Notice of Meeting of the
Governing Body of the
City of Georgetown, Texas
October 13, 2020

The Georgetown City Council will meet on October 13, 2020 at 2:30 PM at Teleconference

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.

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device, please click this URL to join:
https://georgetowntx.zoom.us/j/94838641608?
pwd=cDVpWnROZUo5QnR4MGVmcSt0SFNsQT09
Webinar ID: 948 3864 1608
Passcode: 208349

Description: City Council Workshop and Regular Meeting for Tuesday, October 13th, 2020.

Or to join by phone dial:
(346)248-7799 OR (253)215-8782 OR (669)900-6833 OR (301)715-8592
OR (312)626-6799 OR (929)205-6099 Toll Free (833)548-0276 OR
(833)548-0282 OR (877)853-5257 OR (888)475-4499
Webinar ID: 948 3864 1608
Passcode: 208349
Citizen comments are accepted in three different formats:
Submit the following form by 12:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting and the City Secretary will read your comments into the recording during the item that is being discussed –
https://records.georgetown.org/Forms/AddressCouncil

You may log onto the meeting, at the link above, and “raise your hand” during the item. If you are unsure if your device has a microphone please
use your home or mobile phone to dial the toll free number. To Join a Zoom Meeting, click on the link and join as an attendee. You will be asked to enter your name and email address – this is so we can identify you when you are called upon. At the bottom of the webpage of the Zoom Meeting, there is an option to Raise your Hand. To speak on an item, simply click on that Raise Your Hand option once the item you wish to speak on has opened. When you are called upon by the Mayor, your device will be remotely un-muted by the Administrator and you may speak for three minutes. Please state your name clearly upon being allowed to speak. When your time is over, your device will be muted again.

As another option, we are opening a city conference room to allow public to “watch” the virtual meeting on a bigger screen, and to “raise your hand” to speak from that public device. This Viewing Room is located at City Hall, 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Community Room. Social Distancing will be strictly enforced. Face masks are required and will be provided onsite. Use of profanity, threatening language, slanderous remarks or threats of harm are not allowed and will result in you being immediately removed from the meeting.

If you have questions or need assistance, please contact the City Secretary’s office at cs@georgetown.org or at 512-930-3651.

Policy Development/Review Workshop -

A Presentation and update regarding the Code Compliance Department -- Jack Daly, Community Services Director and Brad Hofmann, Chief Code Compliance Office

B Presentation, discussion and possible direction regarding the City’s response to COVID-19 -- Jack Daly, Community Services Director

C Presentation, update, and possible direction regarding the Downtown Cost of Service Project and enhanced services to include an ambassador or concierge program -- Ray Miller, Director Public Works, and Teresa Chapman, Environmental Services

D Presentation and discussion regarding progress made on the June 23, 2020, Council direction to staff for the development of neighborhood plans for the San Jose and Track Ridge Grasshopper (TRG) neighborhoods -- Sofia, Nelson, Planning Director; Susan Watkins, Housing Coordinator; and Nat Waggoner, Long Range Planning Manager

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.

E 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
- Litigation Update
- PEC Franchise

Sec. 551.072: Deliberations about Real Property
Adjournment

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 _________________, 2020, at __________, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

__________________________________
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary
SUBJECT:
Presentation and update regarding the Code Compliance Department -- Jack Daly, Community Services Director and Brad Hofmann, Chief Code Compliance Office

ITEM SUMMARY:
Staff will provide an update on the Code Compliance department, as well as seek City Council concurrence on the approach to enforcement and proposed ordinance changes in the future.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
N/A

SUBMITTED BY:
Jackson Daly

ATTACHMENTS:

Presentation
Overview

• Introduction
• 2020 Accomplishments
• 2021 Preview
• Approach to Enforcement
• What Governs Code’s Work?
• Discuss proposed ordinance changes

Seeking City Council concurrence on the approach to enforcement and proposed ordinance changes in the future.
Introductions

• Brad Hofmann, Chief Code Compliance Officer
• Malcolm Brown, Code Compliance Officer
• Eric Finn, Code Compliance Officer
• Amber James, Code Compliance Officer
• Mike Rosenwinkel, Code Compliance Officer
• [vacancy]
Mission Statement

To provide extraordinary customer service through education and communication, to partner with our citizens and business owners to gain compliance with local code ordinances, and to have a positive impact on the safety, appearance, and value of our community.
2020 Highlights

• Rebranding
• Step program
  • Certifications
  • Performance
  • Time in position
• Process mapping
2021 Preview

- MyPermitNow Module for Code
- Continued process improvements
- Improved reporting
Approach to Enforcement

