City Council
City of San Marcos

Regular Meeting Agenda - Final-Amended
City Council

Tuesday, May 16, 2017  5:30 PM  City Council Chambers

630 E. Hopkins

I. Call To Order

II. Roll Call

III. Invocation

IV. Pledges Of Allegiance - United States And Texas

PRESENTATIONS

1. Receive a Staff presentation of the Quarterly Investment and Financial Reports, and provide direction to Staff.

6:00 PM

V. 30 Minute Citizen Comment Period

CONSENT AGENDA

THE FOLLOWING ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND OTHER ITEMS MAY BE ACTED UPON BY ONE MOTION. NO SEPARATE DISCUSSION OR ACTION ON ANY OF THE ITEMS IS NECESSARY UNLESS DESIRED BY A COUNCIL MEMBER OR A CITIZEN, IN WHICH EVENT THE ITEM SHALL BE CONSIDERED IN ITS NORMAL SEQUENCE AFTER THE ITEMS NOT REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION HAVE BEEN ACTED UPON BY A SINGLE MOTION.

2. Consider approval, by motion, of the following meeting Minutes:
   A) April 24, 2017 CDBG-DR Workshop Minutes
   B) April 28, 2017 - Packet Meeting Minutes
   C) May 2, 2017 - Transportation Master Plan Workshop
   D) May 2, 2017 - Regular Meeting Minutes

3. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-22, on the second of two readings, authorizing the installation of speed cushions in both directions in the 500 through 600 blocks of Candlelight Lane (from Del Sol Drive to Broadway Street); and including procedural provisions.

4. Consider approval of Resolution 2017-85R, approving amendments to the original Interlocal Cooperation agreement that established the Austin Regional Intelligence
Center and the Interlocal Cooperation agreement for sustainment funding for the Austin Regional Intelligence Center, the purposes of each amendment being to add three new partner agencies to the agreements and to authorize the City of Austin to enter into collateral agreements with certain non-governmental entities that would enable such entities to become partners in the intelligence center; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute both amendments on behalf of the City; and declaring an effective date.

5. Consider approval of Resolution 2017-86R, approving the terms and conditions of an Airport Facility Lease agreement for non-commercial use of city-owned aircraft hangars; authorizing the City Manager to execute said lease agreements on behalf of the City; and declaring an effective date.

6. Consider approval, by motion, of Change in Service #4 to RPS for Construction Phase Services for the Reclaimed Water Expansion Project, in the not to exceed amount of $332,633.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - 7:00 PM

7. 7:00PM Receive a Staff presentation and hold a Public Hearing to receive comments for or against Ordinance 2017-30, amending the Official Zoning Map of the City by rezoning 0.951 acre, more or less, tract of land, out of the J. M. Veramendi Survey, Abstract 17, Hays County, Texas located at 1346 Thorpe Lane from “OP” Office Professional District to “CC” Community Commercial District, and including procedural provisions; and consider approval of Ordinance 2017-30 on the first of two readings.

8. 7:00PM Receive a Staff presentation and hold a Public Hearing to receive comments for or against Resolution 2017-88R, authorizing the submission of an application to the Texas Department of Transportation for funding under the Statewide Alternatives Transportation Set-Aside Program for the proposed San Marcos River Bike and Pedestrian Trail Project (Priority Rank No.1) and the Downtown Accessible Pedestrian Signal Project (Priority Rank No. 2); authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute any and all documents as necessary to accept such funding, if awarded; authorizing the commitment of local matching funds of at least 20 percent of total project costs and the Texas Department of Transportation 15 percent administrative cost; and providing an effective date; and consider approval of Resolution 2017-88R.

9. 7:00PM Hold a public hearing to receive comments for or against Substantial Amendment No. 2 to the Action Plan of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recovery Grant (CDBG-DR).

NON-CONSENT AGENDA

10. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-28, on the first of two readings, designating six parking spaces located at the southwest and southeast corners of Guadalupe and San Antonio Streets as loading and unloading spaces for use only by Transportation Network Company drivers who are waiting for prearranged rides between the hours of
10:00 PM and 3:00 AM each day of the week, authorizing the City Traffic Engineer to install signs identifying such parking spaces; amending the traffic register maintained under section 82.067 consistent with this Ordinance; including procedural provisions; and declaring an effective date.

11. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-29, on the first of two readings, amending Section 82.128 of the San Marcos City Code to clarify the exceptions allowing large commercial trucks weighing more than one ton to deviate from established truck routes; and providing an effective date.

12. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-32, on first and final reading, canvassing election returns of a Bond Election held within said city on May 6, 2017, for Public Safety Facilities in the aggregate principal amount of $17,450,000 and Library Improvements in the aggregate principal amount of $14,750,000; declaring an emergency creating the need to adopt this Ordinance with only one reading; and containing other provision incident and related to the purposes; and providing an effective date.

13. Consider approval, by motion, authorizing the first Regular City Council meeting of July to be moved to July 5, 2017 due to the Independence Day holiday.

14. Discuss and consider appointments to fill vacancies on the San Marcos Commission on Children and Youth, and provide direction to staff.

15. Discuss and consider a request by Becky Collins, Walton Development and Management, to allow an early Preferred Scenario Amendment Process to begin in May, 2017 for Project Zircon and other applicants, and provide direction to staff.

16. Consider a motion to reverse the City’s Policy and Plans to convert Guadalupe and LBJ Streets to two-way traffic, and provide direction to Staff.

VI. Question and Answer Session with Press and Public.

This is an opportunity for the Press and Public to ask questions related to items on this agenda.

VII. Adjournment.

POSTED ON THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2017 at 11:00AM

JAMIE LEE CASE, TRMC, CITY CLERK

VIII. ADDENDUM

The following items were removed from the previously posted agenda:

Item #12 Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-31, on the first of two readings, amending the City’s 2016-2017 Fiscal Year Budget to add a Full-Time Employment Position for a Deputy Court Clerk; providing procedural provisions; and providing an effective date.

Item #18 Discuss and consider the creation of a City Council Subcommittee consisting
of the Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem, and Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission to hold deliberations regarding the Lindsey Hill Project and hold open public forums; and provide direction to staff.

ADDENDUM POSTED ON FRIDAY, MAY 12, 2017 at 3:30PM

JAMIE LEE CASE, TRMC, CITY CLERK

Notice of Assistance at the Public Meetings

The City of San Marcos does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to its services, programs, or activities. Individuals who require auxiliary aids and services for this meeting should contact the City of San Marcos ADA Coordinator at 512-393-8000 (voice) or call Texas Relay Service (TRS) by dialing 7-1-1. Requests can also be faxed to 855-461-6674 or sent by e-mail to ADArequest@sanmarcostx.gov
AGENDA CAPTION:
Receive a Staff presentation of the Quarterly Investment and Financial Reports, and provide direction to Staff.

Meeting date:  May 16, 2017

Department:  Finance-Heather Hurlbert, Finance Director

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:

BACKGROUND:
The Texas Public Fund Investment Act requires the City's Quarterly Investment Report to be received by City Council. The report covers the second quarter of the fiscal year 2016-2017 reflecting investment activity and balances as of March 31, 2017.

The City's total portfolio summary as of March 31, 2017 reflects a total market value of $189,010,722 made up of funds from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Cash</td>
<td>$49,799,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Cash Reserves</td>
<td>$10,802,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Fund</td>
<td>$115,078,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Fund Reserves</td>
<td>$13,329,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These funds are invested in various investment types including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Deposits</td>
<td>$25,285,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Mutual Funds</td>
<td>$1,456,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>$7,895,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Pools</td>
<td>$66,007,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Coupon Securities</td>
<td>$13,807,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td>$74,558,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City's financial performance through March 31, 2017 is detailed in the enclosed Financial Summary Report. The report includes revenues and expenditures for the City's major funds. The reported funds are as
follows: General Fund, Debt Service Fund, Hotel Tax Fund, Water Wastewater Fund, Drainage Fund, Electric Fund and Airport Fund. Included on the report are trending analysis for both year-to-date and month-to-date with the related variances.

The Investment Report and Financial Summary Report for quarter ended March 31, 2017 were reviewed by the Finance and Audit Committee on May 16, 2017.
QUARTERLY FINANCIAL AND INVESTMENT UPDATE

QUARTER ENDED MARCH 31, 2017
Financial Update
REVENUE

- General Fund
  - YTD $1.8M (4.94%) & MTD $763K (18.54%) below forecast
    - Timing on the collection of other agency contracts
    - Sales tax collections below budget due to one-time collections in FY16 and timing of Best Buy revenues in FY17

- Hotel Tax Fund
  - YTD $77K or 4.29% below forecast
    - Timing in reporting and collection
    - Delay in new hotel openings
REVENUE

• Utilities
  – Water/Wastewater $752K or 4.15% below forecast
    • Overall wetter weather patterns
    • Reflecting timing difference and decrease in the collection of BABs interest reimbursement
  – Electric $508K or 1.94% below forecast
    • Mild seasonal temperatures
General Fund
- YTD total expenses $486K or 1.64% favorable to trend
  - Primarily due to timing of payments for contract and professional services
  - Overall organizational savings

Hotel Tax Fund
- YTD total expenses $417K or 20.1% favorable to trend
  - Timing of CVB converting to City department and contractual obligation
EXPENSES

• Utilities
  – Water/Wastewater
    • YTD expenses $863K or 6.52% favorable to trend
      – Primarily due to timing of payments for contracted and professional services
  – Electric
    • YTD expenses $904K or 3.63% favorable to trend
      – Primarily due to timing of payments for contracted and professional services
      – Reduced power purchases due to reduced usage
INVESTMENT UPDATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash</td>
<td>$49,799,759</td>
<td>$43,115,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash-Reserves</td>
<td>$10,802,433</td>
<td>$10,768,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>$115,078,970</td>
<td>$113,834,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise-Reserves</td>
<td>$13,329,561</td>
<td>$12,319,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$189,010,723</td>
<td>$180,037,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Investment Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Yield to Maturity for Period</th>
<th>Weighted Average Maturity (WAM)*</th>
<th>Average Yield to Maturity 1 year ago</th>
<th>Weighted Average Maturity 1 year ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>221 Days</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>200 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash-Reserves</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>655 Days</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>527 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>114 Days</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>165 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise-Reserves</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>463 Days</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>337 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 6-Month Treasury Bill 0.91 %

*Per Investment Policy:
- Maximum WAM for Regular Funds is 730 days
- Maximum WAM for Reserve Funds is 1,095 days
# Investment Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wells Fargo Operating/ Money Market Account</th>
<th>Government Pools</th>
<th>Certificates of Deposit</th>
<th>Municipal Coupon Securities</th>
<th>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash</td>
<td>$9,555,228</td>
<td>$9,169,858</td>
<td>$3,206,000</td>
<td>$5,411,812</td>
<td>$22,456,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash-Reserve</td>
<td>$484,617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,317,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>$16,381,530</td>
<td>$56,837,907</td>
<td>$4,689,000</td>
<td>$5,723,914</td>
<td>$31,446,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise-Reserve</td>
<td>$320,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,671,449</td>
<td>$10,337,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarterly Investment Report
March 31, 2017
City of San Marcos, TX

Aggregate Portfolio Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>March 31, 2017</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
<th>December 31, 2016</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Choice IV</td>
<td>24,184,476</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19,459,045</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bus. Market Rate Public Funds</td>
<td>1,101,375</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,101,104</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,285,851</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>20,560,148</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Mutual Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prime MM Inst (FIPXX)</td>
<td>1,456,371</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,385,794</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD's - Interest at Maturity</td>
<td>7,895,000</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7,907,000</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Investment Pools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexSTAR</td>
<td>966,209</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,164,743</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>28,818,827</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>28,753,192</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexPOOL</td>
<td>510,158</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>509,440</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>14,041,763</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14,011,710</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexasCLASS</td>
<td>21,514,312</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>21,462,668</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexasTERM - Daily</td>
<td>156,496</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>103,644</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,007,765</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>66,005,397</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Coupon Securities</td>
<td>13,807,176</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13,632,143</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Commercial Paper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,996,248</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANNIE MAE (FNMA)</td>
<td>13,806,642</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10,818,670.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK (FHLB)</td>
<td>23,662,796</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23,671,113</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BANK (FFCB)</td>
<td>19,911,947</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22,869,088</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREDDIE MAC (FHLMC)</td>
<td>12,170,069</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5,180,615</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMER MAC (FAMCA)</td>
<td>5,007,105</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5,011,150</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74,558,559</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>67,550,635</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investments</td>
<td>189,010,722</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>180,037,365</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portfoilio Composition as of 3/31/16

- Bank Deposits: 13%
- Money Market Mutual Funds: 1%
- Local Government Investment Pools: 35%
- Federal Agencies: 40%
- Municipal Coupon Securities: 7%

Portfoilio Composition as of 12/31/16

- Bank Deposits: 9%
- Money Market Mutual Funds: 1%
- Local Government Investment Pools: 39%
- Municipal Coupon Securities: 7%
## City of San Marcos, TX

### Investment Report - Quarter Ended March 31, 2017

#### Summary by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Investments or Accounts</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pooled Cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Coupon Securities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,320,000.00</td>
<td>5,411,812.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22,500,000.00</td>
<td>22,456,859.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Investment Pool</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,169,810.13</td>
<td>9,169,858.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD's - Interest at Maturity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Choice IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,252,309.57</td>
<td>9,252,309.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prime MM Inst (FIPXX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302,918.64</td>
<td>302,918.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,751,038.34</td>
<td>49,799,758.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pooled Cash - Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,400,000.00</td>
<td>10,317,816.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prime MM Inst (FIPXX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>484,616.77</td>
<td>484,616.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,884,616.77</td>
<td>10,802,433.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Coupon Securities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,705,000.00</td>
<td>5,723,914.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31,500,000.00</td>
<td>31,446,619.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Investment Pool</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56,833,542.50</td>
<td>56,837,907.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD's - Interest at Maturity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4,689,000.00</td>
<td>4,689,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Choice IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,932,166.20</td>
<td>14,932,166.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bus. Market Rate Public Funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,101,375.37</td>
<td>1,101,375.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prime MM Inst (FIPXX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>347,987.99</td>
<td>347,987.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>115,109,072.06</td>
<td>115,078,970.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise - Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Coupon Securities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,665,000.00</td>
<td>2,671,449.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,400,000.00</td>
<td>10,337,263.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prime MM Inst (FIPXX)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320,848.01</td>
<td>320,848.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,385,848.01</td>
<td>13,329,560.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>189,130,575.18</td>
<td>189,010,722.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Heather Hurlbert, Director of Finance
## Aggregate Portfolio Summary

### Pooled Cash Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 31, 2017</th>
<th>December 31, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>49,751,038</td>
<td>43,089,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>49,799,759</td>
<td>43,115,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Portfolio</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest</td>
<td>93,664</td>
<td>89,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts - Interest Earned</td>
<td>42,418</td>
<td>28,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average Maturity (Days)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield to Maturity for Period:</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 1 Year US Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 6-month Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pooled Cash Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 31, 2017</th>
<th>December 31, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>10,884,617</td>
<td>10,857,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>10,802,433</td>
<td>10,768,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Portfolio</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest</td>
<td>23,993</td>
<td>13,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts - Interest Earned</td>
<td>26,950</td>
<td>27,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average Maturity (Days)</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield to Maturity for Period:</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 1 Year US Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 6-month Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aggregate Portfolio Summary

#### Enterprise Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 31, 2017</th>
<th>December 31, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>115,109,072</td>
<td>113,879,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>115,078,970</td>
<td>113,834,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Portfolio</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest</td>
<td>76,460</td>
<td>147,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts - Interest Earned</td>
<td>297,917</td>
<td>42,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average Maturity (Days)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield to Maturity for Period:</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 1 Year US Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 6-month Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enterprise Fund Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 31, 2017</th>
<th>December 31, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>13,385,848</td>
<td>12,343,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>13,329,561</td>
<td>12,319,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Portfolio</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest</td>
<td>16,588</td>
<td>36,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts - Interest Earned</td>
<td>42,836</td>
<td>25,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average Maturity (Days)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield to Maturity for Period:</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 1 Year US Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Yield 6-month Treasury Bill for period:</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Investments by Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Issuer / Description</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Current Rate (%)</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity (%)</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Current Price</th>
<th>Current Par</th>
<th>Wt’Avg Days to Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pool Cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexSTAR</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>394,347.08</td>
<td>394,347.08</td>
<td>394,372.32</td>
<td>0.6269</td>
<td>0.6269</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.0001</td>
<td>394,347.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>152,468.41</td>
<td>152,468.41</td>
<td>152,491.43</td>
<td>1.0089</td>
<td>1.0089</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.0002</td>
<td>152,468.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexPOOL</td>
<td>Govt Pool</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td>0.4783</td>
<td>0.4783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td>0.7781</td>
<td>0.7781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexasCLASS</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td>0.9002</td>
<td>0.9002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexTERM - Daily</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexTERM*</td>
<td>Texas CD Program (13)-Interest at Maturity</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>1.1469</td>
<td>1.1469</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>110089207</td>
<td>110089207</td>
<td>110089207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo MM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wells Fargo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Investments - Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Issuer / Description</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Current Rate (%)</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity (%)</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Current Price</th>
<th>Current Par</th>
<th>Wt’Avg Days to Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TexSTAR</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>394,347.08</td>
<td>394,347.08</td>
<td>394,372.32</td>
<td>0.6269</td>
<td>0.6269</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.0001</td>
<td>394,347.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>152,468.41</td>
<td>152,468.41</td>
<td>152,491.43</td>
<td>1.0089</td>
<td>1.0089</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.0002</td>
<td>152,468.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexPOOL</td>
<td>Govt Pool</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td>0.4783</td>
<td>0.4783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>5,057.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td>0.7781</td>
<td>0.7781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1,615,577.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexasCLASS</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td>0.9002</td>
<td>0.9002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>6,922,226.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexTERM - Daily</td>
<td>Govt Pool - Overnight Fund</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>80,123.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexTERM*</td>
<td>Texas CD Program (13)-Interest at Maturity</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>1.1469</td>
<td>1.1469</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>3,206,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>110089207</td>
<td>110089207</td>
<td>110089207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investments by Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Issuer / Description</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Current Rate (%)</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity (%)</th>
<th>Days To Maturity</th>
<th>Current Price</th>
<th>Current Cost</th>
<th>Wtd Avg Days to Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3130A52U6</td>
<td>FHLB 0.8 07/27/2017</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,499,610.00</td>
<td>7/27/2017</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.9997</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>313375SZ2</td>
<td>FHLB 2.25 09/08/2017</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,508,274.00</td>
<td>9/8/2017</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.0055</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3130A6863</td>
<td>FHLB 0.75 09/29/2017</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
<td>2,497,477.50</td>
<td>9/29/2017</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3131592Z8</td>
<td>FARMER MAC (FANCA 1.3 12/22/2017)</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
<td>2,503,552.50</td>
<td>12/22/2017</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1.0014</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>31346A5A8</td>
<td>FREDDIEMAC 1.375 03/15/2019</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,998,858.00</td>
<td>2/26/2018</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0.9994</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>31346BM71</td>
<td>FREDDIEMAC 1.05 02/26/2018</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td>1,498,971.00</td>
<td>2/26/2018</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0.9993</td>
<td>1,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3133EGUT3</td>
<td>FFCB .79 7/5/2018</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,980,803.00</td>
<td>7/5/2018</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>0.9936</td>
<td>3,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3133EGU00</td>
<td>FFCB .82 7/5/2018</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td>4,479,669.00</td>
<td>7/5/2018</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>0.9955</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>31355OH63</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE 1.375 01/28/2019</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,002,280.00</td>
<td>7/13/2018</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1.0011</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>31355O4J3</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE .85 07/13/2018</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td>4,480,119.00</td>
<td>7/13/2018</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td>4,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$115,109,072.06 $115,109,072.06 $115,078,970.42

