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

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.

Legislative Regular Agenda

- A Approval of the Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting minutes from the November 15, 2019 meeting Danella Elliott, Committee Liaison
- B Discussion on design elements with WGI representative Eric Johnson, CIP Manager
- C Discussion on next steps for public input Laurie Brewer, Assistant City Manager and Sofia Nelson, Planning Director
- D Discussion on follow up questions from the November 15, 2019 Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholders Committee Meeting Jackson Daly, Assistant to the City Manager

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	d time of said
meeting.	
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary	

SUBJECT:

Approval of the Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting minutes from the November 15, 2019 meeting – Danella Elliott, Committee Liaison

ITEM SUMMARY:

Approval of the Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting minutes from the November 15, 2019 meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

N/A

SUBMITTED BY:

Danella Elliott, Committee Liaison

ATTACHMENTS:

Description Type

□ 11.15.19 Minutes Backup Material

Minutes of Meeting of the Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting City of Georgetown, Texas November 15, 2019

The Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee met on Friday, November 15, 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

City Staff Present:

Laurie Brewer, Assistant City Manager
Wayne Reed, Assistant City Manager
Sofia Nelson, Planning Director
Eric Johnson, CIP Manager
Danella Elliott, Executive Assistant
Kim McAuliffe, Downtown Development Manager
Jackson Daly, Assistant to the City Manager
Eric Lashley, Library Director
Travis Baird, Real Estate Coordinator
Trish Long, Facilities Superintendent
Keith Hutchinson, Communications Manager
Britin Bostick, Historic Planner

Board Members Absent:

Chris Damon Kay Briggs

Others present:

Charlotte Kovalchuk, Williamson County Sun

Legislative Regular Agenda

Michael Walton, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

1. Overview of the Open Meetings Act and Public Information Act – Robyn Densmore, City Secretary

Robyn provided an overview of the Open Meetings Act (OMA) and Public Information Act (PIA). She explained walking quorums (and how easy it is to fall into that situation) and went over the "things to remember" guidelines handout. She said that all correspondence, discussions, etc. should be conducted during the scheduled meeting, which is open to the public.

2. Approval of the Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholder Steering Committee Meeting minutes from the September 17, 2019 meeting – Danella Elliott – Committee Liaison

Motion to approve minutes by Larry Olsen; second by Scott Firth. Approved 6-0. Chris Damon and Kay Briggs absent.

3. Provide an update on the Downtown Parking Garage Survey, Jackson Daly, Assistant to the City Manager

Jack thanked the committee for their great guidance and efforts in promoting the survey and for encouraging everyone to participate. We had 1,400 responses and noted that for Georgetown, that is an outstanding number of responses and engagement from the citizens.

Jack went over the points of the survey:

- The survey had picture of a parking garage and brief descriptor
- We tried to make it more informal
- The positive responses (OK, Cool or Fantastic) were added together to get the net positive percentage

Façade Concept	Net Positive Rating
First-floor retail or displays	78.38
Full Façade	69.15
Brick and glass	63.90
Green walls or planters	54.35
Panel Screens	33.36
Art panels or banners	29.73
Mural	26.07
Steel mesh screening with brick accent	25.72
Artistic Lighting	22.03
Traditional Concrete	20.66
Modern	11.37

We asked people to provide feedback on different design elements. The higher the weighted average, the more positive it is (i.e. landscaping and traditional materials are perceived as being positive).

Design Elements	Weighted average
Traditional materials (stone, brick)	3.23
Landscaping	3.21
First-floor retail or displays	2.73
Green walls or planters	2.34
Public art (banners, murals, lighting)	2.16
Modern materials (glass, exposed steel,	1.84
concrete)	

We asked citizens to provide 3-5 words to describe what they would like the parking garage to look like: the words that emerged more frequently were: traditional, square, historic, fits, blends, modern (this was mostly accompanied by "not" modern, "don't do" modern, etc.); generally the other words were self-explanatory as to how the responders felt.

Jack said that we are really trying to focus on communication, and we want to get the results out and share with the public. He said that we are very fortunate that we got good feedback from the public. The risk with surveys is that you sometimes receive muddled feedback, but he feels that we got back relatively clear direction from the community.

Scott Firth asked about the word "fit" and said that it appeared 6 times in the Wordle. Jack said he can get the words, verbatim comments and raw data together and provide this information to the committee.

He also asked if we had any knowledge of the respondents. Jack said they did collect a few e-mail addresses, but purposely tried to make it informal and easy to understand to encourage more people to complete it. They felt that having demographic area questions, etc. might make the respondents uncomfortable and balk about completing it. It was regulated so that the survey could only be completed one time per person.

There was further discussion about the percentages, and some felt that we didn't do too well with 78% as the highest in any category. Shawn said that we could have made the survey to come out to where we got and A+, but we would basically be getting answers to the questions we asked. We wanted to ask very broad questions and gets as much feedback as possible, and we now have a lot of feedback and data to filter through and gather pertinent information about what our community wants or does not want. We have a lot of data to build on in a very positive way.