• Both proactive and complaint-based
• Ensure equal enforcement within several blocks when notices are sent
• Total violations written in:
  • 2020 – 1,480*
    • Total cases sent to Court – 60
    • 4% of cases
  • 2019 – 3,052
    • Total cases sent to Court – 138
    • 4.5% of cases

*Lower case count related to COVID-19 and reduced staffing levels in 2020
Approach to Enforcement

- Emphasis on Education
  - 348 tall grass and weed complaints
  - 315 (90%) received notice of violation
  - 27 (7.75%) abated by contractor

VIOLATION TYPES FOR FY2020

- TALL WEEDS/GRASS 23%
- TRASH & DEBRIS 22%
- PERMIT VIOLATION 10%
- JUNK VEHICLE 10%
- OPEN STORAGE 7%
- PARKING UNAPP SURF 9%
- OBSTRUCTION 4%
- UDC VIOLATION 4%
- MAINTENANCE CODE 3%
- NUISANCE VIOL 2%
- OTHER 6%
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What Governs Code’s Work?

- Code of Ordinances
- UDC
- International Property Maintenance Code
  - 2015 version adopted earlier this year.

- Common Ordinance Violations
  - Bandit signs*
  - Tall grass and weeds
  - Trash & Debris
  - Permit Violations
  - Junk Vehicle
  - Parking on Unapproved Surfaces

- UDC Violations
  - Zoning violations
  - Tree ordinance

- Other Code Issues
  - Noise
  - Administrative Warrants
  - Trash cans

*Not included in pie chart on slide 7. More than 1,000 bandit sign violations and abatements in 2020.
Ordinance Changes

• Junk Vehicle Ordinance Changes
  • Aligns definitions and processes with State law
    • Adds aircraft and watercraft to junk vehicle definition
  • Allows for the abatement of junk vehicles if no hearing is requested 11 days after notice is received
    • This is in alignment with other nuisance provisions which allow for abatement by city forces if owners are not responsive
  • When a hearing is requested, allows the Municipal Court to order an abatement (as opposed to just issuing a fine)
  • Removes the building standards commission as a body to host a junk vehicle hearing
  • Removes duplicative language regarding the municipal court hearing process
Proposed Timeline

• Junk Vehicles
  • First reading on Oct. 27
  • Second reading on Nov. 10

• Future Ordinance for Review and/or Clean-up
  • Tall grass and weeds
  • Parking on unimproved surface to include backyard
  • Parking of commercial vehicles
  • Trash cans
SUBJECT:
Presentation, discussion and possible direction regarding the City’s response to COVID-19 -- Jack Daly, Community Services Director

ITEM SUMMARY:
Staff will present an update regarding the City's response to COVID-19 and seek City Council concurrence on operational changes, public gatherings, and the approach to holiday events.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
N/A

SUBMITTED BY:
Jackson Daly

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Presentation
Overview

• Updates since previous workshop
• Review Governor’s Orders
• Review of WCCHD Data and Gating Criteria
• Revisit gatherings and city operations
• Holiday Events
• Upcoming Testing

Seeking City Council concurrence on operational changes, gatherings, and approach to holiday events.
Updates since previous workshop – July 14

• Expanded outdoor dining pilot on Labor Day weekend
• Opened Blue Hole with alcohol ban
• Pop-up testing sites in Georgetown
  • Aug. 18 – 20
  • Sept. 12 – 15
• Volunteers returned to library and animal shelter (following COVID-19 protocols)
• Challenges in Rec. Center
  • Expanded hours - Closing at regular intervals for cleaning
  • Reduced usage, mask compliance issues
  • Recommend revisiting mask rules in Rec. Center (*more later*)
Updates since previous workshop – July 14

• **Reimbursements**
  - Accepting $106,698.93 for the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding this evening
    - First reimbursement for period of March 1 – May 31
  - Seeking additional reimbursement for $56,000
  - CARES funding administered by Williamson County

• **Airport**
  - Equipment to be purchased
    - $157,000 (not yet received)

• **EMS**
  - CARES funding to recover lost revenue
    - $76,000
Review Governor’s Orders

• Executive Order 29 – “Mask Mandate” – July 2
• Executive Order 30 – “75% occupancy” – Sept. 17
• Executive Order 31 – “High hospitalizations” – Sept. 17

• Reissued updated local mask mandate to correspond to Governor’s Order – Sept. 22
  • Removes provisions within the local order that explicitly tie it to local health data
  • Simply allow the Mayor or Council to terminate it, or
  • Allow County Judge or Governor orders to supersede it.
Review of WCCHD Data and Gating Criteria