1.09% 115,109,072.06 114

Enterprise - Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Issuer / Description</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>34074G0G6</td>
<td>FL HURRICANE-SER A 2.107 07/01/2018</td>
<td>320,848.01</td>
<td>320,848.01</td>
<td>320,848.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>717087D23</td>
<td>PFLUGERVILLE TX TXBL-CTFS OBLIG SERIES C</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>133,749.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>882723374</td>
<td>TEXAS ST TXBL REF WTR FINL ASSISTANCE-S</td>
<td>145,000.00</td>
<td>145,000.00</td>
<td>143,941.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>717087D31</td>
<td>PFLUGERVILLE TX TXBL-CTFS OBLIG SERIES C</td>
<td>235,000.00</td>
<td>235,000.00</td>
<td>231,016.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>8827233U1</td>
<td>TEXAS ST TXBL REF WTR FINL ASSISTANCE-S</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>147,861.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>3130A70V5</td>
<td>FHLB 1.12 11/09/2018</td>
<td>2,200,000.00</td>
<td>2,200,000.00</td>
<td>2,187,706.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>3130A7R73</td>
<td>FHLB 1.25 04/29/2019</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,987,394.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB71308</td>
<td>3130A6GG6</td>
<td>FHLB 0.875 09/22/2017</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>999,737.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>31346A2U7</td>
<td>FREDDIEMAC 1.35 02/28/2019</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,996,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3136G4R86</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE 1.125 09/09/2019</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,967,158.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AB57431</td>
<td>3135G5O46</td>
<td>FANNIE MAE 1.65 01/27/2020</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>998,848.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal and Average $13,385,848.01 $13,385,848.01 $13,329,560.96 1.06% 13,385,848.01 463

SUBTOTAL - ENTERPRISE $128,494,920.07 $128,494,920.07 $128,408,531.38

TOTAL INVESTMENTS $189,130,575.18 $189,130,575.18 $189,010,722.95

*Texas Term CD Program yields and terms to maturity are blended rates of individual CD's
**Brokered CD's held in Wells Fargo Safekeeping Account. Yields and terms to maturity are blended rates of individual CD's
## City of San Marcos
### 2016-17 Revenue & Expenditure Analysis
#### March 31, 2017

### Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Y-T-D Trend Estimate</th>
<th>Y-T-D Actual</th>
<th>% to Budget</th>
<th>Favorable (Unfavorable )</th>
<th>M-T-D Trend Estimate</th>
<th>M-T-D Actual</th>
<th>Favorable (Unfavorable )</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>63,244,029</td>
<td>36,675,641</td>
<td>34,864,268</td>
<td>55.13%</td>
<td>1,811,373</td>
<td>4,116,236</td>
<td>3,326,979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-18.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>13,804,890</td>
<td>10,509,610</td>
<td>10,509,610</td>
<td>76.13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>206,862</td>
<td>206,862</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Tax Fund</td>
<td>4,044,036</td>
<td>1,798,237</td>
<td>1,721,007</td>
<td>42.56%</td>
<td>(752,200)</td>
<td>206,862</td>
<td>206,862</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Waste Fund</td>
<td>37,692,653</td>
<td>18,123,523</td>
<td>17,371,323</td>
<td>46.09%</td>
<td>7,352,979</td>
<td>3,348,655</td>
<td>9,686</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Fund</td>
<td>58,724,490</td>
<td>26,247,140</td>
<td>25,738,654</td>
<td>43.83%</td>
<td>3,901,885</td>
<td>4,160,646</td>
<td>36,863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Fund</td>
<td>526,002</td>
<td>242,458</td>
<td>211,995</td>
<td>40.35%</td>
<td>(21,295)</td>
<td>30,305</td>
<td>33,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>183,224,051</td>
<td>74,769,917</td>
<td>72,366,901</td>
<td>40.30%</td>
<td>3,203,017</td>
<td>12,638,793</td>
<td>11,756,460</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Y-T-D Trend Estimate</th>
<th>Y-T-D Actual</th>
<th>% to Budget</th>
<th>Favorable (Unfavorable )</th>
<th>M-T-D Trend Estimate</th>
<th>M-T-D Actual</th>
<th>Favorable (Unfavorable )</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>65,795,423</td>
<td>29,559,396</td>
<td>29,073,832</td>
<td>44.19%</td>
<td>485,563</td>
<td>6,447,810</td>
<td>6,013,550</td>
<td>434,260</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>13,285,457</td>
<td>3,599,383</td>
<td>3,599,383</td>
<td>27.09%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,540</td>
<td>39,540</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Tax Fund</td>
<td>4,647,764</td>
<td>2,074,159</td>
<td>1,657,312</td>
<td>35.66%</td>
<td>416,846</td>
<td>334,938</td>
<td>295,065</td>
<td>39,873</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Waste Fund</td>
<td>36,782,723</td>
<td>13,249,817</td>
<td>12,386,552</td>
<td>33.67%</td>
<td>863,265</td>
<td>1,765,297</td>
<td>1,382,549</td>
<td>382,748</td>
<td>21.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Fund</td>
<td>4,322,372</td>
<td>1,868,486</td>
<td>1,483,149</td>
<td>34.31%</td>
<td>(296,663)</td>
<td>114,866</td>
<td>129,401</td>
<td>(14,535)</td>
<td>-12.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Fund</td>
<td>57,864,311</td>
<td>24,858,218</td>
<td>23,954,676</td>
<td>41.40%</td>
<td>903,543</td>
<td>3,826,206</td>
<td>49,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>526,002</td>
<td>242,458</td>
<td>211,995</td>
<td>40.30%</td>
<td>30,463</td>
<td>34,148</td>
<td>(9,902)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MTD / YTD reduction in sales tax collections, timing of collection on other agency contracts
*MTD / YTD decrease in P4 rev Year/Year Delay on new hotels opening
*MTD / YTD decrease in sales tax collections, timing of collection on other revenue - BABs receipt
*MTD / YTD increase in sales tax collections, timing of collection on other revenue - BABs receipt
*MTD / YTD increase in sales tax collections, timing of collection on other revenue - BABs receipt
*MTD / YTD milder weather
*MTD timing of collection on airport agriculture lease
*MTD timing of payments on contracts, salary savings
*MTD / YTD - timing of payments on contracts & CVB internal dept, no qtr payment
*YTD-timing of payments on contracts, prof svc agents
*MTD / YTD - timing of payments on contracts and capital outlay purch
*MTD / YTD - timing of payments on contracts
*MTD / YTD - timing of payments on prof svc contracts
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval, by motion, of the following meeting Minutes:
A) April 24, 2017 CDBG-DR Workshop Minutes
B) April 28, 2017 - Packet Meeting Minutes
C) May 2, 2017 - Transportation Master Plan Workshop
D) May 2, 2017 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: City Clerk

Funds Required: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Funds Available: N/A
Account Name: N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL: N/A

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): N/A

BACKGROUND:
The following minutes are attached for review:
A) April 24, 2017 CDBG-DR Workshop Minutes
B) April 28, 2017 - Packet Meeting Minutes
C) May 2, 2017 - Transportation Master Plan Workshop
D) May 2, 2017 - Regular Meeting Minutes
I. Call To Order

With a quorum present, the CDBG-DR Workshop of the San Marcos City Council was called to order by Mayor Thomaides at 5:30 p.m. Monday, April 24, 2017 in the City Council Chambers, 630 E. Hopkins, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Mayor John Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Jane Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Lisa Prewitt, Council Member Saul Gonzales, Council Member Ed Mihalkanin, Council Member Scott Gregson and Council Member Melissa Derrick

1. Receive a presentation and update regarding the Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) Grant; the findings of the Infrastructure Feasibility Study and the identification of infrastructure projects to address flooding in the neighborhoods affected by the 2015 floods, and provide direction to Staff.

Laurie Moyer, Director of Engineering and CIP, provided an introduction to the Council regarding the infrastructure update, and introduced Daniel Zail with AECOM to review the study and provide a recommendation of the projects that should be funded to address flooding issues. Mr. Zail introduced the team involved with the Infrastructure feasibility studies. Mr. Zail reviewed Blanco River flood events from 1957 to present.

He provided the current findings that showed that the projects recommended will increase protection during local rainfall events, but during larger events flooding will still occur. There were numerous stakeholder meetings and site visits throughout the study to determine needs. The Blanco Gardens Riverine solution was discussed which proposes drainage improvements and a bank improvement trail, either a paved surface or vegetated surface could be created. This bank improvement trail could potentially tie into the City proposed trail at a later time. Overflow channels would be created as well to further increase protection from future flood events.

Mr. Zail presented possible solutions to address local drainage issues in the
following areas: Blanco Gardens, Clarewood/Barbara Drive, Midtown/Aquarena Springs, Clarewood/Hwy 80, Uhland Road/County Road, Fairlawn, River Ridge, and Rio Vista. This includes proposed new storm sewers, new outfalls, street and road regrading, ditch vegetation clearing, and the addition of culverts.

Marcie O’Connell with AECOM presented the prioritization matrix and explained the scoring and ranking of each item. The top five projects recommended with use of Disaster Recover, City and Other funds include: Midtown, Blanco Gardens, Clarewood/Barbara Dr., Bank & Trail Improvements, and Uhland Road. The Rio Vista, River Ridge, and Fairlawn projects were prioritized as the bottom three initiatives, but staff will roll these projects into the CIP and will be completed as funding and staff workload becomes available.

Laurie Moyer, Director of Engineering and CIP, discussed the costs and schedule of completion of the top five projects. Council consensus was to move forward with these recommendations.

III. Question and Answer Session with Press and Public.

Grace Davis: 616 Conway Drive
What is the Woods drainage like at this time? She noted that a senior staff was onboard when the Woods Apartment Complex was constructed and the River Road in front of the Woods Apartment is at a slant and she believes this was a factor of flooding in Blanco Gardens.
Laurie Moyer stated the design of the Woods drainage is 4000 cubic feet per second. The City will use this capacity for other floods and not just the 100 year flood. She also stated The Woods Apartment did provide some of the funding to the City.
Ms. Davis asked what about the total cost in loss of the homes that are not being bought out? Staff indicated this is not known at this time, but will talk with Ms. Davis.
Ms. Davis asked how the City will explain to the citizens when they are fearful when flooding occurs? She mentioned receiving a call from her mother who lives at Mariposa and when Hunter Road began flooding there was a lot of concern by residents.

Sharon Smith: 943 Haynes Street
She questioned the alert system sent to citizens regarding flooding. In 1998 Ms. Smith could not get out of her neighborhood and in 2015 her son could not get out. She said no alert was sent out on April 11th. She was in Austin so had no
idea there was a flood in San Marcos. She wants to ensure citizens get an alert and have a way out of their homes and neighborhood.

Jim Valentine: 1000 Hackberry: He asked about communication with TXDot regarding the ditch behind the Fairlawn addition. He suggested the ditch could be dug out to improve drainage. He asked about cost effectiveness and stated it should be minimal.

Dianne Wassenich: 11 Tanglewood
She asked why the 1971 flood was not listed in the historic flood events chart. Staff informed her this was only flood events on the Blanco River and the 1971 flood was on the San Marcos River.

Douglas Beckett: 714 Barbara Drive
Commented that the City is on the right track, but there is no talk of existing easements in Blanco Garden. These easements have not been maintained throughout the years. He stated better culverts need to be placed in order to convey water. He also noted there are not enough plans for retention ponds. He discussed a project near Slaughter Lane in Austin that is creating a retention pond to provide relief from future flood events.

IV. Adjournment.

Mayor Thomaides adjourned the CDBG-DR Workshop of the San Marcos City Council at 7:39 p.m.

Tammy Cook, TRMC, Deputy City Clerk John Thomaides, Mayor

Notice of Assistance at the Public Meetings

The City of San Marcos does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to its services, programs, or activities. Individuals who require auxiliary aids and services for this meeting should contact the City of San Marcos ADA Coordinator at 512-393-8000 (voice) or call Texas Relay Service (TRS) by dialing 7-1-1. Requests can also be faxed to 855-461-6674 or sent by e-mail to ADArequest@sanmarcostx.gov
With a quorum present, the packet meeting workshop of the San Marcos City Council was called to order by Mayor Thomaides at 12:05 p.m. Friday, April 28, 2017 in the City Council Chambers, 630 E. Hopkins, San Marcos, Texas 78666

II. Roll Call

Present: 4 - Mayor Pro-Tem Jane Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Lisa Prewitt, Council Member Ed Mihalkanin and Council Member Saul Gonzales

Absent: 3 - Mayor John Thomaides, Council Member Scott Gregson and Council Member Melissa Derrick

1. Consider Staff briefing and Council Member discussion and questions regarding items on the agenda for the May 2, 2017 Regular City Council Meeting, to wit Items (3-23).

PRESENTATIONS

3. Staff presentation and discussion regarding back-in parking on Edward Gary and the process for future locations.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Consider approval, by motion, of the following meeting Minutes:
   A) April 14, 2017 - Packet Meeting
   B) April 18, 2017 - Regular Meeting

5. Ordinance 2017-19, on the second of two readings, amending the term limit of key constituency representatives in Chapter 2, Article 3, Division 24, Section 2.370.26, San Marcos Commission on Children and Youth; including procedural provisions; and providing an effective date.

6. Ordinance 2017-20, on the second of two readings, amending Chapter 2, Article 5, Code of Ethics, of the San Marcos City Code; requiring Financial Disclosure Forms to be updated within 30 days following acquisition of additional interests in real property; requiring Financial Disclosure Forms to be filed by members of temporary boards, commissions, subcommittees or similar groups; and providing an effective date.
7. Ordinance 2017-21, on the second of two readings, amending Chapter 58 of the San Marcos City Code regarding Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation by eliminating the requirement of a verbal warning before issuance of citations for public display or consumption of alcoholic beverages in city parks, prohibiting charcoal grills in city parks, and limiting the use of shelters or tents in city parks; providing a savings clause; providing for the repeal of any conflicting provisions; and providing an effective date.

8. Resolution 2017-79R, approving an Airport Advertising Agreement with Clear Channel Airports for advertisement created by the San Marcos Convention and Visitor Bureau to be displayed at the Austin Bergstrom International Airport; authorizing the City Manager to execute the airport advertising agreement; and declaring an effective date.

9. Resolution 2017-80R, approving the procurement of two Nimble Storage Array Systems for the City’s Information Technology Department from Freeit Data Solutions, Inc. in the total amount of $374,605.63 through the Texas Comptroller of Public Account’s Department of Information Resources Program (contract DIR-TSO-2716) for data storage products and related services; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute the appropriate purchasing documents on behalf of the City and declaring an effective date.

10. Resolution 2017-81R, approving the procurement of a Dell Blade Server Chassis from Dell, Inc. in the total amount of $66,574.01 through the Texas Comptroller of Public Account’s Department of Information Resources Program (contract DIR-SDD-1951) for Dell Branded Manufacturer Hardware, Software and Related Products; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute the appropriate purchasing documents on behalf of the City and declaring an effective date.

11. Resolution 2017-82R, approving the award of a construction contract to Rockin Q Construction, LLC for the Reclaimed Water Expansion Project - Pipeline (IFB 217-165) in the amount of $5,076,273.00 contingent upon the contractor’s timely submission of sufficient bonds and insurance in accordance with the City’s construction contract documents for the project; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute all contract documents on behalf of the City and declaring an effective date.

12. Change in Service #4 in the not to exceed amount of $184,753.00 to Espey Consultants, dba RPS for the Comprehensive Watershed Master Plan.


NON-CONSENT AGENDA

14. Ordinance 2017-22, on the first of two readings, authorizing the installation of speed cushions in both directions in the 400 through 600 blocks of Candlelight Lane.
15. Ordinance 2017-23, on first and final reading as allowed by Section 1201.028 of the Texas Government Code, authorizing the issuance and sale of City of San Marcos, Texas, Waterworks and Waste Water System Revenue Bonds, series 2017a in the amount of $4,760,000; providing for the security for and payment of said bonds; prescribing the form of said bonds; awarding the sale thereof; approving the Private Placement Memorandum; enacting other provisions relating to the subject.

16. Ordinance 2017-24, on first and final reading as allowed by Section 1201.028 of the Texas Government Code, authorizing the issuance and sale of City of San Marcos, Texas, Waterworks And Waste Water System Revenue Bonds, Series 2017B in the amount of $1,000,000; providing for the security for and payment of said bonds; prescribing the form of said bonds; awarding the sale thereof; approving the Private Placement Memorandum; enacting other provisions relating to the subject.

