy initiatives as passed in the Fiscal Year 2001 budget."

Council Member Boney stated he wanted to fully support unanimous approval by Council Members for the item which had actually been a part of the Mayor's management initiatives but thought it more clearly or specifically stated out cash management that they had a study in process, debt management and debt refinancing which he thought was very important since debt service was going up \$10 million dollars next year and thought that was just such an abundance of ordinary common sense that they ought to be able to get a unanimous vote on it.

Council Member Boney moved to adopt the paragraph titled "Fast-Track Fiscal Management Policies", seconded by Council Member Parker.

Council Member Bell moved to amend the paragraph titled "Fast-Track Fiscal Management Policies" to add "The Controller is further requested to provide a detailed written account of all such efforts", seconded by Council Member Ellis. Council Members Vasquez and Galloway tagged the motion to amend. Council Member Keller absent.

Council Member Bell tagged the main item. Council Member Keller absent.

Council Member Sanchez stated that on the previous item on the Rainy Day Fund he would like to be on record as voting no, and Council Member Vasquez requested his no vote be recorded as well, and after further discussion Mayor Brown stated that there was not unanimous consent to allow a change in the vote. Council Member Keller absent.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was the paragraph titled "Targeted Tax Relief for Seniors: The and Council will increase the homestead exemption rate for senior citizens to the maximum level over a three-year period. Said increase shall begin after the transfer of Metro dollars is complete or as compatible with financial conditions not to exceed five calendar years henceforth."

Council Member Quan stated that his motion was to adopt the paragraph titled "Targeted Tax Relief for Seniors, seconded by Council Member Boney".

Council Member Boney stated that he would support tax relief for seniors and would also support a process of considering tax dividends for other citizens and just wanted to get into the process and try to figure out how to do it and how they make it make sense with the other fiscal items, that he was going to appeal to Council Member Bell to remove his tag on Fast-Track Fiscal Management Policies, that it was kind of hard to argue against fast tracking efforts for cash management, debt management and debt refinancing, and believed that Council Member Bell's amendment was to involve the Controller and thought that over the course of the past history of all Controllers they would involve themselves in speaking on recommendations related to policies related to cash management, debt management and debt refinancing, that they did not have to embody that in the ordinance, that he thought it was a part of their Charter.

Council Member Bell stated that based on what Council Member Boney was stating it should be included and they should invite the extra oversight, and stated that if Council Member Vasquez removed his tag then he would gladly remove his.

Mayor Brown stated that the item before them was the "Targeted Tax Relief for Seniors" and was tagged by Council Member Galloway.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was the paragraph titled "Tax Dividend Program: A Tax Dividend Program shall accompany the 2001-2002 proposed budget".

Council Member Vasquez stated that his motion was to adopt the paragraph titled "Tax Dividend Program", seconded by Council Member Boney, and was tagged by Council Member Galloway.

The City Secretary stated that the next item was the second one listed on the proposal which was to "Set Tax Rate and Prioritize Savings: The and Council will set the tax rate at \$.6550. For purposes of the 2001 budget, available funds over and above the 5% mandated fund balance shall be considered surplus. Mayor and Council shall prioritize any surplus generated in the 2002 budget during the last quarter of the fiscal year as follows:

- Health benefits
- Meet and Confer
- Performance Incentive Pay (PIP)
- Debt service
- Fire and EMS improvements
- Replenishment of the fund balance to 7.5% (in the absence of a cash rainy day fund)"

Council Member Vasquez stated that his motion was to adopt the paragraph titled Set Tax Rate and Prioritize Savings, seconded by Council Member Quan.

Council Member Tatro asked since they were going to set the tax rate with the next ordinance that was passed out which set the tax rate, he was not sure what the purpose of the item was, that it seemed redundant at best and prioritizes expenses they were aware of.

Mayor Brown stated that it was part of the procedure they agreed upon, and were going through each of the items separately, and Council Member Tatro stated that he was not going to be in support of the item.

Council Member Todd moved to delay the item a week, seconded by Council Member Tatro.

Mayor Brown asked Mr. Hall if a delay of a week was the same as a tag, and Mr. Hall stated yes, and Mayor Brown stated that the motion was out of order.

Council Member Todd asked how a delay of a week the same, that a procedural motion was not subject to the moot doctrine, and the moot doctrine was releasing the tag rule, and Mr. Hall stated that the Mayor was suggesting that it was out of order because it would have no force in effect after midnight tomorrow, it would be a useless act, and Council Member Todd stated that it was a mootness doctrine, a tag issue, it was not a motion to delay issue, that he was not tagging it he was doing a motion to delay, and Mr. Hall stated that Mayor Brown was ruling his motion to delay out of order for that reason.