July 2 – Governor’s Mask Mandate
Review of WCCHD Data and Gating Criteria

July 2 – Governor’s Mask Mandate

Data Dumps from DSHS
Review of WCCHD Data and Gating Criteria

July 2 – Governor’s Mask Mandate
## Phased Reopening Recommendations for the COVID-19 Pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Green</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yellow</strong></th>
<th><strong>Orange</strong></th>
<th><strong>Red</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal</strong></td>
<td>Flat or declining over previous 14 days in <strong>yellow</strong> phase, with no rebound</td>
<td>Decline over previous 14 days in <strong>orange</strong> phase, with no rebound</td>
<td>Decline over previous 14 days in <strong>red</strong> phase, with no rebound</td>
<td>Incidence not declining over 14 days, or has rebounded while in <strong>orange</strong> phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>Incidence during previous 14 days stays <strong>below 1.1</strong> per 100,000</td>
<td>Incidence during previous 14 days stays <strong>below 7</strong> per 100,000</td>
<td>Incidence during previous 14 days stays <strong>below 12.7</strong> per 100,000</td>
<td>Incidence rate is <strong>above 12.7</strong> per 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>Testing positivity rate stays <strong>below 5%</strong> for previous 14 days</td>
<td>Testing positivity rate stays <strong>below 10%</strong> for previous 14 days</td>
<td>Testing positivity rate stays <strong>below 15%</strong> for previous 14 days</td>
<td>Testing positivity rate is <strong>above 15%</strong> during previous 14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spread</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Gating criteria are based on the current state of the COVID-19 pandemic.*
Review of WCCHD Data and Gating Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CAPACITY (CUSTOMERS, CLIENTS, VISITORS)</strong></th>
<th><strong>SOCIAL GATHERINGS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LARGE EVENTS (100+ PEOPLE - SPORTS/FAIRS/CONVENTIONS, ETC.)</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMUNITY MITIGATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>PARKS AND RECREATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to maximum capacity specified by Executive Order, require distancing/masks</td>
<td>Avoid large gatherings of over 25 people</td>
<td>Up to 75% capacity with mitigation plan</td>
<td>Prohibit large gatherings of over 25 people, require personal mitigation measures for individuals/families</td>
<td>Prohibit gatherings of over 25 people, require personal mitigation measures for individuals/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to maximum capacity specified by Executive Order, require distancing/masks</td>
<td>Avoid gatherings of over 10 people</td>
<td>Up to 50% capacity with mitigation plan; postpone events where possible</td>
<td>Prohibit gatherings of over 10 people, require personal mitigation measures for individuals/families</td>
<td>Prohibit gatherings, require personal mitigation measures for individuals/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to maximum capacity specified by Executive Order, require distancing/masks</td>
<td>Avoid gatherings of over 5 people</td>
<td>Avoid or postpone large events until Yellow Moderate Phase</td>
<td>Prohibit gatherings of over 5 people, require personal mitigation measures for individuals/families</td>
<td>Prohibit gatherings, require personal mitigation measures for individuals/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote only where feasible</td>
<td>Stay Home, Stay Safe</td>
<td>Avoid or postpone large events until Yellow Moderate Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following guidelines are suggested for planning, but may be superseded by Executive Order of the Governor. Jurisdictions are encouraged to check the most recent Orders: https://gov.texas.gov/coronavirus-executive-orders. Vulnerable individuals should follow the recommendations for the next-highest phase, i.e., if the County is in YELLOW Phase, a vulnerable individual should follow the recommendations for ORANGE Phase, such as avoiding gatherings of five or more people.)
# Review of WCCHD Data and Gating Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL MEASURES</th>
<th><strong>MASK WEARING</strong></th>
<th><strong>SOCIAL DISTANCING</strong></th>
<th><strong>HAND HYGIENE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PERSONAL MEASURES** | Always wear a mask:  
- Around people who may have been exposed or recently traveled to a high-risk area  
- When outside the home or your personal office  
- Around vulnerable individuals | Maintain a minimum distance of 6' with masks; recommended 10' or more wherever masks cannot be worn | Wash hands regularly with warm water and soap for 20 seconds or more whenever using the bathroom, before and after eating, and before and after gatherings or public interaction |
| **Mask Wearing** | Always wear a mask:  
- Around another person who is not a household contact  
- When outside the home or your personal office  
- Around vulnerable individuals | Always wear a mask:  
- Around another person who is not a household contact  
- When outside the home or your personal office  
- Around vulnerable individuals | Always wear a mask:  
- Around another person who is not a household contact  
- When outside the home or your personal office  
- Around vulnerable individuals |

---
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Revisit gatherings and city operations

- **Governor’s Order Requires Mayor Approval for Outdoor Gatherings of More than 10 People, with exceptions**
  - Exceptions for certain businesses/activities as identified in the Governors guidelines for reopening Texas
  - Generally, City has not been approving outdoor gatherings of more than 10 people