17. Ordinance 2017-25, on the first of two readings, creating a two-hour parking restriction in the general area of downtown San Marcos as authorized by Section 82.160 of the San Marcos City Code and amending the traffic register to reflect such parking restriction; and including procedural provisions.

18. Ordinance 2017-26, on the first of two readings, amending Chapter 82 of the City of San Marcos Code of Ordinances to create a new section 82.190 establishing a downtown employee parking permit program; and providing an effective date.

19. Ordinance 2017-27, on the first of two readings, establishing four downtown employee parking by permit only areas at the periphery of downtown pursuant to Section 82.190 of the San Marcos City Code; amending the traffic register to reflect such parking areas; and providing an effective date.

20. Resolution 2017-83R, approving a principal forgiveness agreement with the Texas Water Development Board that forgives an amount not to exceed $685,839 out of $5,445,839 in principal funds to the city from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to finance the construction of certain Wastewater System Improvements; authorizing the city manager or mayor to execute said agreement on behalf of the city; and declaring an effective date.

21. Resolution 2017-84R, approving a principal forgiveness agreement with the Texas Water Development Board that forgives an amount not to exceed $961,821 out of $1,961,821 in principal funds to the city from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to finance the planning, acquisition and design of certain wastewater system improvements; authorizing the Interim City Manager or mayor to execute said agreement on behalf of the City; and declaring an effective date.

22. Appointment to fill vacancies on the Zoning Board of Adjustments.

23. Appointment to fill a vacancy on Senior Citizen Advisory Board.
The Council received Staff briefings and held discussion regarding items on the agenda for the May 2, 2017 Regular City Council Meeting, to wit Items (3-23).

Item #11 Staff will add background about the cost sharing with Texas State University.

Item #15 Staff will create a comprehensive list of all flood resiliency related bonds and grants.

Item #17 Staff will provide Council with the Jonathan Edwards Study that was conducted in the late 90's, and the Downtown Parking Committee's Off Street Parking Information Report.

Item #18 Staff will add an overlay showing all the different districts that are downtown to the downtown parking maps.

III. Question and Answer Session with Press and Public.

None.

IV. Adjournment.

Mayor Pro Tem Hughson adjourned the packet meeting of the San Marcos City Council at 12:49 p.m.

Jamie Lee Case, City Clerk                                          Jane Hughson, Mayor Pro Tem
630 E. Hopkins - Transportation Master Plan Workshop

I. Call To Order

With a quorum present, the Transportation Master Plan Workshop of the San Marcos City Council was called to order by Mayor Thomaides at 4:04 p.m. Tuesday, May 2, 2017 in the City Council Chambers, 630 E. Hopkins, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Mayor John Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Jane Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Lisa Prewitt, Council Member Ed Mihalkanin, Council Member Scott Gregson, Council Member Melissa Derrick and Angie Ramirez

Absent: 1 - Council Member Saul Gonzales

1. Receive a staff presentation on Transportation Master Plan progress and next steps, and provide direction to Staff

Rohit Vij, Senior Engineer introduced Rashed Islam, Vice President of HDR Engineering, Inc who provided the Council with the presentation.

Mr. Islam provided the City Council with an overview of what the presentation would be covering. He reviewed the Transportation Master Plan Goals: Develop a multimodal transportation system, Obtain “Bicycle Friendly Community” designation, Implement a Complete Streets policy, and integrate the transportation system by coordinating with all related public entities, including, but not limited to, CAMPO, the counties, TxDOT, the University, and the rail district.

He provided the Transportation Master Plan update process and how it is used to expand the Thoroughfare Map to support the Comprehensive Plan and connect Intensity Zones. He reviewed the Thoroughfare Prioritization. Mr. Islam provided information regarding bike facilities and the desire for these facilities within the community.

Jim Adams, HDR Engineering, provided the Council with an update regarding Greenways. He stated that they have worked with the Greenbelt Alliance on developing this plan. He reviewed where various types of Greenways.
Discussion was held regarding the various types of material used to construct trails. HDR staff will to look into the use of pervious concrete in Greenways.

Mr. Islam provided an update regarding the public response and stated that 50 people participated in the survey and reviewed the results.

Staff to provide how many parking spaces we lose on Hopkins with the downtown enhancements with the conversion from angled parking to parallel parking as shown. Staff will work with Council to determine the best options for the downtown enhancements and the bike infrastructure. He reviewed the short-term roadways enhancements.

Mayor Pro Tem Hughson recused herself from the Craddick extension conversation, and exited the Council Chambers. Mr. Islam provided the public response to the Craddick Extension.

Discussion was held regarding coordinating with Texas State to ensure that their buses are able to navigate intersections.

Staff will bring this item back in June for further direction and hope to have it on an agenda for consideration by July. Council was asked to send questions or concerns to Staff so that they can be addressed. Staff will provide costs of Craddick Extension.

Present: 6 - Mayor John Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Jane Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Lisa Prewitt, Council Member Ed Mihalkanin, Council Member Scott Gregson and Council Member Melissa Derrick

Absent: 1 - Council Member Saul Gonzales

VI. Question and Answer Session with Press and Public.

None.

VII. Adjournment.

Mayor Thomaides adjourned the Transportation Master Plan Workshop of the San Marcos City Council at 5:06 p.m.
I. Call To Order

With a quorum present, the regular meeting of the San Marcos City Council was called to order by Mayor Thomaides at 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 2, 2017 in the City Council Chambers, 630 E. Hopkins, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Mayor John Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Jane Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Lisa Prewitt, Council Member Ed Mihalkanin, Council Member Saul Gonzales, Council Member Scott Gregson and Council Member Melissa Derrick

III. Invocation

Pastor Jarrell Sharp from First United Methodist-San Marcos provided this evening’s invocation.

IV. Pledges Of Allegiance - United States And Texas

Travis Alvarez, a 2nd grade student, from Texas Prepratory School, led the Assembly in the Pledges of Allegiance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. 5:30PM Executive Session in accordance with Section § 551.072 of the Texas Government Code - Real Property: Discuss possible acquisition of certain real property interests from Crystal Clear SUD.

   A motion was made by Council Member Gregson, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, to enter closed session at 5:35 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

   For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

   Against: 0

2. Consider adoption or direction to Staff on matters discussed in Executive Session.

   Council reconvened into regular session at 6:05 p.m. and provided direction to
staff in Executive Session.

PRESENTATIONS

3. Receive a Staff presentation and hold discussion regarding back-in parking on Edward Gary, and the process for future locations, and provide direction to Staff.

Collette Jamison, Assistant City Manager, provided the Council with an overview of the direction that is being requested regarding back-in parking on Edward Gary in front of The Local, and the process for future locations. Council Member Mihalkanin stated for the records that just because he is in favor of maintaining the back-in parking on the plan submitted by Mr. Carson does not mean that he is in favor of back-in parking in the downtown. Council direction was to move forward with back-in parking on Edward Gary as requested. Staff will bring back a review after a year from the time of construction to reevaluate the back-in parking on Edward Gary. Discussion was held regarding bike infrastructure plans and the preference of back-in parking in those areas. Council Members Hughson and Mihalkanin requested that a discussion come back regarding the one-way/two-way conversion on Guadalupe and LBJ at a future meeting.

6:00 PM

V. 30 Minute Citizen Comment Period

Chris Rue, Downtown Association President, asked that all downtown parking items be postponed until the second meeting in June to allow the Executive Board the time to review the ordinances and to weigh in. They plan to open up the dialogue with Texas State regarding the use of the parking garage, and they would like to contact downtown property owners of underutilized lots to see if they can work together on the issue. He thanked the City for the help.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Council Member Gregson, seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of item #6 which was pulled and considered separately. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 0

4. Consider approval, by motion, of the following meeting Minutes:
   A) April 14, 2017 - Packet Meeting
B) April 18, 2017 - Regular Meeting

5. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-19, on the second of two readings, amending the term limit of key constituency representatives in Chapter 2, Article 3, Division 24, Section 2.370.26, San Marcos Commission on Children and Youth; including procedural provisions; and providing an effective date.

6. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-20, on the second of two readings, amending Chapter 2, Article 5, Code of Ethics, of the San Marcos City Code; requiring updating of Financial Disclosure Forms; requiring Financial Disclosure Forms to be filed by members of temporary boards, commissions, subcommittees or similar groups; and providing an effective date.

A motion was made by Council Member Mihalkanin, seconded by Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, to postpone Ordinance 2017-20 to the June 6, 2017 Regular City Council Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 0

7. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-21, on the second of two readings, amending Chapter 58 of the San Marcos City Code regarding Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation by eliminating the requirement of a verbal warning before issuance of citations for public display or consumption of alcoholic beverages in city parks, prohibiting charcoal grills in city parks, and limiting the use of shelters or tents in city parks; providing a savings clause; providing for the repeal of any conflicting provisions; and providing an effective date.

8. Consider approval of Resolution 2017-79R, approving an Airport Advertising Agreement with Clear Channel Airports for advertisement created by the San Marcos Convention and Visitor Bureau to be displayed at the Austin Bergstrom International Airport; authorizing the City Manager to execute the airport advertising agreement; and declaring an effective date.

9. Consider approval of Resolution 2017-80R, approving the procurement of two Nimble Storage Array Systems for the City’s Information Technology Department from Freeit Data Solutions, Inc. in the total amount of $374,605.63 through the Texas Comptroller of Public Account’s Department of Information Resources Program (contract dir-tso-2716) for data storage products and related services; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute the appropriate purchasing documents on behalf of the City and declaring an effective date.

10. Consider approval of Resolution 2017-81R, approving the procurement of a Dell Blade Server Chassis from Dell, Inc. in the total amount of $66,574.01 through the Texas Comptroller of Public Account’s Department of Information Resources Program (contract DIR- SDD-1951) for Dell Branded Manufacturer Hardware, Software and Related Products; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute the
appropriate purchasing documents on behalf of the City and declaring an effective date.

11. Consider approval of Resolution 2017-82R, approving the award of a construction contract to Rockin Q Construction, LLC for the Reclaimed Water Expansion Project - Pipeline (IFB 217-165) in the amount of $5,076,273.00 contingent upon the contractor’s timely submission of sufficient bonds and insurance in accordance with the City’s construction contract documents for the project; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute all contract documents on behalf of the City and declaring an effective date.

12. Consider approval, by motion, of Change in Service #4 in the not to exceed amount of $184,753.00 to Espey Consultants, dba RPS for the Comprehensive Watershed Master Plan.

13. Receipt of the Planning and Zoning Commission’s recommended 10 Year Capital Improvement Plan for FY2018-2027

PUBLIC HEARINGS - 7:00 PM

14. 7:00PM Receive a Staff presentation and hold a Public Hearing to receive comments for or against Ordinance 2017-27, creating four Downtown Employee Permit Parking Areas under section 82.190 of the San Marcos City Code allowing parking by permit only From 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, on certain portions of Moon Street, South Edward Gary Street, Comal Street, Centre Street, and Pat Garrison Street; amending the Traffic Register to reflect such parking areas; and providing for an effective date; and consider approval of Ordinance 2017-27, on the first of two readings.

Kevin Burke, provided the Council with an overview of the creation of four Downtown Employee Permit Parking Areas.

Mayor Thomaides opened the Public Hearing at 7:14 p.m.

Dianne Wassenich, 11 Tanglewood, thanked the Council for looking at this. She asked about a scenario where you have five employees per shift, and you have five permits for use, but they do not always work at the same time. How do you track 15 people at once?

There being no further comments, Mayor Thomaides closed the Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Discussion was held regarding parking on Centre Street in front of the two churches and reevaluating the use of Centre Street for parking. Staff to provide the street width of Centre Street, Pat Garrison, Comal and the other streets. Discussion was held about previous requests from downtown business
owners requesting this program. Discussion was held regarding the License Plate Recognition (LPR) program and getting it online timely. Discussion was held regarding the need for an employee parking lot and offering electric bus service. Discussion was held regarding the cost to the City to identify those are parking spaces. Staff to bring a cost for striping and signs for second reading. Discussion was held regarding allowing the downtown businesses via the Downtown Business Association to weigh in on the program. Discussion was held regarding holding off on second reading until they can have a thorough discussion regarding License Plate Recognition (LPR) and its implementation. Discussion was held regarding the education period of LPR.

A motion was made by Council Member Mihalkanin, seconded by Council Member Derrick, that Ordinance 2017-27 be postponed until the second meeting in June. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales and Council Member Derrick

Against: 2 - Mayor Thomaides and Council Member Gregson

NON-CONSENT AGENDA

15. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-22, on the first of two readings, authorizing the installation of speed cushions in both directions in the 500 through 600 blocks of Candlelight Lane (from Del Sol Drive to Broadway Street); and including procedural provisions.

A motion was made by Council Member Mihalkanin, seconded by Council Member Derrick, to approve Ordinance 2017-22, on the first of two readings. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 0

16. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-23, on first and final reading as allowed by Section 1201.028 of the Texas Government Code, authorizing the issuance and sale of City of San Marcos, Texas, Waterworks and Waste Water System Revenue Bonds, series 2017a in the amount of $4,760,000; providing for the security for and payment of said bonds; prescribing the form of said bonds; awarding the sale thereof; approving the Private Placement Memorandum; enacting other provisions relating to the subject.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, seconded by Council Member Mihalkanin, to approve Ordinance 2017-23, on the first and final
reading. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 0

17. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-24, on first and final reading as allowed by Section 1201.028 of the Texas Government Code, authorizing the issuance and sale of City of San Marcos, Texas, Waterworks And Waste Water System Revenue Bonds, Series 2017B in the amount of $1,000,000; providing for the security for and payment of said bonds; prescribing the form of said bonds; awarding the sale thereof; approving the Private Placement Memorandum; enacting other provisions relating to the subject.

A motion was made by Council Member Gregson, seconded by Council Member Mihalkanin, to approve Ordinance 2017-24, on the first and final reading. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 0

18. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-25, on the first of two readings, creating a two-hour parking restriction between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday in the general area of downtown San Marcos as authorized by Section 82.160 of the San Marcos City Code and amending the traffic register to reflect such parking restriction; and including procedural provisions.

A motion was made by Council Member Mihalkanin, seconded by Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, to postpone Ordinance 2017-25 to the June 20, 2017 Regular City Council Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 6 - Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 1 - Mayor Thomaides

19. Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-26, on the first of two readings, amending Chapter 82 of the City of San Marcos Code of Ordinances to create a new Section 82.190 establishing a Downtown Employee Parking Permit Program; and providing an effective date.

A motion was made by Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, seconded by Council Member Mihalkanin, to postpone Ordinance 2017-26 to the June 20, 2017 Regular City Council Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales and Council Member Derrick
Consider approval of Resolution 2017-83R, approving a principal forgiveness agreement with the Texas Water Development Board that forgives an amount not to exceed $685,839 out of $5,445,839 in principal funds to the city from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to finance the construction of certain Wastewater System Improvements; authorizing the city manager or mayor to execute said agreement on behalf of the city; and declaring an effective date.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, seconded by Council Member Gregson, to approve Resolution 2017-83R. The motion carried by the following vote:

**For:** 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

**Against:** 0

Consider approval of Resolution 2017-84R, approving a principal forgiveness agreement with the Texas Water Development Board that forgives an amount not to exceed $961,821 out of $1,961,821 in principal funds to the city from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to finance the planning, acquisition and design of certain wastewater system improvements; authorizing the Interim City Manager or mayor to execute said agreement on behalf of the City; and declaring an effective date.

A motion was made by Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, seconded by Council Member Gregson, to approve Resolution 2017-84R. The motion carried by the following vote:

**For:** 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

**Against:** 0

Discuss and consider an appointment to fill vacancies on the Zoning Board of Adjustments, and provide direction to Staff.

The following applicants were nominated for consideration to serve on the Zoning Board of Adjustments:

Lisa Spencer - Nominated by Council Member Derrick
Gary Gooch - Nominated by Council Member Pewitt
Rick Henderson - Nominated by Council Member Prewitt

Following a roll call vote Rick Henderson, with a term ending February 28, 2019, and Gary Gooch, with a term ending February 28, 2018, received the majority of votes and were approved for appointment to the Zoning Board of Adjustments.
23. Discuss and consider an appointment to fill a vacancy on Senior Citizen Advisory Board, and provide direction to Staff.

A motion was made by Council Member Gregson, seconded by Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, to approve the appointment of Wayne Schurter to the Senior Citizen Advisory Board. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Mayor Thomaides, Mayor Pro-Tem Hughson, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt, Council Member Mihalkanin, Council Member Gonzales, Council Member Gregson and Council Member Derrick

Against: 0

VI. Question and Answer Session with Press and Public.

None.

VII. Adjournment.

Mayor Thomaides adjourned the regular meeting of the San Marcos City Council at 8:12 p.m.

POSTED ON THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2017 AT 11:15AM

JAMIE LEE CASE, CITY CLERK

Notice of Assistance at the Public Meetings

The City of San Marcos does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to its services, programs, or activities. Individuals who require auxiliary aids and services for this meeting should contact the City of San Marcos ADA Coordinator at 512-393-8000 (voice) or call Texas Relay Service (TRS) by dialing 7-1-1. Requests can also be faxed to 855-461-6674 or sent by e-mail to ADArequest@sanmarcostx.gov
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-22, on the second of two readings, authorizing the installation of speed cushions in both directions in the 500 through 600 blocks of Candlelight Lane (from Del Sol Drive to Broadway Street); and including procedural provisions.

Meeting date:  May 2, 2017 - 1st Reading
May 16, 2017 - 2nd Reading

Department:  Public Services - Transportation Division

Funds Required:  $3,000
Account Number:  10006147.53091
Funds Available:  $11,760
Account Name:  Traffic Pavement Marking

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:  Beautify and Enhance the Quality of Place

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s):  A safe well-coordinated transportation system implemented in an environmentally sensitive manner.

BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to Section 82.066 of the City Code, all regulatory signs where the authority to install is not specifically delegated to the traffic engineer requires approval from City Council.