Larry said there was a definite break between the top four concepts and the others. Jack will provide more information on:

- How many asked for additional information by providing their e-mail addresses
- Response rate on other surveys
- Provide an electronic copy

The committee feels there is a growing level of interest in design, as well as location. Mickie said that they also passed out information to visitors that do not live here, because they will use it most likely more than the local community.

Laurie said that this committee should be commended for getting the cards out and really pushing people to do the survey, therefore we received more responses than we ever have. She really appreciates the efforts.

Scott thanked whomever created the cards. They were great to have as he walked around, but noted that about 90% were unaware that we were even building the parking garage. Some were happy and some became involved in very heated discussions. Shawn said the cards were invaluable and allowed him to engage with others and he was able to offer answers and explanations if they asked questions.

4. Provide an update on the design construction contract and project timeline – Eric Johnson, CIP Manager

The design contract went to Council on Tuesday and it was almost unanimously approved. Eric has the signed contracts in his office. Larry asked why is there no schematic design in the contract, and Eric said that the item in the agenda packet was the proposal, not the contract. Included in the contract is 4 stakeholder meetings: 2 with the committee and 2 with the public, but these meetings can be set up however the committee wishes.

Larry asked what happens if HARC votes the design down and asked if then City Council would need to vote to appeal to themselves. Laurie said that we hope that we wouldn't get to that. The task of the architect is to present a design to HARC that is in compliance and if there is a disagreement, we will seek advice from Council.

Timeline:

Design 24 weeks
HARC 18 weeks
Bidding and Award 10 weeks
Construction 1 year

Laurie said we could have as much design discussion as the committee wants, i.e., phone calls, meetings (in person or on the telephone) etc. She wants everyone to feel comfortable, and is hoping to get conceptual review to HARC by February or March.

Larry asked about the lease agreement on the surface parking lot and Laurie clarified that it was a 20 year lease with the County.

Michael asked if there was time for them to do some type of additional public outreach between now and the design phase. The survey results will go to the architect so they can be used for conceptual drawings and review. Eric explained that the design contract scope includes schematic design, design development, construction documents, bidding and negotiation and construction phase services. He hopes to have that done Spring/Summer. In that time, during that process, it would go to HARC for approval. Laurie said that after meeting with the architects, we can put together a more detailed review/schedule.

Scott asked if the retail/display information from the survey has been given to the architect for options. Shawn said that he made multiple trips around square talking to people. He received specific feedback from patrons on the square, and they seem less interested in retail and much more interested in display. It is a hardship for businesses on the square and heard suggestions of using displays to drive customers back to the businesses on the square by making it very appealing, possibly utilizing a rotation system (monthly) between businesses. He was amazed at the interest in the display idea, noting that it was of most importance for the displays to be transparent and not lose the safety aspect of the garage.

5. Public outreach and input – next steps - Laurie Brewer, Assistant City Manager

Laurie said that we haven't set firm deadlines. At our next meeting December, we will meet with the architects, gather feedback and possibly have a few options. We need to make sure we are communicating the right materials to the architects.

Scott said that he was disappointed that we couldn't include the mass and scale discussion in the survey. We did agree in August that we wanted that included in the public outreach but we haven't gotten public feedback on the mass and scale and that is an important aspect, going to HARC.

Michael said that we do need input on the mass and scale, but has no idea how you would ask that, noting that a random citizen would not know what that means. We need to make it more abstract, such as height and property lines possibly.

Suggestions were for the architects to do conceptual drawings that showed eye level perspectives, not bird level, to get the sense of how it will look. The committee would like conceptual drawings (for a focal point) from the Courthouse looking diagonally, from 7th and Main Street and from Church Street.

Shawn said that the mandate from Council for the number of parking spaces really gives the architects the direction that they need to go.

The committee discussed the next meeting, which would include the architects. December 12, 16, 17 or 18 seemed to be the best days.

We will poll the committee and set the next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.	
Michael Walton	Linda McCalla
Board Co-Chair	Board Co-Chair
Date	

SUBJECT:

Discussion on design elements with WGI representative - Eric Johnson, CIP Manager

ITEM SUMMARY:

WGI representative will be a the meeting and lead the discussion and provide examples.

- Design features
- Building materials
- HARC review elements

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

N/A

SUBMITTED BY:

Eric Johnson, CIP Manager

SUBJECT:

Discussion on next steps for public input - Laurie Brewer, Assistant City Manager and Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

ITEM SUMMARY:

Discussion on next steps for public input

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

N/A

SUBMITTED BY:

Laurie Brewer, Assistant City Manager and Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

SUBJECT:

Discussion on follow up questions from the November 15, 2019 Downtown Parking Garage Stakeholders Committee Meeting - Jackson Daly, Assistant to the City Manager

ITEM SUMMARY:

The follow up to questions from the November 15th meeting were distributed via e-mail.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

N/A

SUBMITTED BY:

Jackson Daly, Assistant to the City Manager