Council Member Boney stated that Council Member Todd would be killing it procedurally without the chance for the Council to kill it by delaying it a week or by tagging it, and that was allowable by the rules, that the rules were that the chair had the authority to rule any motion or tag out of order that rendered the matter moot by virtue of the tag or delay killing it automatically without it being able to be considered by Council.

Council Member Todd asked if the critical thing was to vote on the ordinance, and Mr. Hall stated that it was a matter of personal choice as to what was critical, that what he stated was that the ordinance itself actually established the levy and so it could be interpreted that way, but some people might feel that the priorities were more important to them, and Council Member Todd stated that as a matter of law there was no requirement under the Truth and Taxation Law that they pass the proposal paragraph and Mr. Hall stated there was no requirement all, and Council Member Todd stated that it was not moot then, and Mr. Hall stated that if they proposed to set the tax rate as the proposal stated, at that amount, they could not do it after midnight tomorrow, and Council Member Todd stated he understood that, but they could still vote on the ordinance if they did not vote on the proposal, and Mr. Hall stated that they stood alone, and Council Member Todd stated that was his point, that it was not really a mootness problem with the proposal, the mootness problem would be with the ordinance, and Mr. Hall stated no.

Mayor Brown stated that he had made a ruling on the matter.

Council Member Todd moved to overrule the Chair, seconded by Council Member Ellis.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Todd's motion to overrule the Chair.

Mayor Brown asked Mr. Hall if it took 10 votes to overrule the Chair, and Mr. Hall stated 8 votes.

Mayor Brown stated that the vote before them was to overrule the ruling made by the Chair that they could not delay the item by a week because it would be a moot item.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting no.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting aye.	Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting no.	Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting no.	Council Member Quan voting no.
Council Member Boney voting no.	Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting aye.	Council Member Bell voting no.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting aye.	MOTION 2000-1241 FAILED.

Council Member Boney moved to call the question on adopting the paragraph titled Set Tax Rate and Prioritize Savings of the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal that they accept it as written, seconded by Council Member Galloway. All voting aye. Nays none. MOTION 2000-1242 ADOPTED.

A roll call vote was called on the motion to adopt paragraph titled Set Tax Rate and Prioritize Savings.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.	Council Member Vasquez voting aye.
Council Member Tatro voting no.	Council Member Castillo voting aye.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.	Council Member Parker voting aye.
Council Member Goldberg voting no.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting aye.	Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting no.	Council Member Bell voting no.
Council Member Ellis voting no.	Council Member Robinson voting aye.
Council Member Keller voting no.	MOTION 2000-1243 ADOPTED.

Council Member Boney moved to adopt the ordinance on the tax levy and would move that they accept it as posted and as submitted by Council Members Vasquez, Quan and Parker, seconded by Council Member Galloway.

Council Member Parker stated that it should be rightly referred to as the Tax Levy Ordinance.

The ordinance before Council was titled: An Ordinance providing for the assessment, levying and collection of ad valorem taxes for the City of Houston, Texas for the Year 2000; making various findings and provisions relating to the subject; providing for severability; and declaring an emergency.

Council Member Tatro moved to amend the Tax Levy Ordinance to change the rate in Section 2 from .4668 to .45853, seconded by Council Member Ellis.

Council Member Castillo asked if the amendment was taggable, and Mayor Brown stated that the amendment was not taggable.

Council Member Ellis stated that he had passed around an amended budget with an effective tax rate and the numbers in the first column were the numbers they adopted in their FY2001 budget process, that on the second page if they looked at what the difference was in a tax rate of .665 and .64671 it was 97.25% so they used the administrations number to come up with what the difference would be if they adjusted for the .64671 and also added into that the PTS, the uncertain values, that they basically multiplied the administrations numbers by 97.25%, that in the second column of the second page they would notice that the \$530 million in current property tax revenues would be reduced to \$515 million and the delinquent property taxes could be reduced approximately \$600,000 and the current year revenue that was based at \$550 million would go to \$535 million, that if they ran through the numbers going all the way to the bottom they would see that the total ad valorem tax rate based on what they approved was \$573,335,000 and what they were proposing was \$558,140,000, but they would also need to add into that the PTS which was on the front page and the calculation was done at the bottom, that they took the complete amount of \$1.686 billion dollars of property values and multiplied it by the effective tax rate and came up with \$10.9 million dollars and used the 97.5% collection rate which gave them additional revenues of \$10.636 million dollars and from that they backed out \$1.5 million in TIRZ expenses and if they