Candlelight Lane is a two-way residential street with on street parking from Del Sol Drive to Broadway Street.  Local residents submitted a petition for installing speed cushions on Candlelight Lane from Del Sol Drive to Broadway Street.  The petition included 16 addresses supporting the installation and 4 addresses without a response.  The current speed limit on Candlelight is 25 mph.  In the past 3 years, no accidents have been reported on Candlelight Lane.  Based on a traffic study conducted in April 2016, the eighty-five percentile traffic speed on Candlelight Lane is 28.3 mph on weekdays and 27.6 mph on weekend.  The 85th-percentile speeds on Candlelight are less than the Transportation Division warranted speed of $\geq$ 5 mph over the speed limit.
The approximate cost for installation is $3,000.
ORDINANCE NO. ____________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS AUTHORIZING THE INSTALLATION OF SPEED CUSHIONS IN BOTH DIRECTIONS IN THE 500 THROUGH 600 BLOCKS OF CANDLELIGHT LANE (FROM DEL SOL DRIVE TO BROADWAY); AND INCLUDING PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS.

RECITALS:

1. Candlelight Lane is a two-way residential street. A traffic study indicates that the 85th percentile speed in the 500 to 600 blocks of Candlelight Lane is 28.3 miles per hour on weekdays and 27.6 miles per hour on weekends, both of which are in excess of the posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour.

2. Such traffic conditions are not safe for residents and residents have petitioned the City to install speed cushions on said blocks of Candlelight Lane.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

SECTION 1. The Recitals are hereby found to be true and correct and are adopted as the findings of the City Council.

SECTION 2. Pursuant to Section 82.066 of the San Marcos Code, on the basis of such findings, the City Council hereby authorizes the installation of speed cushions in the 500 to 600 blocks of Candlelight Lane (from Del Sol Drive to Broadway Drive).

SECTION 3. The installation of signs providing notice of the presence of the speed cushions is also hereby authorized.

SECTION 4. If any word, phrase, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance is held to be unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the other provisions of this ordinance will continue in force if they can be given effect without the invalid portion.

SECTION 5. All ordinances and resolutions or parts of ordinances or resolutions in conflict with this ordinance are repealed.

SECTION 6. This ordinance shall be effective upon its adoption on second reading.

PASSED AND APPROVED on first reading on May 2, 2017.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on second reading on May 16, 2017.
John Thomaides
Mayor

Attest: 

Approved: 

Jamie Lee Case
City Clerk

Michael Cosentino
City Attorney
TRAFFIC CALMING SURVEY

The City of San Marcos has received a request to install speed humps or rumble strips at the location described below. This survey serves to assess neighborhood/business consent of the proposed traffic calming measure. This survey will be used in conjunction with other City evaluations to assess the feasibility of this restriction or variation thereof. The results of this survey do not guarantee the installation of the traffic calming measure.

Street Name (for Restriction): Candieight Ln (e.g. N. LBJ Drive)
Block No.(s) (for Restriction): (e.g. 500 block, 100 - 300 block, etc.)
Suggested Traffic Calming Measure: speed humps (e.g. speed humps, rumble strips, diverter, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (print)</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>APPROVE Speed Humps (check one)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope Weddow</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>518 Candieight Ln</td>
<td>(512) 832-1595</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DElia S. Lucio</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>516 Candieight Lane</td>
<td>(512) 738-6113</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estella Enriquez</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>514 Candieight Lane</td>
<td>(512) 353-0349</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Moreno</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>517 Candieight Lane</td>
<td>(512) 878-8526</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Gonzalez</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>504 Candieight Lane</td>
<td>(512) 396-4631</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Peralta</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>513 Candieight Lane</td>
<td>(512) 353-578</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose A. Lucio</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>516 Candieight Lane</td>
<td>(512) 738-6113</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Contact: ____________________________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________________________________

Phone: ____________________________________________________________________________________

Please Return to: Cristoval Gonzalez, Engineering Tech III
City of San Marcos, Public Services – Transportation
512-393-8135
The City of San Marcos has received a request to install speed humps or rumble strips at the location described below. This survey serves to assess neighborhood/business consent of the proposed traffic calming measure. This survey will be used in conjunction with other City evaluations to assess the feasibility of this restriction or variation thereof. The results of this survey do not guarantee the installation of the traffic calming measure.

Street Name (for Restriction): Candlelight Ln
Block No.(s) (for Restriction): (e.g. 500 block, 100 – 300 block, etc.)
Suggested Traffic Calming Measure: speed humps
(e.g. speed humps, rumble strips, diverter, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (print)</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>APPROVE Speed Humps</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICKY SANCHEZ</td>
<td>RESIDENT</td>
<td>521 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-353-8416</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudela Amended</td>
<td>Resident Retired</td>
<td>512 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-754-0408</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia Noreia</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>512 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-878-1575</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Weidman</td>
<td>RESIDENT</td>
<td>513 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-749-6085</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMollester</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>408 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-394-3244</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Hernandez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>507 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-353-0481</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Contact: Cristoval Gonzalez, Engineering Tech III
Address: City of San Marcos, Public Services – Transportation
Phone: 512-393-8135
### TRAFFIC CALMING SURVEY

The City of San Marcos has received a request to install speed humps or rumble strips at the location described below. This survey serves to assess neighborhood/business consent of the proposed traffic calming measure. This survey will be used in conjunction with other City evaluations to assess the feasibility of this restriction or variation thereof. The results of this survey do not guarantee the installation of the traffic calming measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name (for Restriction:)</th>
<th>Candlelight Ln</th>
<th>(e.g. N. LBJ Drive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block No.(s) (for Restriction:)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. 500 block, 100 – 300 block, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Traffic Calming Measure:</td>
<td>speed humps</td>
<td>(e.g. speed humps, rumble strips, diverter, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (print)</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>APPROVE</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Rodriguez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>501 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-718-3425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graciela Rosas</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>503 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-676-530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sanchez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>508 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-557-2611</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Martinez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>515 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-393-1153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Villalpando</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>519 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-270-6726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sanchez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>521 Candlelight Lane</td>
<td>512-751-0417</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Contact: Cristoval Gonzalez, Engineering Tech III  
City of San Marcos, Public Services – Transportation  
512-393-8135
Candlelight Speed Cushion Map

Property supports the petition
Property has no response to the petition
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval of Resolution 2017-85R, approving amendments to the original Interlocal Cooperation agreement that established the Austin Regional Intelligence Center and the Interlocal Cooperation agreement for sustainment funding for the Austin Regional Intelligence Center, the purposes of each amendment being to add three new partner agencies to the agreements and to authorize the City of Austin to enter into collateral agreements with certain non-governmental entities that would enable such entities to become partners in the intelligence center; authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute both amendments on behalf of the City; and declaring an effective date.

Meeting date:  May 16, 2017

Department:  Police

Funds Required:  N/A
Account Number:  N/A
Funds Available:  N/A
Account Name:  N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:
Provide for the Efficient and Effective Delivery of Services

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s):  N/A

BACKGROUND:
The Austin City Council recently approved amendments to the Interlocal agreements that established and fund the Austin Regional Intelligence Center (ARIC) to add three new law enforcement agency partners to ARIC. In order to complete the process of including these new agencies as ARIC partners, it is required that the governing bodies of all current partners also approve these amendments. New wording is also added to the original agreement via this amendment that would allow private entities which employ full time peace officers the ability to join and contribute to ARIC. The San Marcos Police Department is one of the original member agencies of ARIC. The new entities that are being added are the City of Sunset Valley, Bastrop and Manor.

As a member agency of ARIC, the San Marcos Police Department is able to share and utilize crime information at the regional level which improves the ability of the organization to detect and deter criminal behavior in San Marcos.
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE ORIGINAL INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT THAT ESTABLISHED THE AUSTIN REGIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER AND THE INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR SUSTAINMENT FUNDING FOR THE AUSTIN REGIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER, THE PURPOSES OF EACH AMENDMENT BEING TO ADD THREE NEW PARTNER AGENCIES TO THE AGREEMENTS AND TO AUTHORIZE THE CITY OF AUSTIN TO ENTER INTO COLLATERAL AGREEMENTS WITH CERTAIN NON-GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES THAT WOULD ENABLE SUCH ENTITIES TO BECOME PARTNERS IN THE INTELLIGENCE CENTER; AUTHORIZING THE INTERIM CITY MANAGER OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE BOTH AMENDMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY; AND DECLARING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

PART 1. The attached Amendment Two to Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for the Austin Regional Intelligence Center and Amendment Two to Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for Sustainment Funding for the Austin Regional Intelligence Center (the “Amendments”) are approved.

PART 2. The Interim City Manager, or his designee, is authorized to execute the Amendments on behalf of the City.

PART 3. This resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately from and after its adoption.

ADOPTED on May 16, 2017.

John Thomaides
Mayor

Attest:

Jamie Lee Case
City Clerk
AMENDMENT TWO TO INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR THE

AUSTIN REGIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER (ARIC)

This Amendment Two to the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for the Austin Regional Intelligence Center (ARIC) is made and entered by and between the following parties:

City of Austin on behalf of its Police Department,
Austin Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Georgetown on behalf of its Police Department,
Hays County through Hays County Sheriff’s Office,
City of Pflugerville on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Round Rock on behalf of its Police Department,
City of San Marcos on behalf of its Police Department,
Travis County through Travis County Sheriff’s Office,
University of Texas Austin Community College on behalf of its Police Department,
Williamson County through Williamson County Sheriff’s Office,
Austin Community College on behalf of its Police Department
Texas State University on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Cedar Park on behalf of its Police Department,
Pflugerville Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Kyle through its Police Department, and
City of Buda on behalf of its Police Department.

(Collectively referred to as the “Current Partner Agencies” in this Amendment).

And

City of Sunset Valley on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Manor on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Bastrop on behalf of its Police Department.

(Collectively referred to as the “New Partner Agencies” in this Amendment).

Collectively, the Current Partner Agencies and the New Partner Agencies are referred to as “Partner Agencies.”
REQUITALS

ARIC is a collaborative effort of public safety agencies in Hays, Travis and Williamson Counties. Current Partner Agencies work together to provide resources, expertise, and information to the ARIC. ARIC focuses on regional public safety data analysis. The mission of ARIC is to maximize the ability to detect, prevent, apprehend, and respond to criminal and terrorist activity.

During the summer and fall of 2010, each of the original 10 Partner Agencies’ governing bodies ("Original Partner Agencies") approved an interlocal cooperation agreement that established and outlined the intent of the Original Partner Agencies to centralize efforts and co-locate certain intelligence operations (Original ARIC Agreement). Further, the Original ARIC Agreement established a framework for the organization of the ARIC. The Original ARIC Agreement set out a common understanding of the policies and procedures that the ARIC currently follows in providing criminal intelligence and coordination of law enforcement service to the citizens in the Austin-Round Rock metropolitan area.

During the summer and fall of 2012, each of the Original Partner Agencies’ governing bodies approved a second Interlocal Cooperation Agreement that established a funding mechanism to sustain the operations of the ARIC (ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement).

Section XIII of the Original ARIC Agreement and section seven of the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement permit these agreements to be amended to add additional partner agencies. Upon approval of an amendment adding a new partner agency or agencies by the Partner Agencies’ governing bodies, each New Partner Agency must execute a Counterpart Original ARIC Agreement and a Counterpart ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement.

The two purposes of this Amendment Two to the Original ARIC Agreement are to add the New Partner Agencies to the Original ARIC Agreement and to authorize the City of Austin to enter into separate collateral agreements with non-governmental entities, as necessary, to provide these non-governmental entities with obligations and benefits equivalent to Partner Agencies.
Legal authority for amending and entering into these Agreements by the Current Partner Agencies and New Partner Agencies is found in the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Texas Government Code Chapter 791 and the Interagency Cooperation Act, Texas Government Code Chapter 771.

NOW, THEREFORE, the New Partner Agencies agree to adopt and be bound by the Original ARIC Agreement as amended by Amendment One. A copy of the fully executed Original ARIC Agreement is attached to this Amendment, and a single executed counterpart copy of Amendment One, which was executed in multiple counterparts, is also attached to this Amendment.

The Partner Agencies all agree to amend the Original ARIC Agreement as amended by Amendment One as follows:

**AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL ARIC AGREEMENT**

### 1.0 LIST OF PARTIES

The list of parties at the beginning of the Original ARIC Agreement is deleted and the following is substituted in its place:

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement (the Agreement) is made and entered by and between City of Austin on behalf of its Police Department, Austin Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department, City of Georgetown on behalf of its Police Department, Hays County through Hays County Sheriff's Office, City of Pflugerville on behalf of its Police Department, City of Round Rock on behalf of its Police Department, City of San Marcos on behalf of its Police Department, Travis County through Travis County Sheriff's Office, University of Texas on behalf of its Police Department, Williamson County through Williamson County Sheriff's Office, Austin Community College on behalf of its Police Department, Texas State University on behalf of its Police Department, City of Cedar Park on behalf of its Police Department, Pflugerville Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department, City of Kyle on behalf of its Police Department, City of Buda on behalf of its Police Department, City of Sunset Valley on behalf of its Police Department, City of Manor on behalf of its Police Department, and the City of Bastrop on behalf of its Police Department.

### 2.0 XIII AMENDMENTS
Section XIII (Amendments) of the Original ARIC Agreement is amended by adding subsection C to read as follows:

C. The City of Austin is authorized to enter into separate collateral agreements, as necessary, to allow agencies that are not state agencies, local governments, or other agencies that are authorized to contract with each other under Chapters 771 and 791 of the Government Code (non-governmental agencies) to assume obligations and receive benefits equivalent to Partner Agencies (Partner Equivalent Agencies). To qualify for consideration to become a Partner Equivalent Agency, a nongovernmental agency must utilize a full-service law enforcement component that employs police officers licensed by the State of Texas and vested with full law enforcement powers and responsibilities. Before any non-governmental agency becomes a Partner Equivalent Agency, that nongovernmental agency must first be agreed upon by a majority of the Executive Board, with approval by the Chair. Upon approval by the Executive Board and Chair, the approved non-governmental agency is recommended to the City of Austin City Council which must approve each agreement to create a Partner Equivalent Agency before any approved non-governmental agency seeking to become a Partner Equivalent Agency may be offered that agreement. Such an agreement must include the same terms of understanding contained in the Original ARIC Agreement in substantially the same format as the Original ARIC Agreement (Partner Equivalent Agreement). To complete the transaction, the approved nongovernmental agency and the City of Austin must execute the Partner Equivalent Agency Agreement.

3.0 XX NOTICE

Section XX (Notice) of the Original ARIC Agreement is amended by adding subsection F to read as follows:

F. Notices pursuant to this Interlocal Agreement after this amendment becomes effective, shall also be delivered or sent to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Sunset Valley</th>
<th>City of Manor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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City of Bastrop


4.0 EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS AMENDMENT

This Amendment is effective when it has been approved by the governing body of each and every Partner Agency and executed by their authorized representatives.

CITY OF AUSTIN on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: 2/21/17

Rey Arellano, Assistant City Manager

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: _____________

________________________________________

CITY OF GEORGETOWN on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: _____________

________________________________________

HAYS COUNTY through the HAYS COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

By: ___________________________ Date: _____________

________________________________________
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CITY OF ROUND ROCK on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ______________

____________________________________

CITY OF SAN MARCOS on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ______________

____________________________________

TRAVIS COUNTY through the TRAVIS COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

By: ____________________________ Date: ______________

____________________________________

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ______________

____________________________________

WILLIAMSON COUNTY through the WILLIAMSON COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

By: ____________________________ Date: ______________

____________________________________
CITY OF PFLUGERVILLE on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: ________________

______________________________________________

AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: ________________

______________________________________________

TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: ________________

______________________________________________

CITY OF CEDAR PARK on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: ________________

______________________________________________

PFLUGERVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: ________________

______________________________________________
CITY OF KYLE on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: ________________

CITY OF BUDA on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: ________________

CITY OF SUNSET VALLEY on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: ________________

CITY OF MANOR on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: ________________

CITY OF BASTROP on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: ________________
AMENDMENT TWO TO INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR
SUSTAINMENT FUNDING FOR THE

AUSTIN REGIONAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER (ARIC)

This Amendment Two to the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for Sustainment Funding for the Austin Regional Intelligence Center (ARIC) is made and entered by and between the following parties:

City of Austin on behalf of its Police Department,
Austin Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Georgetown on behalf of its Police Department,
Hays County through Hays County Sheriff’s Office,
City of Pflugerville on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Round Rock on behalf of its Police Department,
City of San Marcos on behalf of its Police Department,
Travis County through Travis County Sheriff’s Office,
University of Texas on behalf of its Police Department,
Williamson County through Williamson County Sheriff’s Office,
Austin Community College on behalf of its Police Department,
Texas State University on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Cedar Park on behalf of its Police Department,
Pflugerville Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Kyle on behalf of its Police Department, and
City of Buda on behalf of its Police Department.
(Collectively referred to as the “Current Partner Agencies” in this Amendment)

And

City of Sunset Valley on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Manor on behalf of its Police Department,
City of Bastrop on behalf of its Police Department.
(Collectively referred to as the “New Partner Agencies” in this Amendment).
Collectively, the Current Partner Agencies and the New Partner Agencies are referred to as “Partner Agencies.”

**RECITALS**

The ARIC is a collaborative effort of public safety agencies in Hays, Travis and Williamson Counties. Current Partner Agencies work together to provide resources, expertise, and information to the Center. ARIC focuses on regional public safety data analysis. The mission of ARIC is to maximize the ability to detect, prevent, apprehend, and respond to criminal and terrorist activity.

During the summer and fall of 2010, each of the original 10 Partner Agencies’ governing bodies (“Original Partner Agencies”) approved an interlocal cooperation agreement that established and outlined the intent of the Original Partner Agencies to centralize efforts and co-locate certain intelligence operations (Original ARIC Agreement). Further, the Original ARIC Agreement established a framework for the organization of the ARIC. The Original ARIC Agreement set out a common understanding of the policies and procedures that the ARIC currently follows in providing criminal intelligence and coordination of law enforcement service to the citizens in the Austin-Round Rock metropolitan area.

During the summer and fall of 2012, each of the Original Partner Agencies’ governing bodies approved a second interlocal cooperation agreement that established a funding mechanism to sustain the operations of ARIC (ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement).

