

**Notice of Meeting of the  
Governing Body of the  
City of Georgetown, Texas  
Tuesday, July 23, 2019**

The Georgetown City Council will meet on Tuesday, July 23, 2019 at 3:00 PM at the Council Chambers, at 510 West 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Georgetown, TX 78626.

The City of Georgetown is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you require assistance in participating at a public meeting due to a disability, as defined under the ADA, reasonable assistance, adaptations, or accommodations will be provided upon request. Please contact the City Secretary's Office, at least three (3) days prior to the scheduled meeting date, at (512) 930-3652 or City Hall at 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street for additional information; TTY users route through Relay Texas at 711.

Mayor Ross called the meeting to order at 3:02 PM. Council Members were in attendance. Mayor Dale Ross; Valerie Nicholson, Council Member District 2; Mike Triggs, Council Member District 3; Steve Fought, Council Member District 4; Kevin Pitts, Council Member District 5; Rachael Jonrowe, Council Member District 6; and Tommy Gonzalez, District 7.

Anna Eby, Council Member District 1 was absent.

**Policy Development/Review Workshop – Call to order at 3:00 PM**

- A. Presentation and discussion of recommended changes to the City's Fiscal and Budgetary Policy for FY2020 -- Leigh Wallace, Finance Director

Wallace presented the item and noted that the recommended changes are being proposed by the General Government and Finance Committee (GGAF) reviewed the fiscal and budgetary policies noting that they guide: budget development and monitoring process; revenue and expense; capital asset replacement; debt philosophy and process; reserves and financial ratios; accounting and audit procedures; and have a goal of finding a balance between flexible and firm. She noted that the intended of the audience includes: and annual review by GGAF and Council as part of budget development process; internal staff; external auditors; and credit rating agencies. Wallace noted that the administrative changes are to: clarify existing wording and formatting; remove old language that no longer applies; and update compliance for coming fiscal year. She said the substantive changes include; changing the meaning of the policy; calculation change; definition change; change in decision maker; and adding new policies. Wallace noted the Workday alignment opportunities which include budget transfers and consistent approval levels with director authority from \$20,000 to \$25,000, and the interest income calculation will move from month-end balance to average daily cash balance. She said that the revenue management changes are already in practice and are to clarify rate setting goals for solid waste contract services and add language for Airport fuel and lease rates. Wallace stated that relating to expenses and assets, when related to public art the policy defines the annual amount for programs and grants to artists at current level of \$43,000.00 and for fleet units the policy defines adding language for current practice requiring approval for held back vehicles and equipment. She noted that the reserves will be adding debt service reserves for existing debt for GTEC, GEDCO, Stormwater, Airport, Rivery TIRZ, and Downtown TIRZ to be at least 1x the next year's debt service payment. Wallace stated that risk management portion of the policy will add language reflecting existing practices relating to Electric Utility risk management, fraud awareness and reporting, and cybersecurity

awareness. She reviewed in summary that several additions and clarifications were made to the policies for FY2020 reflecting current practices and the City continues to be recognized by credit rating agencies for strong fiscal policies that emphasize flexible liquidity. Wallace noted the next steps of receive Council feedback and adopt policies with the budget in September.

Council had no questions/comments.

**B. Presentation, discussion, and possible direction regarding Housing Policies for the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and process for updating the Land Use Element -- Sofia Nelson, Planning Director**

Nelson presented the item and recapped the previous work that had been done related to this process. She then reviewed the policy language and noted: Lead refers to the City playing a main role in enacting policy, for example, development regulations and incentives; partner refers to the City partnering with other organization(s) to further policy, for example, Home Repair program with Habitat for Humanity; and support refers to the City supporting other efforts to further policy, for example, supporting non-profit volunteer efforts.

Fought noted that he wanted very specific definitions. Gonzalez said that partnership could have a financial element while the City could support something without providing funding. Nelson said she understood and would caption the Council's comments.

