Notice of Meeting for the
Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee
of the City of Georgetown
August 12, 2019 at 3:00 PM
at City Hall Community Room - 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street

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, Georgetown, TX 78626 for additional information; TTY users route through Relay Texas at 711.

Regular Session

(This Regular Session may, at any time, be recessed to convene an Executive Session for any purpose authorized by the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code 551.)

A Consideration and possible action to approve the July 22, 2019 minutes -- Danella Elliott, Committee Liaison

B Public Engagement Plan Presentation -- Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Certificate of Posting

I, Robyn Densmore, City Secretary for the City of Georgetown, Texas, do hereby certify that this Notice of Meeting was posted at City Hall, 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626, a place readily accessible to the general public as required by law, on the _____ day of _________________, 2019, at ____________, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

__________________________________________
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary
City of Georgetown, Texas
Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee
August 12, 2019

SUBJECT:
Consideration and possible action to approve the July 22, 2019 minutes -- Danella Elliott, Committee Liaison

ITEM SUMMARY:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
n/a

SUBMITTED BY:
R.LD for Danella Elliott

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPGMinutes 07.22.2019</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of Meeting of the
Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting
City of Georgetown, Texas
July 22, 2019

The Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee met on Monday, July 22, 2019 at 3:00 PM in the Community Room at City Hall, 808 Martin Luther King Jr Street, Georgetown, Texas.

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.

Board Members Present:
Michael Walton, Co-Chair
Linda McCalla, Co-Chair
Mickie Ross
Scott Firth
Larry Olson
Shawn Hood
Chris Damon

City Staff Present:
Laurie Brewer, Assistant City Manager
Wayne Reed, Assistant City Manager
Sofia Nelson, Planning Director
Eric Johnson, CIP Manager
Amanda Still, Arts & Culture Coordinator
Danella Elliott, Executive Assistant
Kim McAuliffe, Downtown Development Manager
Wesley Wright, Systems Engineering Director
Eric Nuner, Parks & Rec Assistant Director
Jackson Daly, Assistant to the City Manager
Keith Hutchinson, Communications Director

Board Members Absent:
Kay Briggs

Others present:
Larry Brundidge

Legislative Regular Agenda

Michael Walton, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

A Approval of the Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting minutes from the July 22, 2019 meeting – Danella Elliott – Committee Liaison

Motion to approve minutes by Mickie Ross; second by Scott Firth. Approved 7-0. Kay Briggs absent.

Larry Olsen said that he was trying to understand expectations and asked for clarification about what was expected from the committee. He had one concern regarding the design aspects and wanted to know if they were supposed to provide design feedback, and another concern was about his mention of massing and height concerns, and the 18 parking places off of 7th, which were not noted, and he is just trying to get a feel on committee input expectations. Laurie said that all of the above were important and this committee is not responsible for looking for to finalize design, but major elements that drive design, and the team’s feedback on a broader public input process. We do want specific ideas on feasibility and being able to take ideas from the committee, as well as the public, back to Council.
Another question was whether the City was open to having smaller facility or was it set on a four level parking garage. Laurie noted that any feedback to Council was welcome, but there does come a point that a smaller garage wouldn’t be effective, but it would be Council’s decision. She reiterated that all feedback is important, as well as sidewalks to get from the garage to their destination.

Eric Johnson responded to a question and noted that each level would equate to about 50 parking spaces.

**B. Presentation of the planned sidewalk improvements from the Sidewalk Master Plan – Wesley Wright, Systems Engineering Director**

Wes Wright introduced himself and explained that his primary responsibility is Capital Improvements, including Water, Wastewater, Drainage, Streets and Sidewalks. He said that in 2015, voters approved a $100M road bond initiative and it included $10M strictly for sidewalks. Previously, a “windshield” survey noted where we had deficiencies in ADA accessibility, etc. which totaled $100M for missing sidewalks and missing ramps. Council decided to focus on the top 10% in the downtown area and noted that FY20 focuses on downtown/square sidewalks. Wes went over a handout of downtown projects.

Larry suggested that doing stamped concrete was the way to go; it looks nice and is functional, and brick is somewhat dangerous because you can’t keep it flat, which allows for falls. Wes answered a few questions and discussion followed on the flow from various parking lots, and said that focusing on coordination efforts to improve the flow was important. Laurie said that was good feedback. Scott Firth asked if the Parking Study linked up with the Sidewalk Master Plan and Wes said that it did not originally, but we can now coordinate and prioritize with the construction of the parking garage and the high priority areas to make sure we have good access from the new lot. Larry asked about a pedestrian crossing at Austin and 5th, 6th, or 7th. Wes explained that there was one at 7th, but they had bid it out twice for additional lights, and both times the cost was over $450,000. Discussion followed on other lights, parking spots and Wes explained that flat work and traffic control (the need to close down the street) was a big factor in the high cost.