Section XIII of the Original ARIC Agreement and section seven of the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement permit those agreements to be amended to add additional partner agencies. Upon approval of an amendment adding a new partner agency or agencies by the Partner Agencies’ governing bodies, each New Partner Agency must execute a Counterpart Original ARIC Agreement and a Counterpart ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement.
The two purposes of this Amendment Two to the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement are to add the New Partner Agencies to the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement and to authorize the City of Austin to enter into separate collateral agreements with non-governmental entities, as necessary, to provide these non-governmental entities with obligations and benefits equivalent to Partner Agencies.

Legal authority for amending and entering into these agreements by the Current Partner Agencies and New Partner Agencies is found in the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Texas Government Code Chapter 791 and the Interagency Cooperation Act, Texas Government Code Chapter 771.

NOW, THEREFORE, the New Partner Agencies agree to adopt and be bound by the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement as amended by Amendment One. A copy of the fully executed ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement is attached to this Amendment, and a single executed counterpart copy of Amendment One, which was executed in multiple counterparts, is also attached to this Amendment.

The Partner Agencies all agree to amend the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement as amended by Amendment One as follows:

AMENDMENT TO ARIC SUSTAINMENT FUNDING AGREEMENT

1.0 LIST OF PARTIES

The list of parties at the beginning of the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement is deleted and the following is substituted in its place:

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement (the Agreement) is made and entered by and between City of Austin on behalf of its Police Department, Austin Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department, City of Georgetown on behalf of its Police Department, Hays County through Hays County Sheriff's Office, City of Pflugerville on behalf of its Police Department, City of Round Rock on behalf of its Police Department, City of San Marcos on behalf of its Police Department, Travis County through Travis County Sheriff's Office, University of Texas on behalf of its Police Department, Williamson County through Williamson County Sheriff's Office, Austin Community College on behalf of its Police Department, Texas State University
on behalf of its Police Department, City of Cedar Park on behalf of its Police Department, Pflugerville Independent School District on behalf of its Police Department, City of Kyle on behalf of its Police Department, City of Buda on behalf of its Police Department, City of Sunset Valley on behalf of its Police Department, City of Manor on behalf of its Police Department, and the City of Bastrop on behalf of its Police Department.

2.0 AMENDMENT TO SECTION 7

Section 7 of the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement is amended by adding subsection C to read as follows:

C. The City of Austin is authorized to enter into separate collateral agreements, as necessary, to allow agencies that are not state agencies, local governments, or other agencies that are authorized to contract with each other under Chapters 771 and 791 of the Government Code (non-governmental agencies) to assume obligations and receive benefits equivalent to Partner Agencies (Partner Equivalent Agencies). To qualify for consideration to become a Partner Equivalent Agency, a non-governmental agency must utilize a full-service law enforcement component that employs police officers licensed by the State of Texas and vested with full law enforcement powers and responsibilities. Before any non-governmental agency becomes a Partner Equivalent Agency, that non-governmental agency must first be agreed upon by a majority of the Executive Board, with approval by the Chair. Upon approval by the Executive Board and Chair, the approved non-governmental agency is recommended to the City of Austin City Council which must approve each agreement before any approved non-governmental agency seeking to become a Partner Equivalent Agency may be offered an agreement to become a Partner Equivalent Agency. Such an agreement must include the same terms of understanding contained in the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement in substantially the same format as the ARIC Sustainment Funding Agreement. (Partner Equivalent Agency Funding Agreement). To complete the transaction, the approved non-governmental agency and the City of Austin must execute the Partner Equivalent Agency Funding Agreement.

3.0 EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS AMENDMENT.

This Amendment is effective when it has been approved by the governing body of each and every Partner Agency and executed by their authorized representatives.

CITY OF AUSTIN on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ___________________________ Date: 2/21/17

Rey Arellano, Assistant City Manager
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AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: __________________________________________ Date: _______________________

________________________________________________________________________

CITY OF GEORGETOWN on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: __________________________________________ Date: _______________________

________________________________________________________________________

HAYS COUNTY through the HAYS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

By: __________________________________________ Date: _______________________

________________________________________________________________________

CITY OF ROUND ROCK on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: __________________________________________ Date: _______________________

________________________________________________________________________
CITY OF SAN MARCOS on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: __________________

______________________________

TRAVIS COUNTY through the TRAVIS COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

By: _______________________________ Date: __________________

______________________________

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: __________________

______________________________

WILLIAMSON COUNTY through the WILLIAMSON COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

By: _______________________________ Date: __________________

______________________________

CITY OF PFLUGERVILLE on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: _______________________________ Date: __________________

______________________________
AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

_________________________________________________________________

TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

_________________________________________________________________

CITY OF CEDAR PARK on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

_________________________________________________________________

PFLUGERVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

_________________________________________________________________

CITY OF KYLE on behalf of its POLICE DEPARTMENT

By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

_________________________________________________________________
Re: Amendments to original inter-local agreement and sustainment funding inter-local agreement to add new partners to the Austin Regional Intelligence Center

Dear Chief Stapp:

Please find enclosed two original copies each of amendments to the Original Inter-local Agreement and Sustainment Funding Inter-local Agreement to add new partners to the Austin Regional Intelligence Center (ARIC).

On February 9, 2017, Austin City Council unanimously approved these amendments to the two inter-local agreements that govern the operations and funding of ARIC. Assistant City Manager Rey Arellano then signed two copies of each amendment for each current partner and the three agencies that are being brought in as partners via the amendments.

Please take all steps necessary to execute these amendments. Because the Inter-local Cooperation Act requires that the governing body of each agency that is a party to an inter-local agreement approve the agreement, it is possible that the San Marcos City Council must approve the amendments prior to signing by the appropriate official.

Once signed, please mail all four originals to the Travis County Attorney’s Office, care of Assistant County Attorney Barbara Wilson. An envelope addressed to Ms. Wilson is also enclosed for your convenience. Once Ms. Wilson has received signed amendments from all current and soon-to-be partners, the Travis County Commissioners Court will consider and approve the amendments, thereby finalizing the addition of the police departments of the City of Sunset Valley, the City of Manor, and the City of Bastrop as ARIC partners. After the Travis County Judge has also signed all of the amendments, Ms. Wilson’s office will mail one original of each amendment back to you.

Finally, as you review the amendments, you will see language that is also being added to the two inter-locals that will permit the City of Austin to enter into separate agreements with non-governmental agencies in order to include them as an ARIC partner. Only a private entity that employs licensed peace officers is eligible to be a partner. At this time, the St. Edwards University Police Department has expressed an interest in becoming a partner.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (512)974-4402.

Regards,

Lt. Matthew Greer
Director, Austin Regional Intelligence Center
Lieutenant, Austin Police Department
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval of Resolution 2017-86R, approving the terms and conditions of an Airport Facility Lease agreement for non-commercial use of city-owned aircraft hangars; authorizing the City Manager to execute said lease agreements on behalf of the City; and declaring an effective date.

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: City Manager Office, Steve Parker, Assistant City Manager via Texas Aviation Partners

Funds Required: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Funds Available: N/A
Account Name: N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): [add the Plan elements and Goal # and Objective(s)]

BACKGROUND:
At the end of a long-term ground lease, hangars revert in ownership to the City. These hangars are simple “box” style facilities that are not conducive to commercial use based on their location and lack of bathroom and office facilities.

If the previous occupant desires to continue leasing the facility, this non-commercial facility lease would be utilized. The rate would be $1.80 per square foot per year based on the footprint of the facility and the term would not exceed five years.

The attached form would be used for such leases and would be executed by the City Manager or his/her designee. All commercial business leases would still continue to come back to the City Council for approval.
RESOLUTION NO. 2017- R

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS APPROVING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AN AIRPORT FACILITY LEASE AGREEMENT FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE OF CITY-OWNED AIRCRAFT HANGARS; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SAID LEASE AGREEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY; AND DECLARING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

PART 1. The terms and conditions of the Airport Facility Lease Agreement for Non-Commercial Use attached hereto as Exhibit A is hereby approved.

PART 2. The City Manager is hereby expressly authorized to execute Agreements in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A on behalf of the City.

PART 3. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

ADOPTED on May 16, 2017.

John Thomaides
Mayor

Attest:

Jamie Lee Case
City Clerk
THIS SAN MARCOS REGIONAL AIRPORT FACILITY LEASE AGREEMENT FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE ("Agreement") is made and entered into by and between the City of San Marcos, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas ("Lessor" OR "City"), acting by and through its Airport Management company Texas Aviation Partners, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Corporation ("Airport Management") and ______________________________ ("Lessee"). The form of this Agreement was approved by the San Marcos City Council on May 16, 2017.

1. LEASE OF HANGAR SPACE. Lessor hereby leases to Lessee a Hangar ("Hangar") located at _________________________________ at the San Marcos Regional Airport (the "Airport").

2. TERM. This Agreement shall commence on ____________________________, ("Commencement Date") and will continue in effect until ______________________, ("Expiration Date").

3. RENT. For the use of the Hangar Space, Lessee agrees to pay Lessor $_____________ per month, payable in advance on the first day of each month. If this Agreement commences or terminates on a day other than the first (1st) day of the month, rent shall be prorated accordingly.

   A payment shall be considered past due if, after the fifth (5th) day of the month in which the payment is due, Lessor has not received full payment.

   In the event Lessee holds over after the expiration of this lease, such holdover status will create a month-to-month tenancy. In this event, Lessee agrees to pay the rental at the date of expiration of this Lease plus fifty (50%) percent. Said holdover tenancy will be subject to all other terms and conditions of this Lease.

4. METHOD OF PAYMENT. Rent is payable to Airport Management by check or credit card.

5. LATE CHARGES. If Airport Management does not receive payment in the full amount on the 5th day of the month in which it is due, Lessee will pay Airport Management for each late payment an initial late charge equal to $25.00 and additional late charges of $10.00 per day thereafter until the amount due including late charges is paid in full. Additional late charges may not exceed more than 15 days in any one month.
6. **RETURNED CHECKS.** In addition to any late charges, Lessee shall reimburse Lessor or Airport Management for each check Lessee tenders to Airport Management that is returned or not honored for any reason. Lessee must make any returned check good by paying such amount(s) plus any associated charges in certified funds.

7. **SERVICES PROVIDED.** Lessor through Airport Management shall provide one (1) key to Lessee during the term of this Agreement. Lessee shall not copy key without written permission from Airport Management. Lessee shall return the key to Airport Management upon move-out. Lessee shall be solely responsible for the towing or repositioning of its Aircraft into and out of the Hangar. Lessee shall be solely responsible for the securing of its Aircraft while positioned in the Hangar Space. Lessee shall ensure the Aircraft is secured in such a manner that enables other Hangar Space Lessees to tow or reposition their Aircraft at any time for the purposes of ingress and egress to their portion of the Hangar. Lessor has the right to reposition Lessee’s aircraft within the hangar at any time. Lessor will maintain the structural components of the Hangar, including doors and door mechanisms, and Lessor will provide normal building maintenance without additional cost to Lessee.

8. **USE OF HANGAR.** The Hangar shall be used only for aviation-related activities. No commercial activity of any kind shall be conducted by Lessee. Lessee and its invitees shall not engage in any unlawful use of the Premises. Lessee agrees to comply with all federal, state, and local laws, and the Minimum Standards and Rules and Regulations of San Marcos Regional Airport as may be amended. On the termination of this Agreement, by expiration or otherwise, Lessee shall immediately surrender possession of the Hangar and shall remove, at its sole expense, the Aircraft and all other property, leaving the Hangar in the same condition as when received, ordinary wear and tear expected. Lessee shall be liable for any damage to the Hangar caused by Lessee’s use.

9. **LESSEE’S RESPONSIBILITIES.** Lessee shall keep the Hangar, including ramps and loading areas adjacent to the Hangar, neat, clean, and free from trash at all times. Lessee shall provide containers for all trash and arrange for the regular removal of the trash at the Lessee’s expense. Outside storage is specifically prohibited without the advance written consent of Airport Management. Lessee is responsible for obtaining all items necessary or desirable for the use and operation of the Hangar including such items as light bulbs and bathroom supplies, if applicable. Lessee agrees to provide Lessee’s own lock and shall provide Lessor with a currently operative key or any combination to locks placed on the Hangar.

10. **LESSOR’S RESPONSIBILITIES.** Lessor agrees that Lessee shall have access to the runways, taxiways, and ramps at the Airport to the same extent as other Airport users. At its discretion, Lessor will make any necessary repairs or improvements to maintain the functionality and safety of the hangar.

11. **LESSOR’S ACCESS TO LEASED PREMISES.** Lessor or Airport Management has the right of entry at reasonable times for repairs, maintenance, modification or inspection of all rooms, areas, and buildings on the airport including the Hangar which is the subject of this
Agreement. Lessor shall provide Lessee with advance notice of any inspection as is reasonable under the circumstance.

12. AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE. No maintenance on the Aircraft shall be performed in the Hangar without advance written approval of Airport Management, except such minor preventative maintenance as allowed in Part 43, Appendix A, Paragraph C of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs). Lessee shall take steps to ensure that the performance of such maintenance work shall not damage the Hangar or other area where the work is performed.

13. UTILITIES AND TAXES. Lessee shall promptly pay all charges for electricity, water, telephone services, and other utilities furnished to the Hangar. Lessee will be solely responsible for the payment of taxes, if any, that are assessed against all or any portion of equipment, inventory, personal property, including but not limited to aircraft. Lessor shall be responsible for the payment of property taxes on the Hangar.

14. SUBLEASE/ASSIGNMENT. Lessee shall have no right to sublease the Hangar or to assign this Agreement, without prior written consent of Airport Management.

15. CONDITION OF PREMISES. Lessee shall accept the Hangar in its present condition without any liability or obligation on the part of Lessor to make any alterations, improvements, or repairs of any kind to the Hangar and surrounding area.

16. ALTERATIONS. Lessee agrees not to install any fixtures or make any alterations, additions or improvements, including exterior signs, awnings, or lighting, to the Hangar without the prior written approval of Airport Management.

17. INSURANCE. Lessee shall procure and maintain at all times, in full force and effect, a policy or policies of insurance as set forth in the Minimum Standards. All insurance required under this paragraph shall be primary over any other insurance coverage the Lessee may have, and shall be written with the City of San Marcos and Texas Aviation Partners, LLC. as an additional insured.

18. CASUALTY. In the event the Hangar, or the means of access thereto, shall be damaged by fire or any other cause, the rent payable hereunder shall not abate provided that the Hangar is not rendered untenantable by such damage. If the Hangar is rendered untenantable and Lessor elects to repair the Hangar, the rent shall abate for the period during which such repairs are being made, provided the damage was not caused by the acts or omissions of Lessee, in which case the rent shall not abate. If the Hangar is rendered untenantable and Lessor elects not to repair the Hangar, this Agreement shall terminate.

19. INDEMNITY AND HOLD HARMLESS

   a. LESSEE AGREES TO HOLD HARMLESS, INDEMNIFY, AND DEFEND THE LESSOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT AND THEIR OFFICERS,
AGENTS, OWNERS, AND EMPLOYEES FROM AND AGAINST ALL CLAIMS, SUITS, AND ACTIONS BY THIRD PARTIES FOR LOSS OF LIFE, PERSONAL INJURY, OR PROPERTY DAMAGE ARISING IN CONNECTION WITH THE USE OF LESSEE’S PREMISES OR ANY AREAS OF THE AIRPORT BY LESSEE, ITS AGENTS, CONTRACTORS, EMPLOYEES, SERVANTS, INVITEES, OR LICENSEES.

b. LESSEE SHALL USE THE AIRPORT AND USE, OCCUPY, AND STORE PROPERTY ON ITS PREMISES AND ON ANY AREAS OF THE AIRPORT AT ITS OWN RISK, AND LESSEE AGREES TO HOLD HARMLESS AND RELEASE LESSOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT AND THEIR OFFICERS, AGENTS, OWNERS, AND EMPLOYEES FROM ALL CLAIMS, SUITS, AND ACTIONS BY LESSEE OR ITS OFFICERS, AGENTS, OWNERS, EMPLOYEES, SERVANTS, INVITEES, OR LICENSEES FOR LOSS OF LIFE, PERSONAL INJURY, OR PROPERTY DAMAGE ARISING FROM ANY CONDITION OF THE PREMISES OF THE AIRPORT OR FROM ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF THIRD PERSONS.

c. LESSEE SHALL GIVE PROMPT NOTICE TO LESSOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT OF ANY ACCIDENT ON ITS PREMISES OR ANY AREAS OF THE AIRPORT, AND OF ANY DEFECTS IN THE RUNWAYS, TAXIWAYS, LIGHTING SYSTEMS, OR OTHER FACILITIES AT THE AIRPORT OF WHICH THE LESSEE IS AWARE.

d. IN CASE LESSOR OR AIRPORT MANAGEMENT, OR ANY OF THEIR OFFICERS, AGENTS, OWNERS, OR EMPLOYEES ARE MADE A PARTY TO ANY LITIGATION COMMENCED BY OR AGAINST LESSEE THAT IS COVERED BY THIS SECTION, THEN LESSEE SHALL HOLD OPERATOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT, AND THEIR OFFICERS, AGENTS, OWNERS, AND EMPLOYEES HARMLESS FROM, AND LESSEE SHALL PAY, ALL COSTS AND EXPENSES RELATED TO THE LITIGATION, INCLUDING THE FEES OF ATTORNEYS AND EXPERT WITNESSES.

e. LESSEE ASSUMES ALL RESPONSIBILITY AND AGREES TO PAY LESSOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT FOR ANY AND ALL INJURY OR DAMAGE TO LESSOR’S OR AIRPORT MANAGEMENT’S PROPERTY ARISING OUT OF OR IN CONNECTION WITH ANY AND ALL ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF LESSEE, ITS OFFICERS, OWNERS, AGENTS, SERVANTS, EMPLOYEES, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, LICENSEES, OR INVITEES.

f. NEITHER LESSOR NOR AIRPORT MANAGEMENT GUARANTEES POLICE PROTECTION OR SECURITY TO LESSEE OR ITS PROPERTY, AND LESSOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR INJURY TO ANY PERSON ON THE LESSEE’S
PREMISES OR FOR HARM TO ANY PROPERTY WHICH BELONGS TO LESSEE, ITS OFFICERS, OWNERS, SERVANTS, EMPLOYEES, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, LICENSEES, INVITEES OR PATRONS, OR WHICH MAY BE STOLEN, DESTROYED OR IN ANY WAY DAMAGED; AND LESSEE HEREBY INDEMNIFIES AND HOLDS HARMLESS LESSOR AND AIRPORT MANAGEMENT, THEIR OFFICERS, OWNERS, AGENTS, SERVANTS AND EMPLOYEES FROM AND AGAINST ANY AND ALL SUCH CLAIMS.