- **Approved Market Days**
  - Reviewed as retailer

- **Recommendations going forward**
  - Gatherings
    - Issue proclamation requiring event organizers to follow Governor and WCCHD guidance
    - Review plans prior to approving events
  - City Operations
    - Following WCCHD guidance, will modify operations as appropriate based on phases, per city facility
    - For example - Relaxing masking requirements at Rec Center in green zone
Holiday Events - Recommendation

• “Virtual” Lighting of the Square event

• **Modified Christmas Stroll**
  • Fewer vendors
  • No parade
  • No Bethlehem Village
  • Fewer Kids Activities

• **Disallow** events that encourage extended (greater than 15 minutes) concentrated gatherings of people
  • For example: Concerts, fun run
Upcoming Testing (Tentative)

• Pop-up Site at Community Center (9 a.m. – 1 p.m.)
  • Oct. 7-11
  • Oct. 14-16

• Kiosk at Parking Lot north of Library (9 a.m. – 5 p.m.)
  • Oct. 9 - 30
SUBJECT:
Presentation, update, and possible direction regarding the Downtown Cost of Service Project and enhanced services to include an ambassador or concierge program -- Ray Miller, Director Public Works, and Teresa Chapman, Environmental Services

ITEM SUMMARY:

Downtown Cost of Service Update:

The “Cost of Service” project was created to develop a method to ensure that downtown businesses are paying for the solid waste service level they are receiving before the City implements any enhanced solid waste services. Throughout 2019, staff completed a waste audit, generated a list of businesses using the shared dumpster system, developed a processing and billing method, and completed a service level analysis for each business. Staff updated City Council in April 2019, and again in January 2020. On both occasions, City Council asked staff to move forward with finalizing the Cost of Service project.

Staff was ready to implement new solid waste rates in March but was delayed due to COVID 19. Because the waste audit data was then a year old, and because other businesses had opened and/or closed, the waste audit was redone in September 2020. Based upon this updated data, a new analysis completed, monthly rates were adjusted based on current rates, and letters informing businesses of new rates were sent on October 2, 2020.

As the new rates take effect, staff is proposing to move forward with other programs to assist with managing the waste downtown. Specifically, staff recommends implementing a pilot program for an Ambassador and/or a Concierge Services on the city blocks that utilize shared dumpster on the downtown square. These blocks, the different enhanced services, and funding are detailed in the presentation. Ray Miller, Director Public Works & Teresa Chapman, Environmental Services

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
If implemented, the FY21 expense will vary from $100,000 to up to $300,000, for the proposed Light Ambassador Program ($100K), Enhanced Ambassador Program ($200K), and Concierge Service ($300K). The staff recommendation is to fully fund the pilot program using Downtown TIRZ revenues for FY21 and, if successful, to incrementally reduce the TIRZ funding over the FY22 and FY23, until downtown businesses that are benefiting are fully funding the enhanced solid waste services in FY24.

SUBMITTED BY:
Teresa Chapman

ATTACHMENTS:

Update Cost of Service w/ Ambassador and Concierge overview
Presentation Overview

• Update City Council on Solid Waste Downtown Cost of Service Project (SWDCSP) – Notices to Businesses

• Overview of Potential Change in Service Delivery Model for 5 Blocks – **Pilot Program**
  
  • Ambassador vs. Concierge Service
  
  • Cost Comparison
  
  • Funding Source

• Request guidance from Council on Potential Service Delivery Change and Funding Source
Update City Council on Solid Waste Downtown Cost of Service Project (SWDCSP) – Notices to Businesses

Feb. 26, 2020 – Council directed staff to adjust billing to cover cost of service without rate increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid Waste Master Plan April, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of cost and complexity of options presented, staff recommended, and Council concurred, to address the Cost of Service pricing inequities first.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work Approved May, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong> Find all pricing inequities and propose method(s) for moving customers into the correct solid waste rate class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raise revenue to $150,000 to cover cost of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determine pricing inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjust billing to cover cost of service without a rate increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update City Council on Solid Waste Downtown Cost of Service Project (SWDCSP) – Notices to Businesses

Cost of Service Billing Process (Feb. 2020 Information)

1. Cost of service per individual businesses was developed. Data varied based on availability but overall included:
   - Waste audit data
   - Business type
   - Materials generated
   - Hours of operation
   - Comparison data

UPDATE: On Friday, Oct. 2, 2020, City mailed letters directly to 55 businesses explaining changes to their monthly solid waste rate based on 2020 waste audit data. Sixteen (16) of these businesses, had significant rate increases. City contact information was provided to allow business owners to meet with City staff to explain the change in rate.
Overview of Ambassador and Concierge Service