Nelson recapped the policies presented and recapped the policies that were confirmed. For each policy presented Nelson noted the previous Council guidance that had been provided. Nelson reviewed Policy A1: Support and increase rental choices for low-income and workforce households unless they are substandard. She provided the following options:

1. Option 1 - Utilize definition included in housing report defined as 30-80% of AMI
2. Option 2 - Utilize a more narrowed range of 50-80%
3. Option 3 - Establish a specific AMI range for rental policy vs home ownership policy. The following is an example from Dallas: Programs range from 30%- 120% AMI with incentivizing homeownership at 60%-120% AMI and rental developments from 30%-120% AMI

Fought stated he preferred Option 2 but would like narrow range that covers rentals. Nelson responded that there are two different policies A1 and A3 to consider for rentals and home ownership. Gonzalez stated that he agrees with Fought and his concern with the policies are the market effects. He added that staff can put a target in and be effective, and that all price points for housing are in demand. Jonrowe stated that she likes idea of the Dallas model to incentivize both options.

Nelson reviewed Policy A4: Support community housing choices for vulnerable residents including families and individuals experiencing homelessness. She provided the following options:

1. Option 1 - As currently drafted.
2. Option 2 - Support community housing choices for vulnerable residents. ~~including families and individuals experiencing homelessness.~~
3. Option 3 - Support the non-profit community to create housing opportunities for the most vulnerable residents (including but not limited to homeless, seniors, youth aging out of the foster care system, and people with disabilities).
4. Option 4 - Support the non-profit community to minimize the involuntary displacement of people of vulnerable populations such as low-income households, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

Pitts stated that he prefers Options 3 and 4 but would selection option 4 as top choice. Mayor Ross what the significant different between Options 3 and 4 was. Nelson explained that is still includes homelessness, while Option 4 leans more towards the non-profit community. Jonrowe stated that she liked Option 3 and the inclusion of youth aging out of foster care. Gonzalez stated that he is fine with Options 3 and 4, noting that the foster care element is important. He added that Option 3 is his preferred option. Ross stated that it sounds like Council is leading towards Option 3.

Nelson reviewed Policy P2: Preserve existing neighborhoods in targeted areas. She provided Council with their requested information by noting that the City could create a process where residents would need to self-elect neighborhoods for participation (ex. Traffic Neighborhood Management Program) or a specific criteria might be laid out in toolkit for qualifying neighborhoods such as age, maintenance, and vulnerability to change.

Nelson reviewed Policy P3: Support owner ability to stay in their home in neighborhoods with rapid value increases. She provided Council with their requested information noting that possible implementation steps could include: home rehabilitation; utility billing assistance; homestead exemption education; partnerships with non-profits that assist existing home owners with maintenance; property tax abatement for reinvestment areas for homeowners meeting specific criteria; and Neighborhood Empowerment Zones. Nelson then provided the following options:

1. Option 1 - As currently drafted.
2. Option 2 - Support owners ability to stay in homes in neighborhoods with rapid value increases without limiting the sale of the home.
3. Option 3 - Support in minimizing the involuntary displacement of home owners in neighborhoods with rapid value increase without limiting the sale of the home.
4. Option 4 - Support owner choice to say in their home in neighborhoods with rapid value increases.

Fought asked for an example of policy that would fit in option 2, but not option 3 and fit in option 3 but not option 4. He added that he didn't understand the subtleties in the differences of the policies. Nelson responded that staff was trying to focus and hear Council clearly. She added that staff understood the concern for limiting the sale of a home. Nelson stated that she heard Council saying that there was sometimes a choice for people to stay or leave, but that the intent of the policy was for those without a choice. Fought said that he supports the good neighbor fund and he is all for helping people make modifications to homes that lower utility bills. Gonzalez stated that this policy could relate to transition homes where zonings are changing and rezoning is allowed. Mayor Ross asked for clarification on Options 2 and 3. Nelson responded that staff was trying to wordsmith and give Council options. Mayor Ross responded that Option 2 is more broad than Option 3. Morgan responded that this is a wordsmithing exercise and it depends on what words sound best to Council. Mayor Ross stated that he feels Option 2 gives more options.

