

**Notice of Meeting of the
Governing Body of the
City of Georgetown, Texas
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

The Georgetown City Council will meet on Tuesday, September 24, 2019 at 3:00 PM at the Council Chambers, at 510 West 9th 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 3:00 p.m. The following Council Members were in attendance. Mayor Dale Ross; 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. District 1 is vacant and Valerie Nicholson, Council Member District 2 was absent.

Pitts arrived at 3:23 p.m. during Item B.

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

A. Presentation and discussion regarding the Draft Georgetown Bicycle Master Plan -- Ray Miller, Jr. Transportation Planning Coordinator /Interim Director of Public Works

Miller presented the item and reviewed the need for a Bicycle Master plan. He noted that the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update identified the need for bicycling planning and by 2030, there will be almost 100,000 people in Georgetown where 20% will be over 65 years old and 20% will be under 18 years old. Miller stated that based on current cycling preferences, 66% of residents are potential cyclists and bicycling is growing in popularity nationwide. He added that the City needs to take steps now to create a safe bicycle network. Miller then noted the history of the plan and reviewed dates. He reviewed the communication and research that was done which included: a kickoff meeting with City staff; two community workshops open to the general public; three round-table discussions with key stakeholders and representatives of related agencies; online surveys with 1,172 responses; neighborhood intercept surveys with 307 responses; field investigations of existing roads, intersections, and trails with 30+ person trips; 8 cases of peer city case study reviews; and 12 topical research reports. Miller then reviewed the plan the subject of each chapter. He then provided a summary of findings including: barriers; IH-35 (new overpasses will resolve this issue); Williams Drive; Austin Avenue; University Avenue; San Gabriel River; identification of safety concerns and issues; lack of proper infrastructure such as pavement markings, bike lanes, multi-use trails, etc.; and lack of connectivity such as "no loops." Miller then reviewed the proposed improvements and recommendations including: proposed treatments for various types of roadways/functional classification; cost estimates by type of improvement(s); listing of critical intersections; bicycle parking; and a list of the top 10 priority projects. He then noted the proposed Bicycle Network where planning and design of the bicycle network are guided by the Plan Vision, Goals, and Objectives and the essential elements of the proposed system can be characterized using the "5-4-3-2-1" framework. Miller reviewed a map of the proposed bicycle network.

Mayor Ross what had been completed based on the map presented. Miller responded that that information was not in this presentation. Mayor Ross asked Miller to please provide that information at the next meeting. He then asked what is meant by a sharrows. Miller responded that it is a visual designation noting that the lane is share with vehicles and bicycles.

Miller noted the cost of around \$15 million to implement all of the proposed improvements. He added that the proposed improvements are broken up into the following tiers: Tier 1 addresses “easy wins” that are high impact projects with low capital requirements, including painting sharrows and posting wayfinding signs throughout the city, and includes the Top Ten projects identified by the plan; Tier 2 includes striping conventional and buffered lanes on newly developed streets, and streets scheduled for upgrades in the future as identified by the Public Works Department, and incorporates large, high cost projects, such as significant intersection connections, bridge connections, and protected bicycle.

Mayor Ross noted the need for bicycle improvements on the Austin Avenue Bridges and asked if those costs will be included in existing improvement plans. Miller responded yes, they will.

Miller reviewed the proposed adoption schedule which included presentations to different City boards and open houses.

Mayor Ross asked if staff had already reached out to cyclist. Miller responded yes.

B. Presentation and discussion regarding the City’s Tree Preservation requirements -- Sofia Nelson, CNU-A, Planning Director

Nelson presented the item and identified the presentation team that included: Steve McKeown, Landscape Planner; Heather Brewer, Urban Forester; and Chelsea Irby, Senior Planner. She then reviewed why the City is preserving trees. Nelson defined a protected tree as any tree that has a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 12 inches or larger, excluding Hackberry, Chinaberry, Ashe Juniper (cedar), Chinese Tallow, and Mesquite. She then defined a heritage trees as any of the following trees with a DBH of 26 inches or larger: Live Oak, Post Oak, Shumard Oak, Bur Oak, Chinquapin Oak, Monterey Oak, Bald Cypress, American Elm, Cedar Elm, Pecan, Walnut, Texas Ash, or Southern Magnolia. Nelson noted that the UDC guides tree preservation based on type of development, using a tree survey, mitigation, and incentives and priorities. She reviewed tree preservation based on type of development. Nelson explained the tree survey components: location of all heritage trees; location of all protected trees; trees species name, and size; calculation of average protected tree density (total number of Protected Trees divided by the total acreage); and the Critical Root Zone (CRZ) Protection Plan. She then reviewed the tree preservation priorities and noted that protection of heritage and protected trees may be considered for priority over conflicting UDC development requirements. Nelson explained the tree preservation incentives which include: Impervious Cover Increase - the amount of permitted impervious cover may be increased for the preservation of Protected Trees beyond the minimum amount required for the site; Parkland Dedication Credit - the Parkland dedication requirement may be reduced if a Heritage Tree is saved within the dedicated parkland lot; and Parking Space Reduction - a reduction in the number of parking spaces required for a site given preservation of a Protected Tree with a DBH of 20 inches or greater. She reviewed the mitigation options which include: Existing On-Site Credit Trees (Applies towards a maximum 75% of required mitigation inches for Protected Trees); On-Site Planting; Fee-in-Lieu of planting; Aeration and Fertilization; and Off-Site Planting (Subject to Parks & Rec acceptance). Nelson provided an overview of the Project Evaluation for Tree Preservation Plan Review and noted that Tree Preservation Plans show Tree Survey information plus, tree classification, removals, protected, Site Plan, and estimated mitigation

calculations. She then reviewed project evaluation for tree density, the finalized site layout and mitigation, the approval process and the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (CO). Nelson reviewed how the City requirements compare to other cities noting that the City is in line with the surround cities. She then reviewed past and future projects funded by tree mitigation funds.