Michael asked for clarification of Scott’s comment; he asked if it was his intent to suggest an option to switch funds, i.e., instead of a four level garage, take a level off and add those savings to the sidewalk fund. Scott said that was an option, but he meant if we decided to do a three level instead of four, we could now show that we had pedestrian flow and the perception that it is easier to get there now vs. when the survey was done. It would need to be clarified how we would mitigate the loss of 50 spaces if we decide to scale down the size of the garage.

**C. Discussion of Design Guidelines and Public Input Process – Sofia Nelson, Planning Director**

Sofia Nelson gave a presentation on design guidelines and said that it was our intent to get feedback on the bones of a good outreach plan and seek feedback on what our goals are, who we want to reach out to and by what method(s). She said that we need to establish an outreach plan and the purpose is really not to seek input on design process itself, but take input from public meetings and outreach efforts to incorporate into design recommendations to take to Council. She said there are four critical plans: identify the purpose of outreach, identify stakeholders, identify level of participation needed for stakeholders and integrate public participation into decision making process.

Sofia went over the design guidelines that HARC goes by, and gave examples of each. Larry said that it was his understanding that the first floor is supposed to be retail, but that doesn’t seem practical due to the footprint principle and asked or clarification on what type of feedback is requested, like materials, streetscaping, activating ground level, public art, etc. The list is leaning more toward pedestrians as you walk by. Michael said that there is possibly an alternative way to do retail, and we shouldn’t give up on it. It was suggested to also get feedback on 7th street and 2nd street views, like what you would see view from the square and ½ block away. Mickie Ross said that it would be nice to understand perspectives from Round Rock and gather information on their experience(s) with their parking garage.
She also said that we need make sure that we portray this in a positive light vs. soliciting negative publicity/comments. Larry said that massing and height are concerns from many people he has talked to, and if you allow structures that are too massive, it would “set the tone” for future development in the downtown area.

Discussion followed, and Sofia took down suggestions/comments for gathering data.

**Outreach from Community**
- Who would use it?
- Where are people coming from to park in lot?
- Research adding restrooms in parking lot. (Laurie noted that the Visitor’s Center has public restrooms that are staffed for safety, but we can certainly take a look at adding them to the parking garage). Many didn’t realize that there were public restrooms in the Visitor’s Center.
- Michael said that some parking garage in Austin recently won an award and it would be interesting to see what they did.
- Public art recommendations/suggestions.
- Adding a historic element.
- Textural components (brick, stone, stucco, architectural components, etc.).
- Perspective view from 7th and 2nd streets.
- Gateways leading to the garage and view from courthouse.
- Massing, height, materials, streetscaping.
- Activating ground level;
- Using this as an opportunity to ask the public what they would like for it to look like.

**Input from Staff perspective and follow up:**
- Parking garage in Austin won award; find characteristics; what was the design, etc.
- Use of incorporating bathrooms.
- Understanding who will use it and when and where people who use the parking lot will be coming from.
- Perspective from Round Rock and research on their experience.
- Online is good, but should be limited; try to get positive out to the public vs. negative and get visitor’s thoughts.
- Engage music on the square visitors.
- Follow up on statistically valid survey, and how the HARC survey was done.

**Additional comments were:**
- Seek as broad input as possible.
- Utilize up-to-date data collection methods; easy and quick and mix combined with traditional methods.
- Get all stakeholders and residents perspective; who is coming to see them, demographics, how far they are coming.
- Utilize local expertise to build stakeholder list.
- Utilize HOA representatives who could pass information along to residents.

Sofia would like to identify goals (participation) from this public process, such as education, outreach, etc., and maximize opportunities.
- What would you like to accomplish from the public input process; guiding principles.
- Key demographics.
- Massing and size.
- Materials.
- Gather as much information as possible.
- Who do you want on the stakeholder list. (Downtown business owners/residents/customers and merchants).
• City employees.

Some suggested groups were:
• Preservation Georgetown
• DGA
• Groups like Sun City
• Rotary clubs/presentation
• This Stakeholder Committee is to help educate
• Who would be negative and spread the word?
• Who is positive?
• Have core survey and then ask if you are business/resident?
• Parks/Rec users; Blue Hole; close proximity to square, but not necessarily coming to the square
• Strategies: how should we be engaging?
• HOA’s; survey neighborhood?
• NextDoor
• Survey that is statistically valid. How can you do that? Take right sample sizes.