Nelson reviewed Policy D4: Encourage housing options and services to allow people to thrive in Georgetown as they grow older.

1. Option 1 - As currently drafted.
2. Option 2 - Promote aging in place opportunities by aligning land use policies and transportation policies that promote a housing market capable of accommodating residents throughout all stages of life.
3. Option 3 - Combine drafted policy with D3 and move to land use element: Promote development of complete neighborhoods across Georgetown to support improved livability and aging in place options.

Fought stated that if the objective is to allow people to age in place, it doesn't feel like it fits in the housing policy. He stated that can live with either Option 2 or 3. Fought stated that the objective of aging in place goes beyond the housing policy. Nelson responded that the Land Use Policy will be the most overarching. Fought stated that he is not thrilled with any of them but can work with Option 2. Mayor Ross stated that Option 2 is best fit for this and Option 3 has too many other non-housing elements. Gonzalez what "promote" now means in this policy. Nelson went back over the definitions. Jonrowe stated that the transportation element could lead to a financial component.

Nelson then presented the Land Use Element and reviewed the work that has been done so far. She then reviewed the Gateway Overlay Districts and how they: are intended to enhance the entry corridors to Georgetown; consist of 14 corridors into the city are designated for the purpose of applying additional landscaping and design standards; and are part of the 2030 update will identify goals and policies for the location, character, design, streetscape, and signage of our city's gateways and image corridors. Nelson then reviewed the Gateway Survey and noted: there were 335 total participants; live dates were from April 24 - May 15 (22 days); the purpose was to gather broad public input to prioritize gateways and input on what characteristics should be sustained or improved (land use, signage, walkability, building design/scale, streetscape); and the results will be used to develop recommendations for goals to the Steering Committee and City Council. She then reviewed the most important segments as identified by the public. Nelson asked Council for guidance on what gateways should be studied.

Nicholson and what is involved in studying the gateways. Nelson responded that all the overlays are currently identified in that UDC. Nicholson asked what the order of review would be. Nelson responded that a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities; and Threats) analysis would be done. Nicholson stated that she would be in favor of reviewing all of them. Pitts asked, over next 10 years, how does Council want these to develop. Nelson responded yes and provided a table that reviewed the top issues by corridor. Pitts stated that a majority of people that see Georgetown, see if from IH-35 and in the IH-35 corridor the look is important. He added that there are some roads that could be expanded to help alleviate traffic issues. Nelson reiterated Pitts comments on studying gateway areas that may be built up and look for ways to alleviate traffic concerns in gateway areas. Gonzalez stated that he would like staff to look at natural gateways that exist on major roads that lead into Georgetown and start there to try and get ahead. He added that when someone is driving down IH-35 there should be good presentation, but at 75 mph is much of an impact really made. Gonzalez suggested working on outside roads first and then working inward. Fought provided a historical anecdote and noted the two major entrances at North and South. He stated that staff should pick two and get it right as those are the gates to the city. Mayor Ross noted Gaslight District in San Diego and how it clearly defines the downtown. He said that the downtown historic district should be clearly defined. Jonrowe said that she sees the distinction between corridors and gateways and thinks of both in terms of trying to create something that is pleasant. She asked about the target audience and noted that staff needs to refine this further. Nelson recapped the feedback she had received from Council. She asked the Council if there is a level of work to be done before Comp plan is complete.

Gonzalez stated that to have a Comprehensive Plan completed, the land use is a key element, and they should be developed concurrently and make sure that the UDC lines up with the Land Use Plan.