- Ambassador Service is based on number of days and hours
- City can scale up or down as needed
- Weekend Ambassador is minimum service level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Options</th>
<th>Blocks Included</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Dumpster Removed</th>
<th>Est. # of Days</th>
<th>Longevity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Ambassador</td>
<td>38, 39, 40, 51, &amp; 52</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Block 38</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Ambassador</td>
<td>38, 39, 40, 51, &amp; 52</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Block 38</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>5 – 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierge</td>
<td>38, 39, 40, 51, &amp; 52</td>
<td>$300,000 +</td>
<td>Block 38, 39, &amp; 40</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Dumpsters

City pays for four sets of paired shared dumpsters located on the blocks with the stars

Blocks with X have their own containers and are not included in today’s discussion

Businesses utilizing the shared dumpsters reimburse the City for the cost of services
Downtown Square Potential Service Delivery

Proposal:

Change from Shared Dumpsters to Ambassador Program or Concierge Program on 5 blocks: 38, 39, 40, 51, and 52

Pilot Program for 1 year

Benefit is reduction in overflow of dumpsters and cleaner environment.
Downtown Square Current Status

Without Ambassador Service
Block 40 on 9.7.2020 (behind the old City Hall) at 4:00am
Downtown Square Desired Status

With Ambassador Service
Block 40 on 9.28.2020 (behind the old City Hall) at 4:00am
Ambassador Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Date Started</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>285 blocks</td>
<td>Litter collection and empty receptacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Biz District HWY 75 to HWY 375 to the River, to Jefferson Ave</td>
<td>Empty trash, Litter collection, pressure washing, Eyes and Ears patrol, Safety Escorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Public Improvement District</td>
<td>Litter collection, empty trash, pressure wash, bird abatement, beautification etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mission Statements**

Seattle: “ensure an inviting, safe and clean urban experience for everyone.”

Detroit: “a physically attractive downtown Detroit that is appealing to existing and new businesses, employees, residents and visitors.”

San Antonio: “a block by block service for maintenance and hospitality.”
Georgetown Ambassador Program

Option 1: Light Ambassador Assistance
Option 2: Enhanced Ambassador Program
Light Ambassador Program: Resources

- Utilizes current contract; quick start up
- Add full-sized landfill/recycle enclosure on Block 39
- Removes dumpsters on Block 38; leaves dumpsters on Block 40
- Remove sidewalk receptacles except Big Bellies
Light Ambassador Program: Dumpster Enclosure

Block 38

Removes shared dumpsters on Block 38;
Adds shared dumpsters to Block 39
Assists managing discarded materials on weekends for Blocks 38, 39, 40, 50, and 51
Light Ambassador Program: Responsibilities

• On-Duty Friday through Sunday; approximately 30 hours
• Includes Block 38, 39, 40, 51, & Block 52
• Keep shared dumpsters from overflowing
• Sweep and pick up litter from around dumpsters
• Assist businesses with getting bags into dumpsters
• Empty receptacles on sidewalks (Big Bellies)
• Collect litter from sidewalks and streets
• Report maintenance & upkeep concerns or challenges weekly
• Data and photograph documentation (before and after pics)
• Safety and security: report suspicious solid waste activity
Enhanced Ambassador Program: Resources

• Everything included in the Light Ambassador Program, plus…
  • Increased days/times as needed for Enhanced Ambassador
  • Utilizes current contract; quick start up
  • Add full-sized dumpster enclosure on Block 39
  • Remove sidewalk receptacles except Big Bellies
  • Possible 5 days – Wednesday through Sunday
Concierge Service
Overview

- $300,000 quoted in 2018; TDS said expect the price to increase based on the number of blocks and/or number of businesses
- True Concierge Service - not Based on the Denton Model (cart service)
- First year would be a pilot to enable the City to determine actual cost per business; step program for businesses to assume full costs
- Would take 3 - 4 months to be operational; could start early next calendar year

“an individual or a company which specializes in personal assistance or other assistance services.”
Concierge Program

Removes dumpsters from Block 38 & 40
Add a small holding area for each shared services block
Actively manages discarded materials 7 days a week
Concierge Program: Resources

Examples of garbage and recycling enclosures.
Cost Comparison: Ambassador and Concierge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Blocks Included</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Dumpster Removed</th>
<th># of Days</th>
<th>Longevity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Ambassador</td>
<td>38, 39, 40, 51, &amp; 52</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Block 38</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Ambassador</td>
<td>38, 39, 40, 51, &amp; 52</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Block 38</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>5 – 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierge</td>
<td>38, 39, 40, 51, &amp; 52</td>
<td>$300,000 +</td>
<td>Block 38, 39, &amp; 40</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All options

• Remove dumpsters from Block 38
• Prepare for full concierge service
• Include litter collection, sweeping, emptying receptacles
• Ability to scale up and/or down
City Staff Recommendation:

- Move forward with a light ambassador program as a pilot program
  - Fund through Downtown TIRZ for one year (Up to $100k)
  - Ongoing assessment throughout pilot program

- After the one year pilot, transition costs to downtown business customers
  - Transition costs over a three year period to allow businesses to adjust to new rates

- Long-term:
  - Evaluate need to enhance ambassador services based on trash demands
  - Consider a concierge program as needed
Council Feedback

• Does the City Council support implementing the light ambassador program as a one year pilot?