equate the number that the administration used before it was \$6.5 and they added an additional \$1.5 so there was a complete \$8 million that would be backed out of that, that if they looked at the variance they would find that the budget would have \$567 million dollars a difference of \$6 million dollars and they also backed out the \$1 million that Mr. Haines brought to the table because of his sales tax projections, so they reduced that for a total reduction of a little over \$7 million dollars, that where those numbers would be made up were in the electrical franchise fees which would be \$5.8 million dollars and other fees which were the cable franchise fees of \$2 million dollars, that the net effect to that was that they could increase their budget by \$721,000 if they adopted the effective tax rate and that was not in addition to what they just did by implementing the Rainy Day Fund, that if they listened to what Mr. Haines had stated, right now 2.5% in the Rainy Day Fund equated to \$25 million dollars and asked Mr. Haines where they were in percentages on their calculations of that 7.5, that he understood that they did not have exactly \$25 million dollars in that account, and Mr. Haines stated that was correct, that they presently had about 6.5%, that 1.5% would roughly calculate to about \$14 million dollars, and Council Member Ellis stated they could back out another \$5 million dollars and that meant that the administration just picked up an additional \$9 million dollars in that projection and they now had an additional \$9.7 million dollars to operate within their budget if they adopted the effective tax rate, that if they did not and chose some other number that was higher they would have even additional revenues, that they did not propose to cut the budget, what they did was propose to show true dollars in the ad valorem tax rate.

Council Member Boney asked if they accepted all of Council Member Ellis's assertions and assumptions the bottom line was how much in net dollars of more revenue than was budgeted was he stating that he expected them to have, how much new money was he talking about having and Council Member Ellis stated that based on the analysis they had an addition \$721,000, but if they implemented the Rainy Day Fund they would have \$9.7 million dollars of unbudgeted money, and Council Member Boney stated that even if they accepted the assumptions they still had \$10 million dollars debt service expenses, \$20 million to \$25 million dollars in health care for all of the employees, they still had Meet and Confer for Police and Fire, they still had no incentive pay for civilian employees and still had an uncertain expenditure in fuel costs which was rising at a rate of 6% above, and they still did not have enough dollars to rationalize making the cut. Council Members Galloway, Todd, Castillo, Sanchez and Robinson absent.

Council Member Vasquez asked Mr. Haines if prior to receiving Council Member Ellis's handout at the Council table had he seen it, and Mr. Haines stated no, and Council Member Vasquez asked Mr. Haines if he had any discussion with anybody about the topics and assumptions, and Mr. Haines stated that he and Council Member Ellis did discuss his assumptions and methodologies in coming up with the calculations and that was about a week or so ago and he disagreed with two of them, that first of all the PTS or the uncertified values had traditionally never been released this early and he was not confident with that total, that secondly Council Member Ellis showed \$5.8 million dollars in increased revenues in electric franchise, but he needed to show an offset of nearly \$4 million dollars because there was a cost to the General Fund of that electric franchise that needed to be offset, so there was not savings in terms of the calculations, and Council Member Vasquez asked Mr. Haines if he agreed or disagreed with the analysis, because Council Member Ellis was referencing him as the person who came to him with those assumptions and Mr. Haines stated that he disagreed with Council Member Ellis's

conclusions and they presented it at the Fiscal Affairs Committee meeting last week. Council Members Tatro, Galloway, Todd, Castillo, Sanchez and Robinson absent.

Council Member Ellis stated that they based the \$5.8 million dollars in additional electrical franchise fees based on the worksheet that Mr. Haines brought to the Fiscal Affairs Committee meeting and that he also gave them the \$2 million dollars because they had two new cable franchise companies and they set the sales tax based on Dr. Smith's calculations and Mr. Haines readjusted that \$1 million dollars and Mr. Haines stated that was all correct, and Council Member Ellis stated that the crux of the argument went back to the PTS values and that Mr. Haines was stating that historically they did not come in that early, and Council Member Vasquez asked if basically Council Member Ellis got his information for his analysis from Mr. Haines, and Council Member Ellis stated that a lot of the analysis came from Mr. Haines, but some came from the Controller's office and some from the Tax Collector's office, but to make it more valid he used F&A's and the numbers that they budgeted, and Council Member Vasquez stated that the point was that Mr. Haines was suggesting that they had never done it that early and that was the only place where they differed other than the electrical offset and Council Member Ellis stated that was true enough. Council Members Tatro, Galloway, Goldberg, Todd, Sanchez and Robinson absent.