- C. Presentation, update and discussion regarding amendments to the Parmer Ranch MUD (a.k.a. Northwest Williamson County Municipal Utility District #2 or NWWCMUD #2) Amended Consent Agreement -- Wayne Reed, Assistant City Manager

Reed presented the item and noted that Joe Owen the Master Developer was in attendance with his assistant Nathaniel Klugman. He stated that the purpose of the presentation was for staff to receive

Council's feedback and direction on an amendment to the Parmer Ranch MUD Consent Agreement. Reed reviewed the Parmer Ranch Amended Land Plan and the MUD Policy which states: The City of Georgetown finds that the purpose of a Municipal Utility District (MUD) is to assist in closing the financial gap when a development is seeking to exceed minimum City standards, provide a robust program of amenities, and/or where substantial off-site infrastructure improvements are required that would serve the MUD and surrounding properties. He then reviewed the MUD Policy Basic Requirements that consist of: quality development, extraordinary benefits, public service/safety, exclusive provider, fiscally responsible, finance plan, and annexation. Reed noted that the developer has agreed to meet/exceed standards in UDC, plus add the following enhancements to the Development Agreement: development and design standards for single-family residential to ensure minimum standard of quality and create equality with more recent developments with MUDs and incorporate approval process for alternative architectural standards. He then explained that the developer will: provide a master sign plan to create a unified and attractive appearance across the entire development with consistent use of high-quality materials and design; and meet City's infrastructure standards and fund the design and construction of roadway infrastructure based upon TIA. Reed added that the developer has requested flexibility with Tree Preservation which includes: abiding by the UDC Tree Preservation standards on 382 acres out of 454 acres and on the remaining 72 acres (Parcels 6, 19, 20, and 21), provide tree preservation identical to Wolf Ranch-Hillwood PUD standards based upon tree survey that documented concentration of Heritage Trees on these parcels. He stated that the developer/district must design, fund, and construct on-site collector level roads and make developer contributions to and/or construct other transportation improvements based upon TIA. Reed stated that the developer/district must: design, fund, and construct regional trail (10' wide) along south side of Ronald Regan Boulevard; provide neighborhood parks, a private amenity center, and preserve 47 acres as open space/parkland; provide a minimum of \$250,000.00 to improve each neighborhood park which will be triggered by a certain building permit threshold.

Pitts asked if the parks would be private parks. Reed responded that they would be private parks because they will be in the ETJ.

Reed noted that the developer will use residential development standards provide a diversity of housing with range of single-family lots/designs, multi-family, and cluster homes. He then reviewed existing benefits in the development agreement related to wastewater, water infrastructure, SIP Fee, City exclusive provider, on-site facilities, and impact fees. Reed reviewed the bond terms: estimated maximum amount of bonds is \$84,000,000.00; maximum bond maturity of 25 years; bond issuance period of 15 years from the date of the first issuance of Bonds issued by each district; refunding bonds not later than 10th anniversary of date of issuance; reimbursement agreement of no later than the fifteenth (15th) anniversary of the date of the first issuance of bonds by the District; District only tax rate (Maximum) of \$0.95/\$100 in assessed value; and a master development fee. He noted that the development is responsible for on-site costs of infrastructure and will not impose financial burden on citizens of City of Georgetown. Reed added that a Strategic Partnership Agreement for Commercial development will allow the City's sales tax to be collected from retail businesses located in this ETJ development and the sales tax will be split between City (80%) and Developer (20%). He said that staff is seeking the Council's feedback and direction on an amendment to the Parmer Ranch MUD Consent Agreement that covers: residential development standards; architectural design standards; master sign plan; amenity center; parks and regional trail; parkland fees; sidewalks and trails; tree preservation; Fire SIP Fee; and financial terms.

Fought stated that it looks like well negotiated agreement. He then asked what the timeline is on starting the project. Joe Owen with Parmer Ranch Partners LP stated that there was a meeting with City yesterday and is hoping to get started around the first quarter of next year or last quarter of this year. He added that things are going well and they are ready to get started.

Gonzalez stated that the agreement was a well worked document and the triggers used in the document should be used in future development.