  • Light Ambassador Program
    • Part-Time (3 Days/week)
    • Following first year begin three year transfer of costs to downtown business customers
Next Steps

• If City Council supports enhanced service program, the implementation will include:

  • City staff to negotiate with TDS on Contract Amendment

  • Inform Businesses of Change

  • Return to Council with Contract Amendment
SUBJECT:
Presentation and discussion regarding progress made on the June 23, 2020, Council direction to staff for the development of neighborhood plans for the San Jose and Track Ridge Grasshopper (TRG) neighborhoods -- Sofia, Nelson, Planning Director; Susan Watkins, Housing Coordinator; and Nat Waggoner, Long Range Planning Manager

ITEM SUMMARY:
Staff will provide the Council an update on the outreach and project plan activities completed with neighborhood representatives since the August 11th workshop.

Neighborhood representatives partnered with city staff to survey both the San Jose and Track Ridge Grasshopper (TRG) neighborhoods to gather resident concerns and expectations for a neighborhood plan. Survey results for each neighborhood are attached (Attachment 1 - San Jose Neighborhood Initial Survey Results and Attachment 2 - TRG Neighborhood Initial Survey Results). The resident input was used to develop objective statements for each neighborhood and inform the plan scope. The proposed scope was reviewed by the neighborhood leader core teams.

San Jose Neighborhood Plan Scope:
- Preserve and promote San Jose as a safe, quiet neighborhood with caring neighbors, through information sharing and intentional engagement
- Celebrate San Jose as a place of culture and history
- Support access to homes, San Jose Park and Annie Purl Elementary through improved traffic, parking and sidewalk solutions
- Enable San Jose residents to stay in the neighborhood and promote compatible development and investments in rehabilitation and infrastructure

TRG Neighborhood Plan Scope:
- Protect TRG long term residents by reducing and removing challenges to staying within the neighborhood
- Identify and preserve the key character defining components of the neighborhood and ensuring compatible new development
- Improve mobility including transportation and parking, sidewalks and streetlights
- Maintain and promote TRG as a place of culture and history
- Maintain and promote TRG as a safe place to live
- Maintain public spaces and infrastructure

Based on preliminary discussions with planning professionals, it is estimated that a budget of $60-90K per plan would address the outlined objectives with a qualified team and complete the planning activities below:
- Engagement of neighborhood
- Document existing conditions
- Evaluate alternatives
- Develop a layered implementation plan
- Implementation of high impact, short term recommendations

Staff is seeking direction on:
- Does Council need additional information prior to proceeding with both small area plans?
- Does Council support the proposed scope for each neighborhood?
- Is this partnership going to achieve the vision for the small area plan project?

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The scope of the neighborhood plans will drive the cost to prepare both plans. Preliminary estimates identify a need for $200,000 to complete both neighborhood plans.

SUBMITTED BY:
ATTACHMENTS:

Presentation
Attachment 1 - San Jose Neighborhood Initial Survey Results
Attachment 2 - TRG Neighborhood Initial Survey Results
THANK YOU

• Thank you to City Council for allowing us to learn more about key neighborhoods in our community.

• Thank you to neighborhood leaders who embraced the opportunity and walked with us through their neighborhoods.

• Thank you to city staff who supported – Keith Hutchison, Mayra Cantu, Eric Lashley, Gloria Powers, Planning team
PRESENTATION TEAM

• Sofia Nelson, Planning Director
• Susan Watkins, Housing Coordinator
• Nat Waggoner, Long Range Planning Manager
NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERS – THANK YOU!!!
People, Place, and Investment
PRESENTATION AGENDA

• Share actions since 8/11/2020 workshop
• Present key neighborhood findings and proposed work plan scope
• Seek feedback from the City Council on next steps
FEEDBACK REQUESTED

• Do you need additional information prior to proceeding with both small area plans?

• Do you support the proposed scope for each neighborhood?

• Is this partnership going to achieve the vision for the small area plan project?
ACTIONS SINCE AUGUST 2020
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP
PATH TO PARTNERSHIP

Meet
- Trusted leaders
- Ask questions
- Be present
- Show interest

Listen

Learn
- Concerns
- Values
- Vision

Plan
- Develop a partnership to co-achieve vision
- Develop a plan scope

Confirm
Is this partnership going to achieve the vision?