Council Member Keller asked that they work together to make the volume of dollars more efficient, that they had \$2.2 billion dollars could they not figure out how to make things bigger without growing government, that they should be the Council and Mayor that lowered taxes. Council Members Tatro, Galloway, Goldberg, Sanchez and Robinson absent.

Council Member Tatro stated that on September 13, 2000 they took a vote on the tax rate and eight Council Members voted to reduce the tax rate and nothing had effectively changed since that date and actually the effective tax rate was a little higher than what the Council Members voted to set on that day, that the only thing that had changed was that they had passed a Rainy Day Fund tonight which would allocate approximately \$5 million dollars over the next couple of years and it had actually given them a bigger buffer as Council Member Ellis had pointed out, so he would hope that Council would remain consistent and vote to approve the amendment and vote to set the tax rate at .64671. Council Members Galloway, Boney, Keller and Sanchez absent.

Council Member Castillo stated that the amendment was not taggable and if they adopted it, it was obviously diametrically opposed to the item that was in the presented ordinance and asked if they could do that.

Mayor Brown stated that the question was asked of the City Attorney if they could adopt Council Member Tatro's amendment in that it was opposed to the ordinance that was on the table.

Mr. Hall stated that they had indicted earlier that the question in the tax levy was the actual number in the tax rate and it was subject to amendment by majority of Council, and Mayor Brown stated that the answer was that it could be adopted.

A roll call vote was called on Council Member Tatro's motion to amend the Tax Levy Ordinance to change the rate in Section 2 from .4668 to .45853

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting no.	Council Member Vasquez voting no.
Council Member Tatro voting aye.	Council Member Castillo voting no.
Council Member Galloway voting no.	Council Member Parker voting no.
Council Member Goldberg voting aye.	Council Member Quan voting no.
Council Member Boney voting no.	Council Member Sanchez voting aye.
Council Member Todd voting aye.	Council Member Bell voting aye.
Council Member Ellis voting aye.	Council Member Robinson voting no.
Council Member Keller voting aye.	MOTION 2000-1244 FAILED.

Mayor Brown stated that they were now on the main item which was the ordinance.

Council Member Bell stated that in closing, since it was apparent where it was going, he hoped that they had all learned some lessons from the experience and hoped that folks would start practicing what they preached, that he did not doubt the sincerity of those who brought the Fiscal Reform and Accountability Proposal forward, but did doubt however the willingness on the part of the administration to follow through with any of those proposals and thought that from the beginning what it was really about was trying to get a little more money in the coffers by ratcheting up the tax cut that had been previously passed, that would be accomplished and the Mayor would get the penny back, but hoped that he would also take the message, and even though those proposals either got tagged or voted down, to follow through, because really at the end of the day it would not have mattered how they voted on any of the proposals if the administration did not have buy in and did not care about them and did not start trying to affect some of the policies it would never happen because of their form of government in the City of Houston, so he thought that the message was loud and clear that people wanted greater efficiency and better management and hopefully they would move in that direction, that they all needed to scale the rhetoric back a bit and the trust had been damaged on all sides, that no one was right and no one had the hollowed ground, so if they toned it down a little bit and perhaps tried to work together, that they did not have to like each other, that the personalities were going to differ, and did not have to be dinner guests for one another, but at the end of the day they did have to work together, and they could not just steamroller folks or run over folks because after a while that would lead to a dead end road, that he realized it and hoped that the administration had realized it and hoped they could go forth from here and try to find room for compromise. Council Member Galloway and Keller absent.

Mayor Brown stated that he was compelled to respond to Council Member Bell to remind him that they had a very extensive budget process that went for months and under the leadership of the Finance Committee Chairman, Council Member Castillo, they had 22 meetings where Council Members had the opportunity to bring anything they wanted to that committee to be considered, and reminded Council Member Bell that he only attended 3 of those meetings, so if he was so serious about wanting to have his voice heard he had an opportunity to do so 22 times and only opted to do so 3 times, and Council Member Bell stated that the Mayor opted to go zero, and Mayor Brown stated that he met with every department head prior to putting his budget together, that the meetings were for Council and not for the Mayor. Council Members Galloway and Keller absent.