Jonrowe asked that Reed review the tree preservation portion and asked what flexibility means when deviating from UDC requirements. Reed responded that the biggest change is related credit trees. Jonrowe stated that keeping smaller trees leads to wildlife preservation and she is not crazy about precedent. She said that she is willing to entertain it in this case, but Council should look at the tree preservation ordinance and see if it needs to be updated. There was much discussion about tree preservation and the use of the tree preservation ordinance. Jonrowe stated that she would ideally preserve all trees but understands that is not possible. More general discussion about tree removal and mitigation. Mayor Ross asked why staff was using Hillwood as the standard. Morgan responded that these are negotiations and once an exception is granted to one develop, other developers will ask for the same exception. He added that only sections of the MUD have been identified and staff will do follow-up research. Mayor Ross asked what's in it for the City to allow less trees. Morgan responded that the developer would offer different commitments for this concession. Reed noted the 10 general amendments that were presented previously. Ross asked if the parks will be open to all Georgetown residents. Reed responded that they will not be open and the developer could prohibit the general public.

Gonzalez stated that he is worried about these exceptions creating a precedent. Reed responded that the City does have virtually every developer ask for exceptions and the City requires a tree survey before providing an exception. Pitts asked if the exception done for Hillwood was for certain sections or the entire thing. Reed responded that is was for the entire thing. Pitts stated that since this development only wants a waiver in a few areas he is fine with the proposal. He added that there are alternatives and it is virtually impossible to develop without addressing tree preservation. Gonzalez stated that he understands, but staff and Council need to review the policy so that continuous exceptions aren't needed. Reed stated that tree preservation is on an upcoming workshop. Owen stated that on 454 acres he is asking for a variance that will allow the removal for 20% of the of the heritage trees. He continued that the park plan is not on presentation, but they will keep trees for the parks and can plant 300 trees. Owen said that the corners that are being asked about are identified for future commercial. He finished by saying that the amendment has taken months of work with staff to reach a compromise.

Reed asked for Council's direction. Gonzalez stated that he supports the amendment. Nicholson stated that she supports the amendment.

- D.** Presentation, update and discussion regarding amendments to the Oaks at San Gabriel MUD (a.k.a. West Williamson County Municipal Utility District #1 or WWCMUD #1) Amended Consent Agreement and related agreements -- Wayne Reed, Assistant City Manager

Reed presented the item and reviewed the proposed changes consisting of: Overall Development Plan; Fee for CHWWTP expansion; Architectural Design Standards; and Financial Terms related to Bond Capacity. He noted that this development has been in development since 2007. Reed then showed Council pictures of the development and what has been completed to date. He then briefly reviewed the how the key components of the MUD policy are utilized in the Oaks at San Gabriel. Reed noted that staff is reviewing the feasibility of the developer must cover the full cost of expanding the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He added that the developer is asking to increase the maximum bond amount to \$35,000,000.00. Reed said that the developer has paid in full to date, all financial obligations totaling \$408,000.00. He then asked for feedback from Council in the proposed changes.

Gonzalez stated that he understands changes and has no issues. He then asked how impending MUDs staff is working on. Reed responded four and one PID.

E. Presentation and discussion regarding the 86th Legislative Session -- Jack Daly, Assistant to the City Manager

Daly presented the item and reviewed the City's efforts during the legislative session which included: adopting a Legislative agenda in Oct. 2018; Williamson County Day; Chamber's Government Affairs Committee; Texas Municipal League; and Focused Advocacy. He then reviewed a chart that showed bills introduced versus bills passed and noted that the City related bills has continued to increase over time. Daly provided a 2019 Session Summary that noted: an explicit effort to preempt cities in lieu of state authority across the board seems to be declining slightly; all so-called "super-preemption" bills died; a trend to try and politicize cities is on the increase; and increased use of population brackets in bills. He noted that there has been an effort to add party affiliations to local races. Daly then reviewed Senate Bill 2: 3.5% rollback rate on cities/counties; "No new revenue rate"; de minimus relief for cities under 30,000 population: can adopt rate that levies \$500,000.00; 3-year "banking"; certificates of obligation provision removed; and is effective January 1, 2020.