Jul ➔ Aug ➔ Sept ➔ Oct
Founded in 1947

Original families established a grocery store and churches, to this day, a multi-generational neighborhood

Notable leaders in the neighborhood served on the City Council and within GISD, County and US
# San Jose Initial Survey

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys completed</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses visited</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish only responses</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map of San Jose neighborhood]
Pride and Concerns

In San Jose, we are most proud of...

- **Our traditional neighborhood**, because it has nice, supportive neighbors, is quiet and safe.
- **Our history**, because of its community leaders, businesses, and founding families.
- **Our neighborhood park and schools**.

Our top five concerns for our neighborhood are...

- Traffic and Parking
- Maintain Safety
- New Development and rehabilitation
- Noise
- Infrastructure and City services
In San Jose, we want our future generations to remember...

In San Jose, we feel very safe.

8.8/10

Hispanic heritage, culture, neighborhood, safety, history, families, people, religious and holiday events.
INITIAL INSIGHTS

• The traditional multi-generation households, which have created a strong sense of place and history are under pressure.
• Close proximity to Old Town and Downtown overlay districts is creating development pressure within the San Jose neighborhood.
• Opportunity to improve access to information and city services.
• Opportunity to promote the cultural and historical contributions of the neighborhood for the benefit of the entire Georgetown community.
SAN JOSE PLAN SCOPE

• Preserve and promote San Jose as a safe, quiet neighborhood with caring neighbors, through information sharing and intentional engagement

• Celebrate San Jose as a place of culture and history

• Support access to homes, San Jose Park and Annie Purl Elementary through improved traffic, parking and sidewalk solutions

• Enable San Jose residents to stay in the neighborhood and promote compatible development and investments in rehabilitation and infrastructure
• Many living in this neighborhood were born and raised and have raised their own families in this neighborhood since the 1870s.

• The federal urban renewal effort created widespread demolition and relocation of the Ridge community starting in the late 1960s.

• Commercial land uses along MLK Street, county and city government campuses, and the popularity of proximity to key community destinations (parks and downtown) have transitioned a single-family neighborhood into an area that is experiencing change.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys completed</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses visited</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish only responses</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANK THE FOLLOWING NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES/CONCERNS BY IMPORTANCE

Other Responses:
- Streetlights
- Sidewalks
- Public Safety
- Homelessness issues
IF THIS PLAN IS ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH ONE THING, WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

- Protect longterm residents and preserve the neighborhood: 45%
- Address traffic and parking issues: 15%
- Maintain/improve public spaces: 12%
- Address safety concerns: 11%
- Improve infrastructure (street lights, sidewalks): 11%
- Other: 5%

Sample responses about protecting longterm residents and preserving the neighborhood:

- "Keep development in same price range of neighborhood."
- "Keep property taxes down."
- "Protect residents, so they can stay in the homes."
- "Retain single-family neighborhood."
HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THE TRG NEIGHBORHOOD?

- 30% Fewer than 10 years
- 26% More than 30 years
- 32% 20-30 years
- 12% 10-20 years
TRG PLAN SCOPE

• Protect TRG long term residents by reducing and removing challenges to staying within the neighborhood
• Identify and preserve the key character defining components of the neighborhood and ensuring compatible new development
• Improve mobility including transportation and parking, sidewalks and streetlights
• Maintain and promote TRG as a place of culture and history
• Maintain and promote TRG as a safe place to live
• Maintain public spaces and infrastructure
TRG REPRESENTATIVE CONCERNS

• Rapid redevelopment/commercial encroachment of neighborhood during time it takes to develop plan
  • Legal options/restrictions for development regulation within the time period of plan
• Boundaries of neighborhood
  • Track portion of TRG (south of 29 to Leander Rd not accurately incorporated/included)
TRG
• Protect long time residents and preserve the neighborhood
• $60-90K
• 6-9 months
• Possible short-term solutions

San Jose
• Preserve the San Jose neighborhood
• $60-90K
• 6-9 months
FEEDBACK REQUESTED

• Do you need additional information prior to proceeding with both small area plans?

• Do you support the proposed scope for each neighborhood?

• Is this partnership going to achieve the vision for the small area plan project?
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Planning Department used a variety of methods to distribute the survey to the San Jose neighborhood, including a mix of digital and in-person options provided in both English and Spanish. The San Jose neighborhood has 91 addresses, though that number includes 10 vacant lots.

The purpose of this initial survey was to gather concerns from San Jose residents for consideration in the neighborhood plan and to invite the residents to continue to participate throughout the process.

A total of 10 volunteers went door to door Aug. 24 and 26, 2020, to engage neighbors and leave door hangers. This included multiple people who could speak Spanish and Council Member Mary Calixtro, along with City staff and neighborhood residents. The door hangers were printed in English and Spanish and included links to the online survey and information on neighborhood plan. Together, the team reached 81 addresses over two days.