Council Member Robinson thanked everyone for being present in the audience, and made the observation that the bottom line point was that they had to be real on their numbers, and part of the issue was that there was \$27 million dollars in unanticipated revenues expenditures that the administration released and the reason that he was comfortable in changing his vote was that even with all the revenues that Council Member Ellis pointed out, he still came out short by \$7.3 million dollars to cover \$27 million dollars in unanticipated expenditures and cover an \$8 million dollar rollback on the tax rate and that was including the Rainy Day Fund, because the Rainy Day Fund, the 2.5% as they now called it was not fully funded at 2.5% and those were the things that people had to lay on the table and the police and fire folks, he had to be honest with them and thought there was going to be an uproar if the surplus was larger than that and if it was not they had to understand and hoped the administration would tell them that they still had not met the \$27 million dollars yet so he did not know how they would get the health care benefits, meet and confer, PIP, debt, or EMS and Fire, and they still had \$7.3 million dollars and that was the reality, that he certainly was going to protect himself and was going to be out there and making it clear to the folks that if they said it was going to be devastating at \$15 million dollars and people could not walk away and wash their hands and say now they had a reduction in the 2.5% and a one cent rollback, everything was sunshiny and there really was no problem, because he hoped that everyone that was looking at him and holding him accountable was going to be holding the administration accountable for saying that the sky was falling at \$15 million dollars, that they were going to rollback by one cent and take \$7.5 million dollars off the table, but they still had \$27 million dollars and that plus \$7 million dollars was \$34.5 million dollars and if they could not cover \$34.5 million dollars they would not get anything else so they needed to keep track of the pennies, and knew that the police and fire certainly would, and he certainly would, because he was going to keep track of all of it because he had been accused of being fiscally irresponsible, but everybody ought to be held accountable to the same standards. Council Members Galloway, Castillo and Parker.

Council Member Goldberg thanked Mayor Brown for moving the meeting to accommodate his day to pray on Yom Kippur and during that day it did give him a lot of time to reflect on some of the sentiments that had been expressed, and the fact that it was politicized and there was a lot of bickering and a lot of backhanded influencing and threats that went around and thought that after the vote it would be nice if they were able to work together as a Council, that obviously they were not going to get to some of the items that were put in the proposal and thought that when the eight people who voted for the tax decrease voted for it they stated that they could do better, that the result of the tax decrease was the formation of the proposal and it looked like they were not going to get there and he had hoped they could do better, and in his mind they were going to fall short of that. Council Member Galloway and Robinson.

Council Member Boney stated that there was nothing that happened tonight that precluded a majority of Council working with the administration to move toward implementing the reform policies, fiscal and budget policies that were proposed, that he again wanted to commend the leadership of Council Members Quan, Vasquez and Parker, and suggested to some Council Members that were just elected and had not been in Council a full year yet that they might just give a little pause and time to develop a little deeper understanding about fiscal matters as well as political matters, that he would take everybody at their word in terms of what they put on the table, and he thought that

they could all do a better job on behalf of the citizens of Houston and that was what the citizens wanted, and there was unfortunately too much partisanship in the City business, but he would be willing to work with them to lower the volume and consider what kind of language they used, and quite frankly he thought they used to have a little more fun and got a little more done when they were trying to operate more in that way, but it would take everybody doing that, and when they did make that effort they had to be honest about the facts and put the facts on the table and not just play gotcha games or take part of the facts and that he thought was more important. Council Members Galloway and Robinson absent.

Council Member Castillo moved to call the question on adopting the ordinance on the Tax Levy, seconded by Council Member Boney. Council Members Sanchez, Keller, Tatro and Todd voting no, balance voting aye. Council Members Galloway and Robinson absent. MOTION 2000-1245 ADOPTED.

A roll call vote was called on the ordinance.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mayor Brown voting aye.	Council Member Vasquez voting aye.
Council Member Tatro voting no.	Council Member Castillo voting aye.
Council Member Galloway voting aye.	Council Member Parker voting aye.
Council Member Goldberg voting no.	Council Member Quan voting aye.
Council Member Boney voting aye.	Council Member Sanchez voting no.
Council Member Todd voting no.	Council Member Bell voting no.
Council Member Ellis voting no.	Council Member Robinson voting aye.
Council Member Keller voting no.	ORDINANCE 2000-888 ADOPTED.

At 12:52 a.m. upon motion by Council Members Castillo and Galloway the City Council adjourned.

There being no further business before Council, the City Council adjourned at 12:52 a.m. upon MOTION by Council Member Castillo seconded by Council Member Galloway. MOTION ADOPTED. COUNCIL ADJOURNED.

DETAILED INFORMATION ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY SECRETARY.

MINUTES READ AND APPROVED

Anna Russell, City Secretary