Fought asked about the possibility of banking percentages for future year. Daly responded that he will double check but he doesn't think that's an option.

Ross asked who was against local control. Daly said that Schwertner was in favor, Wilson was in favor, and Telarico was against.

Daly resumed the presentation and noted the changed to Annexation and ETJ which does not allow unilateral annexation in all counties, with limited exceptions, and is effective immediately (HB 347 by King). He then reviewed Land Use and how cities: must approve/conditionally approve/reject subdivision plat, site plans, and all other subdivision development applications within 30 days or deemed approved; (HB 3167 by Oliverson, 9/1/19); require digital mapping for home rule cities (SB 1303 by Bettencourt—9/1/19); and have 3/4s vote of council required for non-consensual historic landmark designation (HB 2496 by Cyrrier, effective immediately).

Pitts asked the developments application must be approved by Council or staff within 30 days. Daly responded that they must be approved by staff and focuses on development applications. Skye Masson, First Assistant Attorney said that there is work being done on this bill. She added that the 30 days includes taking it to P&Z (Planning and Zoning Commission) and changes approval from planning director to P&Z. Pitts asked about any applications that need both Council and P&Z. Masson responded at this time, none require approval of both.

Daly continued by reviewing Online Sales Tax with: HB 1525 will shift all sourcing, including in-state, to destination if goods sold at certain "marketplaces"; HB 2153 allows Comptroller-recommended legislation to affect the city's share; blended rate instead of individual city rates; and cities collect based on current sales tax collections, not actual deliveries from out-of-state retailers. He reviewed economic development and a bill that extend Ch. 312 tax abatement by 10 years: HB 3143 by Murphy, 9/1/19 and new hearing and 30-day notice requirements were added. Daly reviewed City fees: residential building permit fees may not be tied to value of building or cost of construction (HB 852 by Holland—immediately effective); cities must choose some other criteria such as square footage; and TABC reauthorization allows breweries to sell beer-to-go, but also created new types of permits; cities must update license fees accordingly (HB 1545 by Paddie, 9/1/19). He then reviewed Building Codes and

Regulations and how the City can't regulate building materials authorized by national building codes with limited exceptions (HB 2439 by Phelan, 9/1/19),

Mayor Ross asked about historic districts. Daly responded that there are exceptions for historic, along with planned developments.

Daly reviewed the changes to plumbing and the attempt to pass a bill that would all State plumbing licensing and regulations to end Sep. 1 because sunset bill, SB 621, but it didn't pass. He added the Governor extended the Texas State Board of Plumbing Examiners and its licensing law until 2021 via an executive order.

Ross why was it determined licenses weren't needed. Daly did not want to speak on why certain things happened in the legislature.

Daly reviewed Open Meetings and the attempt to fix recent court case declaring conspiracy crime of Open Meetings Act unconstitutional (SB 1640 by Watson—effective immediately). He added that there was a change that City's must allow public to comment in all public meetings including workshops (HB 2840 by Canales, 9/1/19) and expanded emergency powers under Open Meetings Act (SB 494 by Huffman, 9/1/19). He then reviewed Public Information: if a city has a website, requires meeting, election, and other info to be posted on it (HB 305 by D. Paul, 9/1/19); Bill to expand third party vendors and contractors of cities subject to open records (SB 943 by Watson, 1/1/20); City officials must forward city business on cell phones to PIA officer (SB 944 by Watson, 9/1/19); and information about parades and concerts paid for with public funds are open records (HB 81 by Canales, effective immediately).

Fought asked if this includes text messages. Daly responded that it includes text and personal email. Fought asked about phone calls. Daly responded that he will double check that. Fought noted that text is difficult to monitor because texts get deleted. Daly responded that staff will be coming back and go into deeper discussion.