24 SURVEY RESPONSES

30% response rate (24 out of 81); Spanish-only responses came to 17 percent (four out of 24).

PHONE/TEXT

BEST WAY TO CONTACT

96% said they wanted to be contacted. Of those, most people (41%) prefer contact via phone/text. Email was the second top preferred means of contact (29%).

MAP OF SAN JOSE
In San Jose, we are most proud of...

- **Our traditional neighborhood**, because it has nice, supportive neighbors, is quiet and safe.
- **Our history**, because of its community leaders, businesses, and founding families.
- **Our neighborhood park and schools**.

Our top five concerns for our neighborhood are...

- Traffic and Parking
- Maintain Safety
- New Development and rehabilitation
- Noise
- Infrastructure and City services
In San Jose, we want our future generations to remember...

Hispanic heritage  culture
neighborhood
safety  history  families
people
religious and holiday events

In San Jose, we feel very safe.

8.8/10
The Planning Department used a variety of methods to distribute the survey to the Track Ridge Grasshopper (TRG) neighborhood, including a mix of digital and in-person options provided in both English and Spanish. The TRG neighborhood has 439 addresses, though that number includes 18 vacant lots, four non-residential lots and 110 units at The Rail apartments.

The purpose of this initial survey was to gather concerns from TRG residents for consideration in the neighborhood plan and to invite the residents to continue to participate throughout the process.

A total of nearly 20 volunteers went door to door Aug. 28, 20, and 31, and Sept. 3, 2020, to engage neighbors and leave door hangers. This included multiple people who could speak Spanish and Council Member Mary Calixtro, along with City staff and neighborhood residents. The door hangers were printed in English and Spanish and included links to the online survey and information on the neighborhood plan. Together, the team reached 417 addresses over four days.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Planning Department used a variety of methods to distribute the survey to the Track Ridge Grasshopper (TRG) neighborhood, including a mix of digital and in-person options provided in both English and Spanish. The TRG neighborhood has 439 addresses, though that number includes 18 vacant lots, four non-residential lots and 110 units at The Rail apartments.

The purpose of this initial survey was to gather concerns from TRG residents for consideration in the neighborhood plan and to invite the residents to continue to participate throughout the process.

A total of nearly 20 volunteers went door to door Aug. 28, 20, and 31, and Sept. 3, 2020, to engage neighbors and leave door hangers. This included multiple people who could speak Spanish and Council Member Mary Calixtro, along with City staff and neighborhood residents. The door hangers were printed in English and Spanish and included links to the online survey and information on the neighborhood plan. Together, the team reached 417 addresses over four days.

91
SURVEY RESPONSES
22% response rate (91 out of 417); Spanish-only responses came to 9 percent (eight out of 91).

EMAIL
BEST WAY TO CONTACT
Most people (47%) prefer email contact for on-going conversations. Other top choices included phone/text (34%) and mail/fliers (33%).

MAP OF TRG
Rank the following neighborhood issues/concerns by importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Importance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting longtime residents</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic &amp; cultural preservation of the neighborhood</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain/improve public spaces</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (below)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RESPONSES**

Street lights | Sidewalks | Public safety | Homeless issues
If this plan is able to accomplish one thing, what should it be?

- **Protect long-term residents and preserve the neighborhood**: 45%
- **Address traffic and parking issues**: 15%
- **Maintain/improve public spaces**: 12%
- **Address safety concerns**: 11%
- **Improve infrastructure (street lights, sidewalks)**: 11%
- **Other**: 5%

Sample responses about protecting long-term residents and preserving the neighborhood:

- "Keep development in same price range of neighborhood."
- "Keep property taxes down."
- "Protect residents, so they can stay in the homes."
- "Retain single-family neighborhood."
**WHO TOOK OUR SURVEY**

**QUESTIONS 5-7**

**What street do you live on?**

- **Scenic Drive**: 9
- **MLK Jr. St. | Forest St. | West St. | W. 17th | W. 15th | W. 8th**: 6 each
- **Stone Circle | W. 16th**: 4 each
- **Timber St. | W. 9th**: 3 each
- **Hart St. | Bridge St. | W. 18th | W. 10th | W. 7th | W. 2nd**: 2 each
- **Montgomery St. | W. 16th | W. 14th | W. 13th | W. 11th**: 1 each

**Do you own or rent your home?**

- **26% RENT**
- **74% OWN**

**How long have you lived in the neighborhood?**

- **30% Fewer than 10 years**
- **32% 10-20 years**
- **26% More than 30 years**
- **12% 20-30 years**

Taken from 50 written responses.