D. Discussion and direction on timeline for garage design and construction – Eric Johnson, CIP Manager

Eric presented the timeline and setting expectations as the next steps, affecting construction timeline. When we get to the point when we are ready to hire an engineer: Schematic design (3-4 weeks), owner review (COG), Council approval and public meetings (4 weeks); design development (6 weeks); owner review/comments (2 weeks); construction documents (8 weeks) site plan review (1st round comments – 6 weeks). Building review 1st round comments (2 weeks); bidding and award. HARC review would also be included. Bidding and award (8 – 10 weeks). Before final scope, we will need to answer same questions so the scope can be determined (i.e. general types of materials, how much of façade is covered, part of the structure or stand alone? We would need to be able to define scope for design contract. Laurie explained that Council has funded a garage in this location for a certain amount. Laurie explained that $5 M was the total approved by Council, but sidewalk money would be extra. The timeline would be 42 weeks after contract is signed for design.

Laurie and Sofia recapped the questions, and asked how long the committee feels the public input process should be? Developing a good survey will be critical, and it would need to be determined how long will it take to do that. Laurie said that between the time of the parking study and this last year’s budget, there has been so much activity in the downtown. The Council will want to look the various options that the committee considers, and we need to have evidence to identify and support the suggestions.

Laurie said that staff will provide more information from the parking study. The study didn’t include the current changes and we can provide speaking points and more background information. This is a very diverse group and it might be difficult to come to a complete consensus. Some options may require additional land, and we may be able to get more feedback from Council based on the committee’s recommendations.

Larry asked Sofia to email the table that was in her presentation. She said that she will draft a plan and send as homework to get feedback and finalize the communication plan. Mickie recommended that October 1st be the target date to take recommendations from the committee to Council.

Michael and Chris’ proposed having only 3 ideas to present to the public for input such a concept that is extreme, once that is conservative, and some other type. Present it as: here are 3 options; which do you like? Larry said that they should be very careful in showing any particular designs, but focus on individual elements that would inspire ultimately what HARC looks for.
Larry said to show the perspective and importance of massing and height to get people to really understand. We can talk and show photos and examples, as people do react better to photos.

Chris likes the idea of just showing the 3 ideas/choices just to see what people like. He thinks it might be more useful or constructive and get better participation. Mickie said she was not sure we could come up with 3 choices, as this is a very diverse group. Chris believes that we can.

Laurie suggested possibly approaching it both ways at the next meeting, and possibly come up with ideas or concepts, using a likert scale, along with Sofia’s survey information. We can discuss feedback. Sofia will send out a homework package.

Dates were discussed, and it was decided to meet again on August 12th. At 3:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Michael Walton
Board Co-Chair

Linda McCalla
Board Co-Chair

Date
SUBJECT:
Public Engagement Plan Presentation -- Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

ITEM SUMMARY:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
n/a

SUBMITTED BY:
RLD for Danella Elliott

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPGPresentation 08.12.2019</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Downtown Parking Garage

Project Background

The 2015 Downtown Parking Study identified various options for short, mid, and long-term solutions for downtown parking, including a parking management plan, street designs, street improvements, and construction of parking lots and parking garage.

Increased intensity and development within the past few years has presented an opportunity for a smaller garage to meet the mid-term needs.

The current location is designed for 210 spaces, 4 levels and 3 stories and will serve the 9 block square. The $5 million budget would be ½ funded by dedicated TIRZ revenues.

Creation of the Steering Committee

May 14, 2019  City Council appointed a 8 member steering committee to lead the public outreach and review the design of the exterior of the parking garage.
Downtown Parking Study

*Lot north of Monument Café usually at under 50% occupancy
Goals for Engagement

• Seek as broad public input as possible.
• Utilize business owners as ambassadors of the public outreach efforts.
• Utilize up to date collection methods for collecting input combined with traditional meeting methods.
Education/Outreach Topics

**Education**

- Where/What/Why of the Downtown Parking Garage
- Goals and Benefits of a parking garage

“The short-term recommendations … can help to better manage existing parking resources until such time that structured parking capacity is able to be brought online.” (Page 30 of DPS)

**Outreach**

- Material influences in the downtown area that should be considered for inclusion in this project
- Streetscaping - Activating ground level
- Public Art- Community history exhibit incorporation
- Mass and Scale
- Architectural Character
Engagement Strategies

Public Meetings

• Short Presentation
• Staff / Steering Committee present to address questions

Online Participation/ Meeting in a box

• Website survey- consistent survey across the community
• Opportunity for small groups to meet together and provide feedback

Building on existing outreach opportunities (in person and in writing)

• Join existing meetings and publications
• Schedule special meeting with specialized stakeholders
• Asking local businesses to promote via their social media accounts
PREPARING A TIMELINE FOR OUTREACH
Next Steps

• August 27th- City Council Workshop presentation