20. DEFAULT. The following events shall be events of default by Lessee under this Agreement:

   a. The Lessee fails to pay when due any rental or any other sums or charges due under this Agreement, and such failure continues for seven (7) days following written notice thereof (provided, however, that Lessor shall be obligated to give only two such notices in any calendar year, and after such two notices, Lessor will no longer be obligated to give any other notice under this Section within such calendar year).

   b. The Lessee fails to comply with any other term, provision, or covenant of this Agreement, and does not cure the failure within thirty (30) days after written notice to the Lessee. However, if Lessee’s failure to comply cannot reasonably be cured within thirty (30) days, Lessee shall be allowed additional time (not to exceed sixty (60) days) as is reasonably necessary to cure the failure so long as Lessee commences to cure the failure within fifteen (15) days and Lessee diligently pursues a course of action that will cure the failure. For any subsequent default by the Lessee for the same or any other reason, the Lessor may terminate the Agreement if that subsequent default continues for more than three (3) days after notice of the subsequent default.

   c. The Lessee becomes insolvent, makes a transfer in fraud of creditors, or makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors.

   d. The Lessee commences, or another party commences against the Lessee, proceedings in bankruptcy, for reorganization, or for the readjustment or arrangement of its debts under the bankruptcy laws of the United States or under any other law.

   e. A receiver or trustee is appointed for all or substantially all of the assets of the Lessee.

   f. The Lessee abandons or vacates all or any substantial portion of Lessee’s Premises for 120 consecutive days.

The acceptance by the Lessor of the Lessee’s monthly payments after the occurrence of any event of default shall in no way constitute a waiver by the Lessor of its right to exercise any remedy provided for any event of default.
21. **TERMINATION.** Any breach, default or failure by Lessee to keep and/or perform faithfully any of the terms of this Agreement shall be cause for Lessor to terminate this Agreement immediately. In this event, Lessor or Airport Management shall deliver to Lessee a written notice of termination which will include a reasonable description of the breach or default justifying the termination.

If it becomes necessary for the Lessor or Airport Management to employ an attorney to enforce or defend any of the Lessor’s or Airport Management’s rights or remedies because of any breach or default by the Lessee under this Agreement, the Lessee agrees to pay all reasonable attorney’s fees incurred by the Lessor and Airport Management, within thirty (30) days of the Lessor’s issuance of a statement for the fees to the Lessee.

22. **GOVERNING LAW.** The laws of the State of Texas shall govern this Agreement. Venue for any action brought to interpret or enforce, or arising out of or incident to, the terms of this Agreement shall be in Hays County, Texas.

23. **RELATIONSHIP OF PARTIES.** This Agreement shall not be construed as creating the relationship of principal and agent or of partnership or of joint venture between the parties. The only relationship between the parties is that of Lessor and Lessee.

24. **NOTICES.** Notices required of either party pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement shall be conclusively determined to have been delivered when (1) hand-delivered to the other party, its agents, employees, servants or representatives, or (2) mailed in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, certified, with return receipt requested, and addressed to the parties hereto at the address specified hereunder. The parties may change their address by giving notice. Should any party fail or refuse delivery of certified mail, notice is deemed received three (3) days after being sent by regular mail:

**LESSOR:**
City of San Marcos
630 E. Hopkins
San Marcos, Texas 78666

**MANAGER:**
Texas Aviation Partners
1807 Airport Drive, Suite 200
San Marcos, Texas 78666

**LESSEE:**

EXECUTED BY THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS ON ________________

Signature: ______________________________________

Printed Name and Title: ______________________________________________

EXECUTED BY LESSEE ON ________________

Signature: ______________________________________

Printed Name and Title: ______________________________________________
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval, by motion, of Change in Service #4 to RPS for Construction Phase Services for the Reclaimed Water Expansion Project, in the not to exceed amount of $332,633.
Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: Engineering / CIP

Funds Required: $332,633.00
Account Number: C482
Funds Available: $7,500,000
Account Name: Reclaimed Water System Expansion

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:
#5 - Maintain and Improve City’s infrastructure

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): [add the Plan elements and Goal # and Objective(s)]
ERPG204
Model sustainable practices in infrastructure, operations, and facilities in City projects.

BACKGROUND:
The Reclaimed Water Expansion Project is broken up into three phases:
   1) Pipeline Extension
   2) Elevated Storage Tank and
   3) Pump Station Improvements at the wastewater treatment plant.

This Change in Service #4 will provide consulting services during construction of all three projects pertaining to the following:
- Attendance at the preconstruction meeting
- Monthly coordination meetings, site visits/reports and wage rate review
- Review of schedule of values, shop drawings, submittals and payment requests
- Contractor’s request for information (RFI’s) and change order’s
- Substantial and final completion observation
- Record drawings that document “as built” plans

The consultant fees for each of the three project phases are allocated as follows:
1) Pipeline Extension ($162,497.00)
2) Elevated Storage Tank and ($50,707.00)
3) Pump Station Improvements at the wastewater treatment plant. ($32,457.00)

A subconsultant to RPS will review the electrical components of the project and fund allocation is shown below:
   1) Pipeline Extension ($15,376.00)
   2) Elevated Storage Tank and ($16,322.00)
   3) Pump Station Improvements at the wastewater treatment plant. ($44,163.00)

This including printing/mileage expenses accounts for a total of $332,633.00. The total construction contract amount for the Pipeline Extension project is $5,076,273.00. The Elevated Storage Tank and Pump Station Improvements which are scheduled to start in January and August of 2018, respectively, are estimated at $1,856,000 and $588,500 for a total construction cost of $7,520,773.00. This Change In Service reflects 4.4% of the total project construction cost.

Staff recommends approval of CIS #4.
AUTHORIZATION OF CHANGE IN SERVICES
CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS

PROJECT: Water Reuse System Expansion Project
ENGINEER: Espey Consultants, Inc., dba RPS
AUTHORIZATION NO.: 4
ORIGINAL CONTRACT DATE: 05/05/15
DATE OF CHANGE: 05/02/17

WORK TO BE ADDED TO OR DELETED FROM SCOPE OF SERVICES

The proposed change in services is to provide engineering services during the construction phase of three projects related to the Water Reuse System Expansion Project. The projects are:

a. Reclaimed Water Expansion Project – Elevated Storage Tank
b. Reclaimed Water Expansion Project – Pump Station Improvements
c. Reclaimed Water Expansion Project – Pipeline

Specific tasks to be added to the existing project scope of services are detailed in the attached Exhibit A.

Previous contract amount: $ 906,521
Net increase/decrease in contract amount: $ 332,633
Revised contract amount: $ 1,239,154

Requested by:
Espey Consultants, Inc. dba RPS

By: [Signature] Date: 4/20/2017
Printed Name/Title

Approved by:
City of San Marcos:

By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________
Printed Name/Title
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 100</th>
<th>Reclaimed Water Expansion Project – Pipeline</th>
<th>Total Estimated Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>$29,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Pre-construction conference.</td>
<td>$1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Monthly construction progress/coordination meetings</td>
<td>$38,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Monthly Project construction observation.</td>
<td>$19,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Monthly site visit reports.</td>
<td>$7,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Review of Schedule of Values.</td>
<td>$1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Maintain shop drawing &amp; submittals log.</td>
<td>$2,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Shop drawings &amp; submittal review.</td>
<td>$21,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Monthly contractor payment request review.</td>
<td>$5,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Contractor Requests for Information/Modifications review.</td>
<td>$8,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Contractor change, cost proposals, and substitutions review.</td>
<td>$8,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Monthly Wage Rate review.</td>
<td>$8,4488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Substantial and final completion observations.</td>
<td>$2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Prepare &quot;Record Drawings.&quot;</td>
<td>$6,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** $162,497

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 200</th>
<th>Reclaimed Water Expansion Project – Elevated Storage Tank</th>
<th>Total Estimated Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>$15,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Participate in a pre-construction conference.</td>
<td>$891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Monthly Project construction observation.</td>
<td>$6,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Monthly site visit reports.</td>
<td>$2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Review of Schedule of Values.</td>
<td>$694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Maintain shop drawing &amp; submittals log.</td>
<td>$992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Shop drawings &amp; submittal review.</td>
<td>$4,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Monthly contractor payment request review.</td>
<td>$5,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Contractor Requests for Information/Modifications review.</td>
<td>$2,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Contractor change, cost proposals, and substitutions review.</td>
<td>$4,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Monthly Wage Rate review.</td>
<td>$4,7081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Substantial and final completion observations.</td>
<td>$1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Prepare &quot;Record Drawings.&quot;</td>
<td>$1,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** $50,707

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 300</th>
<th>Reclaimed Water Expansion Project – Pump Station Improvements</th>
<th>Total Estimated Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>$5,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Participate in a pre-construction conference.</td>
<td>$891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Monthly Project construction observation.</td>
<td>$3,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Monthly site visit reports.</td>
<td>$1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Review of Schedule of Values.</td>
<td>$1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Maintain shop drawing &amp; submittals log.</td>
<td>$744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Shop drawings &amp; submittal review.</td>
<td>$3,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Monthly contractor payment request review.</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Contractor Requests for Information/Modifications review.</td>
<td>$2,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Contractor change, cost proposals, and substitutions review.</td>
<td>$3,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Monthly Wage Rate review.</td>
<td>$2,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Substantial and final completion observations.</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Prepare &quot;Record Drawings.&quot;</td>
<td>$2,392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** $32,457

**TOTAL LABOR** $245,661

Subconsultant Services (Gupta Associates, Inc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>901</th>
<th>Pipeline E&amp;I $13,978 X 1.1</th>
<th>15,376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>EST E&amp;I 14,838 X 1.1</td>
<td>16,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>RWPS E&amp;I 40,148 X 1.1</td>
<td>44,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses**

| Expenses | 10,101 X 1.1 | 11,111 |

**TOTAL BASIC SERVICES** $332,633
AGENDA CAPTION:
7:00PM Receive a Staff presentation and hold a Public Hearing to receive comments for or against Ordinance 2017-30, amending the Official Zoning Map of the City by rezoning 0.951 acre, more or less, tract of land, out of the J. M. Veramendi Survey, Abstract 17, Hays County, Texas located at 1346 Thorpe Lane from “OP” Office Professional District to “CC” Community Commercial District, and including procedural provisions; and consider approval of Ordinance 2017-30 on the first of two readings.

Meeting date: May 16, 2017 - 1st Reading
June 6, 2017 - 2nd Reading

Department: Planning and Development Services Department

Funds Required: n/a
Account Number: n/a
Funds Available: n/a
Account Name: n/a

CITY COUNCIL GOAL: n/a

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): Land Use, Goal 1, Goal 2

BACKGROUND:
The subject property is approximately 0.951 acres in size and is located at 1346 Thorpe Lane. The site is currently zoned Office Professional (OP) and includes an existing one-story building with associated parking. The building is approximately 4,920 square feet and is currently occupied by a dentist office and two additional vacant suites. The applicant intends to lease the remaining vacant suites with retail and restaurant uses.

The subject property is located in the Midtown High Intensity Zone as designated on the Preferred Scenario Map. Currently, the property owner can develop the property in accordance with Office Professional (OP) zoning which is restricted to predominately professional and medical offices uses, as other retail and restaurant uses are restricted in this district. The proposed Community Commercial (CC) zoning would allow a variety of commercial uses such as office, retail, personal business services, restaurant, and other similar uses.

The zoning change request has been reviewed using the Comprehensive Master Plan, Vision San Marcos: A River Runs Through Us, as well as the guidance criteria in Section 1.5.1.5 of the Land Development Code.
A public hearing at the Planning and Zoning Commission was held on April 25, 2017. The Commission recommended approval of the request with a vote of 8-0.

Staff provides this request to the Council with a recommendation of approval.
ORDINANCE NO. 2017-

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY BY REZONING A 0.951 ACRE, MORE OR LESS, TRACT OF LAND OUT OF THE J.M VERAMENDI SURVEY, ABSTRACT 17, HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS, LOCATED AT 1346 THORPE LANE, FROM “OP” OFFICE PROFESSIONAL DISTRICT TO “CC” COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND INCLUDING PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS.

RECITALS:

1. On April 25, 2017, the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of San Marcos held a public hearing regarding a request to change the zoning designation from “OP” Office Professional District to “CC” Community Commercial District for a 0.951 acre, more or less, tract of land out of the J.M Veramendi Survey, Abstract 17, Hays County, Texas, located at 1346 Thorpe Lane.

2. Subsequent to the public hearing on that date, the Planning and Zoning Commission considered the request and voted to recommend that the request be approved by the City Council of the City.

3. The City Council held a public hearing on May 16, 2017 regarding the request.

4. All requirements of Chapter 1, Development Procedures, of the City Land Development Code pertaining to Zoning Map amendments have been met.

5. The City Council hereby finds and determines that the adoption of the following ordinance is in the interest of the public health, morals, welfare and safety.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

SECTION 1. The Official Zoning Map of the City, as described in Section 4.1.2.2 of the City Land Development Code, is amended to rezone the 0.951 acre tract of land described in Exhibit “A,” attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes, from “OP” Office Professional District to “CC” Community Commercial District.

SECTION 2. This ordinance will take effect after its passage, approval and adoption on second reading.

PASSED AND APPROVED on first reading on May 16, 2017.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on second reading on June 6, 2017.
John Thomaides
Mayor

Attest:

Jamie Lee Case
City Clerk

Approved:

Michael Cosentino
City Attorney
At their regular meeting on April 25, 2017 the Planning and Zoning Commission considered this item during a Public Hearing.

**Public Notification:**

*Personal notification for the April 25, 2017 P&Z Meeting was mailed on April 14, 2017 (please see attached map and list). Notice for the May 16, 2017 City Council Meeting was published in the April 30, 2017 San Marcos Daily Record.*

**Correspondence:**

*Staff has received 1 citizen comment letter. This letter is included in the City Council packet.*

**Public Hearing:**

*For:*

1. Griffin Spell
2. Scott Phillips

*Against:*

1. None

**Planning & Zoning Commission draft meeting minutes:**

ZC-17-03 (1346 Thorpe Lane) Hold a public hearing and consider a request by Scott Phillips, on behalf of 1346 Thorpe Lane, LTD, for a Zoning Change from Office Professional (OP) to Community Commercial (CC) for approximately 0.951 acres of land, more or less, out of the J.M. Veramendi Survey, Abstract 17, Hays County, located at 1346 Thorpe Lane. (A. Villalobos)

Chair Garber opened the public hearing.

Andrea Villalobos, Planner, gave an overview of the request.
A motion was made by Commissioner Dupont, seconded by Commissioner McCarty, that ZC-17-03 (1346 Thorpe Lane) be approved as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 8 - Chair, Garber, Vice Chair Kelsey, Commissioner Ramirez, Commissioner McCarty, Commissioner Dupont, Commissioner Rand, Commissioner Dillon, and Commissioner Gleason

Against: 0 -

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Porterfield

Attachments:

1. Notification Map
2. Property Owner List
This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAVASTONE CAPITAL HOLDINGS LLC</td>
<td>3832 CHEVY CHASE DR</td>
<td>HOUSTON</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77019-3014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAJE PROPERTIES LP</td>
<td>1347 THORPE LN</td>
<td>SAN MARCOS</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN MARCOS STUDENT LIVING DST</td>
<td>PO BOX 3666</td>
<td>OAK BROOK</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>60522-3666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMIT/Carlisle APT INC</td>
<td>1502 STATE HIGHWAY 156</td>
<td>COLDSPRING</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>77331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY-SAN MARCOS</td>
<td>601 UNIVERSITY DR</td>
<td>SAN MARCOS</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78666-4684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU TRUST</td>
<td>5844 GORHAM GLEN LN</td>
<td>AUSTIN</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.
Zoning Change
ZC-17-03
1346 Thorpe Lane
OP to CC

Summary: The applicant is requesting a zoning change from Office Professional District (OP) to Community Commercial District (CC) for 0.951 acres.

Applicant: Scott Phillips
500 West 5th Street, Ste 700
Austin, TX 78701

Property Owners: 1346 Thorpe Lane, LTD.
500 West 5th Street, Ste 700
Austin, TX 78701

Notification: Personal notifications of the public hearing were mailed on Friday, April 14, 2017 to all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property. Additionally, signs were posted on the site. Notice for the May 16, 2017 City Council Meeting was published in the April 30, 2017 San Marcos Daily Record.

Response: Staff has received 1 citizen comment letter. The letter is included in the City Council Packet.

Property/Area Profile:

Legal Description: Approximately 0.951 acres, more or less, out of the J. M. Veramendi Survey, Abstract 17, Hays County

Location: 1346 Thorpe Lane

Existing Use of Property: Office / Medical

Proposed Use of Property: Restaurant / Commercial

Preferred Scenario Map: High Intensity – Midtown

Existing Zoning: Office Professional (OP)

Proposed Zoning: Community Commercial (CC)

Utility Capacity: The property is served by City water and wastewater

Sector: Sector Seven (7)

Area Zoning and Land Use Pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N of Property</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Office, Medical</td>
<td>High Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of Property</td>
<td>MF-24</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>High Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E of Property</td>
<td>MF-24</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>High Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W of Property</td>
<td>MF-24</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>High Intensity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Summary

The subject property is approximately 0.951 acres in size and is located at 1346 Thorpe Lane. The property is immediately surrounded by two apartment complexes, The Summit Apartments and Uptown Square, and is across the street from office and medical uses. The site is currently zoned Office Professional (OP) and includes an existing one-story building with associated parking. The building is approximately 4,920 square feet and is currently occupied by a dentist office and two additional vacant suites. The applicant intends to lease the remaining vacant suites with retail and restaurant uses.