Daly then reviewed debt and HB 477 by Murphy that adds one item to ballot (that taxes will be used to pay the debt) and requires a voter guide and new notice requirements (9/1/19) and single specific purpose for each bond proposition (SB 30 by Birdwell, 9/1/19). He then reviewed changes to elections which include: allowing a City to remove deceased candidates from ballot up to deadline to file (HB 1067 by Ashby, immediately effective); runoff ballot candidate order must be same relative to original ballot order (HB 88 by Swanson, 9/1/19); other than disaster displacement, candidates to show eligibility must have made an effort to return to residence after a temporary absence (HB 831 by Huberty, 1/1/20); and for November elections, can't have early voting place that isn't a county voting place, unless all county places in city are designated by city (HB 1048 by Guillen, effective immediately). Daly noted that a city must report lobby expenses in budget (HB 1495 by Toth and S.B. 65 by Nelson). He then reviewed Right of Way Fees and how providers don't have to pay both cable and telecom franchise fees and can drop the lowest (SB 1152 by Hancock, 9/1/19). Daly added that this will result in litigation. He then reviewed Workers Comp issues: the list of Firefighter cancers was expanded from 3 to 11 cancers covered (SB 2551 by Hinojosa, effective immediately); add police to presumption statute other than cancers (SB 1582 by Lucio, 9/1/19); and PTSD caused by multiple events (HB 2143 by J. Turner, 9/1/19). Daly reviewed changes to purchasing and contracting: contractors not liable for specification defects in road construction (HB 2899 by Leach, effective immediately); some limitation of can't-boycott-Israel contracting bill from 2017 (HB 793 by P. King—effective immediately) the company must have 10 or more employees and the contract must have value over \$100,000.00; and city contracts using state money can't require union participation (HB 985 by Hancock, 9/1/19). He then reviewed the changes to utilities noting that all gas utilities must replace



cast iron delivery pipes by 2022, and replace at least 8% of all pipes annually thereafter (HB 866 by Anchia). Daly reviewed changes to employment noting that all city officials and employees with access to government computer systems must complete annual cybersecurity training that can be offered in-house (HB 3834 by Capriglione, effective immediately). He then reviewed good bills for cities which include: automatic allocation of sporting goods sales taxes to parks (SB 26 and SJR 24 by Kolkhorst—on November ballot); mandatory notice to city of radioactive discharges (HB 2203 by Miller, effective immediately); and rock climbing protected under Tort Claims Act (HB 687 by Guillen and SB 230 by Perry, effective immediately). Daly noted bills that landed on the cutting room floor: cities can't lobby or join associations that do; short-term rental regulation preemption; working conditions ordinance preemption; disease notice by animal shelters; broad "super preemption" bills; confusing financial information on bond ballots; State or district judge approval of ballot propositions; 6 chickens for every backyard; no arrests for Class C misdemeanors; must release ETJ on petition; AG can settle city lawsuits; 145% required offer in eminent domain; limitations on issuance of COs; email notification of city fees; and must use county polling places at May election. He then reviewed the next steps of: address local conflicts with State Law; reviewing building permits; reviewing alcohol licenses; updating meeting procedures; considering needed UDC revisions; and continuing to engage with elected officials.

### **Executive Session**

In compliance with the Open Meetings Act, Chapter 551, Government Code, Vernon's Texas Codes, Annotated, the items listed below will be discussed in closed session and are subject to action in the regular session.

**F. Sec. 551.071: Consultation with Attorney**

Advice from attorney about pending or contemplated litigation and other matters on which the attorney has a duty to advise the City Council, including agenda items

-PEC Franchise

-Legislation Update

**Sec. 551.086: Certain Public Power Utilities: Competitive Matters**

- Purchased Power Update

**Sec. 551:074: Personnel Matters**

City Manager, City Attorney, City Secretary and Municipal Judge: Consideration of the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal

### **Adjournment**

**Meeting adjourned into Executive Session at 5:09 PM.**

-----  
Approved by the Georgetown City Council on \_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dale Ross, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attest: City Secretary