Jonrowe asked if the preservation on residential properties referred to new developments. Nelson responded that was correct. Jonrowe asked if staff had looked into to an opt-in program for citizens who want help with a heritage tree on their property. Nelson responded that staff had not but could look into. Jonrowe asked if the arborist services are available to all citizens. Brewer responded yes. Jonrowe asked if citizens are aware of this service. Brewer responded that there is not currently advertising in place. Jonrowe asked if staff will be reaching out now with the addition of the Landscape Planner position. Brewer responded yes. Jonrowe noted that someone had come to the City to see about establishing a Tree City USA status. She asked if there was follow-up on this. Brewer responded that the designation would require different ordinance that what the City currently has. She noted that it is not just a parks and rec issue but is a citywide issue. Discussion between Jonrowe and Brewer about trees in the rights of way and how those are maintained. Jonrowe asked if, aside from trees in the rights of way, does the City meet many of the qualifications for Tree City USA status. Brewer responded yes, many of them. Jonrowe then asked about staff suggestion for improvements. Brewer responded that there are lot of small tweaks that could be made. She added that there is a large hole in process when it leaves Planning, and no one is inspecting trees once home are going up. Brewer stated that trees on home lots disappear and for commercial projects, there is no one dedicated to look at trees. She then noted that the review times are difficult. Jonrowe asked how this could be remedied. Morgan responded that he is happy to explore further. Jonrowe noted the room to improve. Nelson stated that the ordinance allows for flexibility. Jonrowe asked about “trash trees” and if there has been any change to that designation. Nelson responded that recent legislation change will allow for more education. She added that “trash trees” vary from city to city. Morgan noted that has added an additional employee and will look for opportunities over the next year. Jonrowe asked that staff reevaluating the impact of new, smaller trees versus established trees. Nelson responded that staff agrees and will provide information.

C. Presentation and discussion regarding the Home Repair Program -- Sofia Nelson, CNU-A, Planning Director and Susan Watkins, AICP, Housing Coordinator

Watkins presented the item and noted that staff is requesting feedback on the following questions:

1. Do you agree with recommended strategy for FY20?
2. Is there interest/support to pursue partnerships with the non-profit community in Georgetown to leverage funds and build awareness of the home repair program?
3. What additional information do you need?

Watkins showed Council a video that showed the impact home repair has on the community. She then reviewed the FY2019 successes and noted that the \$25,000.00 Habitat for Humanity Williamson County (HFHWC) partnership impacted: 15 families (25 people); 26 volunteers, 800 volunteer hours; exhausted funding; and interdepartmental coordination. She then reviewed the FY20 Funding which includes: \$130K total funding; \$75K – Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from Williamson County; \$55K - City of Georgetown; \$25,000 (General Fund); and \$30,000 (Conservation – Water & Electric). Watkins then reviewed recommendations for home repair that are in the Housing Element. She then reviewed the program goals of: preservation of neighborhoods; energy conservation; housing affordability; support homeownership; support homeowners with historic requirements for rehabilitation; and building partnerships with the non-profit community. Watkins outlined the program strategy for FY20 which includes: citywide eligibility to apply for program; direct outreach efforts; Old Town and Downtown districts; homeowners in need of utility bill assistance; seniors in need of

accessibility improvements; and awareness of ability to assist urgent repairs subject to fund availability. She then provided Council a list of key dates and then asked for feedback.

Gonzalez asked if staff has considered commercial partnerships. Whites responded that she was not aware of any of that type of outreach. Morgan stated that the City's Habitat partnership would lend to that. Linda Sloan with Habitat stated that yes, Habitat already does that and utilizes discounted rates and donated services. Gonzalez thanked Sloan for the work.

Pitts noted that last year the amount was around \$1700 per family. He added that this year \$130,000 is available and asked if demand last year would lead to the total \$130,000 being spent. Sloan responded that Habitat stopped soliciting once funds ran out. She added that there is discussion on whether to address all of the needs at a given home or just focus on emergency repairs. Pitts asked if, for some reason, all \$130,000 was not utilized, would any remaining funds be marked for the following year for Georgetown families. Sloan responded that how those funds are handled would depend on the City and how it is outlined in the contract. She added that it will not be difficult to spend all of the funds. Pitts responded to the questions referenced earlier in the presentation:

1. Do you agree with recommended strategy for FY20?
 - a. Pitts responded yes.
2. Is there interest/support to pursue partnerships with the non-profit community in Georgetown to leverage funds and build awareness of the home repair program?
 - a. Pitts responded yes.
3. What additional information do you need?
 - a. Pitts responded no.

Mayor Ross recessed the meeting into Executive Session at 3:50 p.m. and called for a ten minute break. Council started Executive Session at 4:00 p.m.

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.

D. 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

- Clearway
- PEC Franchise
- Industrial District Agreement with Texas Crushed Stone

Sec. 551.086: Certain Public Power Utilities: Competitive Matters

- Purchase Power Update
- Garland QSE Agreement
- Electric Energy Portfolio Managed Services RFP

Sec. 551.072: Deliberations about Real Property

- Right of Way acquisition from Kids Kottage (Parcel 1), Old Airport Road Realingment Project -- Travis Baird, Real Estate Services Manager

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

Approved by the Georgetown City Council on _____
Date

Dale Ross, Mayor

Attest: City Secretary