The subject property is located in the Midtown High Intensity Zone as designated on the Preferred Scenario Map. This is considered a High Intensity – Redevelopment Infill site as more than 50% (in this case 100%) of the neighboring residential property is mixed residential zoning and not single family zoning. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to Community Commercial (CC). This application does not require a Preferred Scenario Amendment (PSA) as Community Commercial (CC) zoning is allowed within a High Intensity – Redevelopment Infill area.

Currently, the property owner can develop the property in accordance with Office Professional (OP) zoning which is restricted to predominantly professional and medical office uses, as other retail and restaurant uses are restricted in this district. The proposed Community Commercial zoning would allow a variety of commercial uses such as office, retail, personal business services, restaurant, and other similar uses. Residential uses are limited and only permit a Bed and Breakfast or Caretaker’s/Guard’s Residence by right, while Loft Apartments or an Accessory Dwelling Unit require a Conditional Use Permit.

Planning Department Analysis

The subject property is located within the Midtown High Intensity Zone. The San Marcos Comprehensive Plan, Vision San Marcos, provides the following description of the future vision for Midtown:

“Because of its central location and accessibility, Midtown will be a high-density mixed use area, possibly the densest area in San Marcos, with housing for many household types. Midtown residents will have easy access to services, city facilities, the University, and the San Marcos River. They will have the most diverse options for transportation including transit connections to the University and the rest of the city.”

The Land Development Code states that the Office Professional (OP) district is intended “primarily for low intensity, small scale office uses and service facilities”, which is not consistent with the Preferred Scenario designation of High Intensity. Conversely, the Land Development Code states that the Community Commercial District is “established to provide areas for quality larger general retail establishments and service facilities for the retail sale of goods and services. This district should generally consist of retail nodes located along or at the intersection of major collectors or thoroughfares to accommodate high traffic volumes generated by general retail uses”.

The zoning change request has been reviewed using The Comprehensive Master Plan, Vision San Marcos: A River Runs Through Us as well as the guidance criteria in Section 1.5.1.5 of the Land Development Code. A review worksheet is attached to this report which details the analysis of the zoning change using Comprehensive Plan Elements.

It is important to note on the Comprehensive Plan worksheet that the Land Use Suitability table indicates a Level 5 (most constrained) for the Watershed class. This level of constraint is due to the fact that this property is located within the Sewell Park Watershed. The Comprehensive Plan and Preferred Scenario anticipated denser development in the Sewell Park Watershed due to the location of Midtown, and the expected increase in impervious cover is accounted for in the Preferred Scenario projections for this Watershed. According to the applicant, no change in impervious cover is proposed at this time as the applicant will be leasing the vacant suites within the existing building. However, if re-development does
occur, both Office Professional and Community Commercial zoning allow a maximum of 80% impervious cover.

Staff finds this request is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Elements as summarized below:

- The property is located within the Midtown High Intensity Zone on the Preferred Scenario Map;
- The property being considered for rezoning is located in a moderately constrained area according to the Land Use Suitability Map;
- The subject property is not located in a wastewater or water “hot spot”. Water and wastewater service are available to the subject property;
- The transportation access to the site appears to be adequate. The Travel Demand Model (TDM) shows Thorpe Lane remains an “A” for Daily Level of Service (LOS), only dropping to a “B” LOS during the future peak.

In addition, the consistency of this proposed change to the LDC criteria is detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Criteria (LDC 1.5.1.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Inconsistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Criteria (LDC 1.5.1.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>The proposed change implements the policies of the adopted Master Plan, including the land use classification on the Future Land Use Map and any incorporated sector plan maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The change is consistent with the Preferred Scenario Map and Comprehensive Plan Elements in Vision San Marcos. See the analysis above and the attached Comprehensive Plan Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Consistency with any development agreement in effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No development agreements are in effect for this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Whether the uses permitted by the proposed change and the standards applicable to such uses will be appropriate in the immediate area of the land to be reclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The zoning designation of Community Commercial is consistent with the designation of surrounding parcels which are a mix of commercial, office, mixed use, and multi-family districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Whether the proposed change is in accord with any existing or proposed plans for providing public schools, streets, water supply, sanitary sewers, and other public services and utilities to the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The property is within the City’s water and wastewater service area and has access along Thorpe Lane, which is classified as a major arterial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>Other factors which substantially affect the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the Council should consider:

(1) Is the property suitable for use as presently zoned?

_Staff evaluation:_ The property is currently developed as a small office park. However, the current zoning category does not permit the mixture of uses and services envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan.

(2) Has there been a substantial change of conditions in the neighborhood surrounding the subject property?

_Staff evaluation:_ Within the past two years, the formally vacant tract to the north of the subject property has developed as a multifamily project known as Uptown Square. Additional retail and restaurant uses are also being constructed and occupied within the existing Springtown Shopping Center. Furthermore, the Comprehensive Plan designated the area between the Texas State University Football Stadium to the east side of IH-35 as a High Intensity Area.

(3) Will the proposed rezoning address a substantial unmet public need?

_Staff evaluation:_ Approval of this zoning change would allow the property to develop according to the vision of the Comprehensive Plan, which states that high density, mixed use development [should occur] in intensity zones (Land Use, Goal 2) and to direct growth compatible with surrounding uses (Land Use, Goal 1).

(4) Will the proposed rezoning confer a special benefit on the landowner/developer and cause a substantial detriment to the surrounding lands?

_Staff evaluation:_ No, there is no special benefit to the landowner as the proposed zoning district meets the intent and vision of the Comprehensive Plan.

(5) Will the proposed rezoning serve a substantial public purpose?

_Staff evaluation:_ The rezoning does serve a substantial public purpose as it furthers the goals and vision of the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff provides this information with a recommendation of approval of the zoning change request.

**The Council's Responsibility:**

The Council is required by law to hold a public hearing and receive public comment regarding the proposed zoning. After considering the public input, the Council is charged with ultimately deciding whether to approve or deny the zoning change request.
**LAND USE** – Preferred Scenario Map / Land Use Intensity Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the request meet the intent of the Preferred Scenario Map and the Land Use Intensity Matrix?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO (map amendment required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** – Furthering the goal of the Core 4 through the three strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>SUPPORTS</th>
<th>CONTRADICTS</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the 21st Century Workforce</td>
<td>Provides / Encourages educational opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant has not indicated that educational facilities will be included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Infrastructure &amp; Entrepreneurial Regulation</td>
<td>Provides / Encourages land, utilities and infrastructure for business</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant has not indicated that infrastructure will be extended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community of Choice</td>
<td>Provides / Encourages safe &amp; stable neighborhoods, quality schools, fair wage jobs, community amenities, distinctive identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant has not indicated that opportunities for jobs and services will be included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENT & RESOURCE PROTECTION** – Land Use Suitability & Development Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint by Class</th>
<th>1 (least)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (moderate)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (most)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Overall Constraint</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Aquifer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Species</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersheds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Zone</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENT & RESOURCE PROTECTION** – Water Quality Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Located in Subwatershed: Sewell Park</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>25-50%</th>
<th>50-75%</th>
<th>75-100%</th>
<th>100%+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeled Impervious Cover Increase Anticipated for watershed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: The Sewell subcatchment will have a higher overall impervious cover within the Preferred Scenario (58%) compared to the trend scenario (53%). Most of the changes within the Preferred Scenario will occur on previously developed urban areas. This means that developments for the Preferred Scenario, such as the Midtown area, will have a high amount of impervious cover. The increase in impervious cover with the Preferred Scenario could result in a 7 percent increase of Total Suspended Solids (TSS) with a similar increase in bacteria (8.8%) generally during rain events. Note, the maximum impervious cover for both OP and CC zoning is 80%. Furthermore, future development on the site must be reviewed as part of a Complete Site Preparation Permit and Watershed Protection Plan process.

NEIGHBORHOODS – Where is the property located

| CONA Neighborhood(s): | Millview West |
| Neighborhood Commission Area(s): | 7 |
| Neighborhood Character Study Area(s): | N/A |

PARKS, PUBLIC SPACES AND FACILITIES – Availability of parks and infrastructure

| Will Parks and / or Open Space be Provided? | X |
| Will Trails and / or Green Space Connections be Provided? | X |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance / Repair Density</th>
<th>Low (maintenance)</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High (maintenance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Infrastructure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Facility Availability

| Parks / Open Space within ¼ mile (walking distance)? | X |
| Wastewater service available? | X |
| Water service available? | X |

TRANSPORTATION – Level of Service (LOS), Access to sidewalks, bicycle lanes and public transportation

| Existing Daily LOS | Thorpe Lane | X |
| Existing Peak LOS | Thorpe Lane | X |

| Preferred Scenario Daily LOS | Thorpe Lane | X |
| Preferred Scenario Peak LOS | Thorpe Lane | X |

The Transportation Demand Model shows that Thorpe Lane remains at a level of service A for the Daily LOS, however, it drops from an A to a B LOS in the Preferred Scenario Peak LOS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Availability</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are existing sidewalks along the frontage of the subject property.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adjacent to existing bicycle lane? | X |
| Adjacent to existing public transportation route? | X |

Notes: The property is located adjacent to 2 CARTS stops on either side of the property. One stop is located at the Uptown Square Apartments and one stop is located at the Summit Apartments. The stops serve both the Uhland Road route and the Post Road route.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Abbreviation</th>
<th>LS-PC</th>
<th>LS-RI</th>
<th>LS-ND</th>
<th>M-PC</th>
<th>M-RI</th>
<th>M-ND</th>
<th>H-PC</th>
<th>H-RI</th>
<th>H-ND</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>OA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-R</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF-4.5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH-ZL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-24</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OA is generally intended where shown on the Preferred Scenario Map

**Legend:**
- **LS** - Low Intensity and Areas of Stability
- **M** - Medium Intensity
- **H** - High Intensity
- **PC** - Neighborhood Area Protection / Conservation
- **RI** - Redevelopment / Infill
- **ND** - New Development
- **EC** - Employment Center
- **OA** - Open Space / Agricultural

**Current Condition:** High Intensity - Redevelopment Infill

**Requested Zoning:**

**Current Zoning:**
A LAND TITLE SURVEY OF 0.051 ACRES (APPROXIMATELY 41,426 SQ. FT.) IN THE J. M. VERAMENDI SURVEY, ABSTRACT 17, HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS, BEING A PORTION OF A 0.87 ACRE TRACT CONVEYED TO THORPE LANE PROFESSIONAL CENTER, INC. IN A WARRANTY DEED/VENDOR'S LIEN EXECUTED JUNE 28, 1979 AND RECORDED IN VOLUME 328, PAGE 263 AND BEING A PORTION A 4.09 ACRE TRACT CONVEYED TO THORPE LANE GROUP IN A WARRANTY DEED EXECUTED JANUARY 17, 1983 AND RECORDED IN VOLUME 397, PAGE 618, BOTH OF THE DEED RECORDS OF HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS.
0.951 ACRES
HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS

A DESCRIPTION OF 0.951 ACRES (APPROXIMATELY 41,426 SQ. FT.) IN THE J. M. VERAMENDI SURVEY, ABSTRACT 17, HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS, BEING A PORTION OF A 0.87 ACRE TRACT CONVEYED TO THORPE LANE PROFESSIONAL CENTER, INC. IN A WARRANTY DEED/VENDOR'S LIEN EXECUTED JUNE 28, 1979 AND RECORDED IN VOLUME 328, PAGE 263 AND BEING A PORTION A 4.09 ACRE TRACT CONVEYED TO THORPE LANE GROUP IN A WARRANTY DEED EXECUTED JANUARY 17, 1983 AND RECORDED IN VOLUME 387, PAGE 618, BOTH OF THE DEED RECORDS OF HAYS COUNTY, TEXAS; SAID 0.951 ACRE TRACT BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED BY METES AND BOUNDS AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING at a rebar with "MBC" cap found for an angle point in the southeast right-of-way line of Thorpe Lane (right-of-way width varies), being in the northeast line of the said 0.87 acre tract, being also the westernmost corner of Lot 1, Thorpe Lane Apartments, a subdivision of record in Volume 17, Page 199 of the Plat Records of Hays County, Texas, from which a mag nail found in the southeast right-of-way line of Thorpe Lane and the northwest line of Lot 1, of said Thorpe Lane Apartments, bears North 44°15'35" East, a distance of 188.21 feet;

THENCE South 46°34'00" East with the northeast line of the said 0.87 acre tract and the southwest line of Lot 1, of said Thorpe Lane Apartments, a distance of 226.76 feet to a 3/4" iron pipe found for the easternmost corner of the said 0.87 acre tract, being a northern corner of the said 4.09 acre tract;

THENCE South 46°58'55" East with the northeast line of the said 4.09 acre tract and the southwest line of Lot 1, of said Thorpe Lane Apartments, a distance of 129.88 feet to a 1/2" rebar found for a northern corner of Lot 1, Amendatory Plat of The Summit Subdivision, a subdivision of record in Volume 3, Page 117 of the Plat Records of Hays County, Texas;

THENCE crossing the said 4.09 acre tract and the said 0.87 acre tract and with the perimeter of Lot 1, of said Amendatory Plat of The Summit Subdivision, the following two (2) courses and distances:

1. South 45°13'35" West, a distance of 115.67 feet to a 1/2" rebar found;

2. North 46°37'52" West, a distance of 360.22 feet 1/2" rebar found in the southeast right-of-way line of Thorpe Lane, being in the northwest line of the said 0.87 acre tract.
tract, being also the northernmost corner of Lot 1, of said Amendatory Plat of The Summit Subdivision, from which a 1/2" rebar found in the southeast right-of-way line of Thorpe Lane, being the westernmost corner of the said 4.09 acre tract, same being the westernmost corner of Lot 1, of said Amendatory Plat of The Summit Subdivision, bears South 45°19'58" West, a distance of 135.53 feet;

THENCE with the common right-of-way line of Thorpe Lane and the said 0.87 acre tract, the following two (2) courses:

1. North 45°19'58" East, a distance of 115.14 feet to a cotton spindle with "Chaparral" washer set for the northernmost corner of the said 0.87 acre tract, from which an "X" in concrete found, bears North 46°34'00" West, a distance of 16.57 feet;

2. South 46°34'00" East, a distance of 3.39 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 0.951 acres of land, more or less.

Surveyed on the ground October 12, 2016.

Bearing Basis: The Texas Coordinate System of 1983 (NAD83), South Central Zone, based on GPS Solutions from The National Geodetic Survey (NGS) On-Line Positioning User Service (OPUS).

Attachments: Drawing 372-026-BASE

Joe Ben Early, Jr.
Registered Professional Land Surveyor
State of Texas No. 6016
T.B.P.L.S. Firm No. 10124500
Site Photos

View of property frontage

Rear View
View of Parking Lot

View of Rear Parking Lot
# ZONING CHANGE, OVERLAY OR ESTABLISHMENT OF A HISTORIC DISTRICT/LANDMARK APPLICATION

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Scott Phillips</th>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>1346 Thorpe Lane, Ltd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Mailing Address</td>
<td>500 W 5th Street, Ste 700 Austin, TX 78701</td>
<td>Owner's Mailing Address</td>
<td>500 W 5th Street, Ste 700 Austin, TX 78701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Phone #</td>
<td>512-682-5556</td>
<td>Owner's Phone #</td>
<td>512-682-5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant's Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sphillips@endeavor-re.com">sphillips@endeavor-re.com</a></td>
<td>Owner's Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sphillips@endeavor-re.com">sphillips@endeavor-re.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPER INFORMATION

Subject Property Address(es): 1346 Thorpe Lane, San Marcos, TX 78666

Legal Description: Lot Block Subdivision A0017-2 JUAN M VERAMENDI SURVEY #2

Total Acreage: 0.951 Tax ID #: 12291

Preferred Scenario Designation: High Intensity Existing Zoning: OP

Existing Land Use(s): Offices (Medical Offices)

## DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

Proposed Zoning District(s): Change of zoning from OP to CC

Proposed Land Uses / Reason for Change: The property is currently almost 50% vacant and needs to be retenanted. The financial viability requires the ability to retenant the vacancy and the current zoning is highly prohibitive in this respect. We hope to retenant with a user that complements the high-density, mixed use vision for this area as put forth in Vision San Marcos.

## AUTHORIZATION

All required application documents are attached. I understand the fees and the process for zoning and understand my responsibility to be present at meetings regarding this application.

**MF-12, 16, 24 Filing Fee** $1,275 plus $50 per acre  
**Technology Fee** $11  
**MAXIMUM COST** $4,011

**Other Districts Filing Fee** $1,000 plus $100 per acre  
1346 Thorpe Lane, Ltd.  
**Technology Fee** $11  
**MAXIMUM COST** $3,011

By: BFP 2015 Management, LLC, its general partner

Applicant's Signature: [Signature]  
Date: ________________________

Printed Name: Andy Pastor  
Executive VP

To be completed by Staff: Accepted By:  
Date Accepted: 3/13/2017  
Proposed Meeting Date: 4/17/2017  
Application Deadline: 3/13/2017

Planning & Development Services • 630 East Hopkins • San Marcos, Texas 78666 • 512-393-8230
ZONING CHANGE & ZONING OVERLAY CONSIDERATIONS

Process. The Zoning process may take 2-3 months and will include at least two public hearings – one before the Planning and Zoning Commission and one before the City Council.

CHECKLIST FOR ZONING CHANGE, ZONING OVERLAY OR HISTORIC DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Required for Complete Submittal</th>
<th>Staff Verification &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Pre-application conference with staff is recommended</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please call 393-8230 to schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Completed Application for Zoning Change, Overlay, or Establishment of Historic District/Landmark</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Copy of Subdivision Plat or Metes &amp; Bounds</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Certificate of no tax delinquency</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Proof of Ownership</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Lien Holder(s) Name and Mailing Address(es)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Agreement to the placement of notification signs and acknowledgement of notification requirements</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Authorization to represent the property owner, if the applicant is not the owner</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-12, 18, 24 Filing Fee $1,275 + $50 per acre ($4,000 max)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Districts Filing Fee $1,000 + $100 per acre ($2,000 max)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Fee $11</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information may be required at the request of the Department

I hereby certify and attest that this application and all required documentation is complete and accurate. I hereby submit this application and attachments for review by the City of San Marcos.

Signed: [Signature]  Date: 3/10/2017
Print Name: [Name]

☐ Engineer  ☐ Architect/Planner  ☐ Surveyor  ☐ Owner  ☐ Agent
AGREEMENT TO THE PLACEMENT OF NOTIFICATION SIGNS
AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The City of San Marcos Land Development Code requires public notification in the form of notification signs on the subject property, published notice, and / or personal notice based on the type of application presented to the Planning Commission and / or City Council.

- Notification Signs: if required by code, staff shall place notification signs on each street adjacent to the subject property and must be placed in a visible, unobstructed location near the property line. It is unlawful for a person to alter any notification sign, or to remove it while the request is pending. However, any removal or alteration that is beyond the control of the applicant shall not constitute a failure to meet notification requirements. It is the responsibility of the applicant to periodically check the sign locations to verify that the signs remain in place until final action is taken on the application and have not been vandalized or removed until after such final decision or when such application is withdrawn by the applicant. It is the responsibility of the applicant to immediately notify the Planning and Development Services Department of missing or defective signs.

- Published Notice: if required by code, staff shall publish a notice in a newspaper of general circulation in accordance with City Codes and the Texas Local Government Code. If, for any reason, more than one notice is required to be published it may be at the expense of the applicant. The renotification fee shall be $85 plus an $11 technology fee.

- Personal Notice: if required by code, staff shall mail personal notice in accordance with City Codes and the Texas Local Government Code. If, for any reason, more than one notice is required to be mailed it may be at the expense of the applicant. The renotification fee shall be $85 plus an $11 technology fee.

I have read the above statements and agree to the required public notification, as required, based on the attached application. The City’s Planning and Development Services Department staff has my permission to place signs, as required, on the property and I will notify City staff if the sign(s) is/are damaged, moved or removed. I understand the process of notification and public hearing and hereby submit the attached application for review by the City.

Signature: [Signature] Date: [3/10/2017]

Print Name: [Scott Phillips]

To be completed by Staff: Case #__________-__________

Planning & Development Services • 630 East Hopkins • San Marcos, Texas 78666 • 512-393-8230
AGENT AUTHORIZATION TO REPRESENT PROPERTY OWNER

I, 1346 Thorpe Lane, Ltd. (owner) acknowledge that I am the rightful owner of the property located at 1346 Thorpe Lane, San Marcos, TX (address).

I hereby authorize Scott Phillips (agent name) to serve as my agent to file this application for a Zoning change (application type), and to work with the Responsible Official / Department on my behalf throughout the process.

1346 Thorpe Lane, Ltd.
By: BGP 2015 Management, LLC, its general partner

Signature of Property Owner: Andy Pastor Date: 3/10/17
Printed Name: Andy Pastor
Executive VP

Signature of Agent: Scott Phillips Date: 3/10/2017
Printed Name: Scott Phillips

To be completed by Staff: Case # ____________________________

Planning & Development Services • 630 East Hopkins • San Marcos, Texas 78666 • 512-393-8230
To whom it may concern

My name is Charles Reeves and I currently own a dental practice at 1346 Thorpe Lane. I have had my practice there since 1993 and my father had his practice there since 1972. It has been a true blessing to provide dental care to San Marcos Tx. for over 45 years at this location.

In the fall of 2016 Endeavor real estate group bought the property and I was told that they were going to do there best to keep the 3 tenants in place and sign all of us to leases. The rent went up so much that the pharmacist left and I have not seen the chiropractor for months. I did sign a 3 year lease.

Now endeavor wants to rezone a property that has provided much needed medical/professional services for over 40 years to this part of San Marcos.

If everything on Thorpe Lane turns into retail I believe the citizens who live on this side of town will loose close access to much needed professionals and healthcare providers.

I hope you can value the concerns of your longtime small business owners and citizens. My concern is that big companies that don't even live or work in San Marcos will have a greater voice than those of us who have been a part of San Marcos most of our lives.

Thank you for your time

Charles Reeves
512-757-5082

CAUTION: This is an email from an EXTERNAL source. DO NOT click links or open attachments without positive sender verification of purpose. Never enter USERNAME, PASSWORD or sensitive information on linked pages from this email.
Consent Agenda

Item #XX

• Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-XX, on the first of two readings, amending the Official Zoning Map of the City by rezoning 0.951 acres of land, more or less, out of the J. M. Veramendi Survey, Abstract 17, Hays County, located at 1346 Thorpe Lane from “OP” Office Professional District to “CC” Community Commercial District, and including procedural provisions.
Summary

• Approximately 0.951 acres

• Existing one-story multi-tenant building on property with office / medical uses

• Located within Midtown High Intensity Zone

• Currently zoned Office Professional (OP), requesting Community Commercial (CC) zoning

• The applicant intends to lease the remaining vacant suites with retail and restaurant uses
Site Photos

Front / Side View
View of property frontage
Front / Side View
Rear view of parking lot
**Ordinance 2017-XX**

**Staff Recommendation**

- A public hearing at the Planning and Zoning Commission was held on April 25, 2017. The Commission recommended approval of the request with a vote of 8-0.

- **Staff recommends approval of Ordinance 2017-XX as submitted**
AGENDA CAPTION:
7:00PM Receive a Staff presentation and hold a Public Hearing to receive comments for or against Resolution 2017-88R, authorizing the submission of an application to the Texas Department of Transportation for funding under the Statewide Alternatives Transportation Set-Aside Program for the proposed San Marcos River Bike and Pedestrian Trail Project (Priority Rank No.1) and the Downtown Accessible Pedestrian Signal Project (Priority Rank No. 2); authorizing the Interim City Manager or his designee to execute any and all documents as necessary to accept such funding, if awarded; authorizing the commitment of local matching funds of at least 20 percent of total project costs and the Texas Department of Transportation 15 percent administrative cost; and providing an effective date; and consider approval of Resolution 2017-88R.

Meeting date:  May 16, 2016

Department:  Public Services Department - Tom Taggart, Community Services Department - Rodney Cobb

Funds Required:  $540,000
Account Number:  Future bond issue
Funds Available:  Future bond issue
Account Name:

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:
Goal #5: Maintain and improve the City’s infrastructure

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s):
Transportation Goal 1: A safe, well-coordinated transportation system implemented in an environmentally sensitive manner

BACKGROUND:
The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) is holding a statewide Call for Projects under the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA Set-Aside) Program for population areas of 200,000 or less. The TA Set-Aside Program provides funding to construct a variety of alternative transportation projects that improve mobility for non-motorized users and mitigate congestion by providing transportation options. Eligible project activities include construction of on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, infrastructure for non-drivers, and access to public transportation. Projects will be scored heavily for Project Readiness and Local Funding and Support. Project nominations are due May 22, 2017. At a minimum, a 20% local match is required.
The Departments of Community Services and Public Services seeks to submit the following projects in response to the TxDOT TA Set-Aside Program Call-for-Projects:

1. San Marcos River Bike and Pedestrian Trail (Estimated Total Cost: $2,500,000; City’s Match: $500,000)
2. Downtown Accessible Pedestrian Traffic Signal Project (Estimated Total Cost: $200,000; City’s Match: $40,000)
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-  R

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION TO THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR FUNDING UNDER THE STATEWIDE ALTERNATIVES TRANSPORTATION SET-ASIDE PROGRAM FOR THE PROPOSED SAN MARCOS RIVER BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAIL PROJECT (PRIORITY RANK NO. 1) AND THE DOWNTOWN ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL PROJECT (PRIORITY RANK NO. 2); AUTHORIZING THE INTERIM CITY MANAGER OR HIS DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ANY AND ALL DOCUMENTS AS NECESSARY TO ACCEPT SUCH FUNDING, IF AWARDED; AUTHORIZING THE COMMITMENT OF LOCAL MATCHING FUNDS OF AT LEAST 20 PERCENT OF TOTAL PROJECT COSTS AND THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 15 PERCENT ADMINISTRATIVE COST; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

RECITALS:

1. The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) issued a call for nominations in January 2017 for communities to apply for federal highway funding assistance made available through the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program (TA Set-Aside Program).

2. The City of San Marcos wishes to improve the safety and efficiency of the movement of people by walking or bicycling.

3. In furtherance of this goal has identified two projects ranked in order of priority below for which it seeks funding under the TA Set-Aside Program:

   a. **Priority Ranking No. 1.** San Marcos River Bike and Pedestrian Trail; and

   b. **Priority Ranking No. 2.** Downtown Accessible Pedestrian Traffic Signal Project.

4. Each of these projects will advance the objectives of the City stated in paragraph 2 and are in the best interests of the public health, safety and welfare.

   BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

   PART 1. The Interim City Manager, or his designee, is authorized to apply for funding through the Texas Department of Transportation TA Set Aside Program for the San Marcos River Bike and Pedestrian Trail project and the Downtown Accessible Pedestrian Traffic Signal project.
PART 2. The projects are ranked in order of priority as follows:

a. **Priority Ranking No. 1.** San Marcos River Bike and Pedestrian Trail; and

b. **Priority Ranking No. 2.** Downtown Accessible Pedestrian Traffic Signal Project.

PART 3. The City supports funding this project as described in the 2017 TA Set-Aside Nomination Form (including the construction budget, TxDOT’s 15% administrative cost, and the required local match) and is willing to commit to the project’s development, implementation, construction, maintenance, management, and financing. The City is willing and able to enter into an agreement with TxDOT by resolution or ordinance, should the project be selected for funding.

PART 4. The Interim City Manager, or his designee is authorized to execute any and all documents as necessary to accept funding for the above projects under the TA Set-Aside Program, if awarded.

PART 5. This resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately from and after its adoption.

ADOPTED on May 16, 2017.

John Thomaides
Mayor

Attest:

Jamie Lee Case
City Clerk
ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC SIGNAL LOCATION MAP

LEGEND

● PROPOSED APS
〇 EXISTING APS
AGENDA CAPTION:
7:00PM  Hold a public hearing to receive comments for or against Substantial Amendment No. 2 to the Action Plan of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant - Disaster Recovery Grant (CDBG-DR).

Meeting date:  May 16, 2017

Department:  Planning and Development Services

Funds Required:  N/A
Account Number:  N/A
Funds Available:  N/A
Account Name:  N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:  Maintain and Improve City’s Infrastructure

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s):  Environment and Resource Protection Goal #4: A population prepared for and resilient to man-made and natural disasters.

BACKGROUND:
The purpose of this agenda item is to request citizen input on the substantial amendment #2.
Content being added, changed, or amended by this document:

1. **Infrastructure Projects**
   The City conducted a feasibility study to determine the infrastructure projects that would protect households from flooding with the limited amount of Community Development Block Grant – Disaster Recovery funds. The City will be allocating additional local funds to complete the identified projects to mitigate floods up to 37-yr levels. The Action Plan is being amended to add the specific infrastructure projects. See the attached “Infrastructure Projects” which will be located in Tab 3: Action Plan Section VIII D. Infrastructure and behind the renamed Section J. Infrastructure Projects.

2. **Flood Recovery Expenditure Projection**
   As required by Federal Register FR-5938-N-01, the Action Plan is being amended to add a quarterly projection of expenditures and performance outcomes. The projection will be located in Appendix I “Flood Recovery Expenditure Projection” behind the Annual Projection Graph.

3. **Housing Program Guidelines – Period of Affordability**
   The Action Plan is being amended to change the affordability period of rental homes repaired or reconstructed from five (5) years to the “Period of Affordability” Ranges Used by the HOME which will be placed in Tab 3: Action Plan Section VIIIC3b.

Approved for submittal to HUD: _____________________          ________________
Charles Daniels, Interim City Manager          Date

Submitted to HUD for approval:  May 31, 2017

HUD approval received: _____________________

Posted on City Website:  May 1, 2017
CDBG-Disaster Recovery
Substantial Amendment No. 2

Tuesday, May 16, 2017
Agenda

- Why an Amendment?
- Infrastructure Projects
- Expenditure Projection
- Rental Policy Change
- Amendment Timeline
Background

• In response to the Memorial Day Floods and All Saints Flood of 2015, San Marcos received a $25M allocation from the U.S. Department of Housing (HUD).

• **Substantial Change** in Action Plan requires an Amendment to the Action Plan.

• 3 major changes
  o infrastructure projects,
  o expenditures, and
  o rental housing policy.
# Action Plan Projects and Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Single Family Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rental Unit</td>
<td>2,524,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blanco Gardens</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarewood/Barbara</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uhland Road</td>
<td>$4,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(contingency)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,762,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,080,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rental Unit Housing Policy Change

- **Period of Affordability**
- **Action Plan – 5 year lien**
- **Amendment – Standard HOME Program Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure on Unit</th>
<th>Period of Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $15,000</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001 to $40,000</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $40,001</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Housing Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Secure Applicant Pool</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach/Application Intake/Eligibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Site-Specific Planning Activities</th>
<th>Damage Assessment/Scope of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey/Plans and Specifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Construction</th>
<th>Contractor Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signing Event/Setup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4: Post-Construction</th>
<th>Payment/Closeout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amendment Process

- Comment Period: April 28 – May 31
- Post information: April 28, 2017
- Public Hearing: May 16, 2017
- Add Comments to Amendment: May 31, 2017
- City Management Signature: May 31, 2017
- Post Amendment with Comments: May 31, 2017
- Submit Amendment to HUD: June 1, 2017
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-28, on the first of two readings, designating six parking spaces located at the southwest and southeast corners of Guadalupe and San Antonio Streets as loading and unloading spaces for use only by Transportation Network Company drivers who are waiting for prearranged rides between the hours of 10:00 PM and 3:00 AM each day of the week, authorizing the City Traffic Engineer to install signs identifying such parking spaces; amending the traffic register maintained under section 82.067 consistent with this Ordinance; including procedural provisions; and declaring an effective date.

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: Police

Funds Required: $600
Account Number: 10006147-53230
Funds Available: $15,840
Account Name: Signs-traffic

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:
Provide for the Efficient and Effective Delivery of Services

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): N/A

BACKGROUND:
The utilization of Transportation Network Companies such as Uber and Lyft has become commonplace in our downtown, particularly at night during the peak bar-attendance hours. San Marcos Police Corporal Ryan Hartman, who is assigned to our downtown patrol division, has observed many instances wherein TNC drivers stop in the lane of traffic in or near our downtown square in order to pick up and drop off their passengers. Corporal Hartman met with Chief Stapp and Sabas Avila and recommended that several spaces near the intersection of San Antonio Street and Guadalupe Street be designated for TNC drop-off and pick-up use only between the hours of 10:00 PM and 3:00 AM every night of the week. This recommendation will enhance safety in our downtown during these hours by reducing the risk of a TNC driver’s vehicle being struck by another motorist while stopped in the lane of traffic.
ORDINANCE NO. 2017-

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS DESIGNATING SIX PARKING SPACES LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST CORNERS OF GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO STREETS AS LOADING AND UNLOADING SPACES FOR USE ONLY BY TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANY DRIVERS WHO ARE WAITING FOR PREARRANGED RIDES BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 10:00 P.M. AND 3:00 A.M. EACH DAY OF THE WEEK; AUTHORIZING THE CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER TO INSTALL SIGNS IDENTIFYING SUCH PARKING SPACES; AMENDING THE TRAFFIC REGISTER MAINTAINED UNDER SECTION 82.067 CONSISTENT WITH THIS ORDINANCE; INCLUDING PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS; AND DECLARING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Six parking spaces located at the southwest and southeast corners of Guadalupe and San Antonio Streets as shown in Exhibit “A” are hereby designated as loading and unloading spaces for use only by transportation network company drivers who are waiting for prearranged rides.

SECTION 2. The restricted use provided in Section 1 is limited to the hours between 10:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m. each day of the week.

SECTION 3. The City Traffic Engineer is hereby authorized to install signs identifying the parking spaces and providing notice of said restrictions and the traffic register maintained under Section 82.067 of the City Code is amended consistent with this ordinance.

SECTION 4. If any word, phrase, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance is held to be unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the other provisions of this ordinance will continue in force if they can be given effect without the invalid portion.

SECTION 5. All ordinances and resolutions or parts of ordinances or resolutions in conflict with this ordinance are repealed.

SECTION 6. This ordinance shall be effective upon its adoption on second reading.

PASSED AND APPROVED on first reading May 16, 2017.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on second reading June 6, 2017.
John Thomaides  
Mayor  

Attest:  

Jamie Lee Case  
City Clerk  

Approved:  

Michael Cosentino  
City Attorney
EXHIBIT A
Designated Parking Spaces Shown in **Yellow**
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-29, on the first of two readings, amending Section 82.128 of the San Marcos City Code to clarify the exceptions allowing large commercial trucks weighing more than one ton to deviate from established truck routes; and providing an effective date.

Meeting date:  May 16, 2017 - First Reading
                June 6, 2017 - Second Reading

Department:  Public Services - Tom Taggart (Sabas Avila)

Funds Required:  N/A
Account Number:  N/A
Funds Available:  N/A
Account Name:  N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:
Goal #5: Maintain and improve the City’s infrastructure

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s):
Transportation Goal 1: A safe, well-coordinated transportation system implemented in an environmentally sensitive manner

BACKGROUND:
The current Truck Route ordinance allows trucks to depart from designated routes:

(1) When departure is necessary to reach a terminal or to load or unload materials at a location situated off the applicable route;

(2) When departure follows the shortest practical route consistent with the reasonable operation of the vehicle; and

(3) The operator of the vehicle keeps in the operator’s possession a log book, delivery slips or other evidence of the operator’s destination and point of origin

Truck drivers have asserted that the second part of the exception allows them to take short cuts through the city even if deviation from an established truck route was not necessary in order to reach a terminal or to load
or unload materials.

Approval of this amendment will clarify the original intent and purpose of the ordinance - that departure from designated truck routes is allowed only when necessary to reach a terminal or to load or unload materials at a location situated off the applicable route.

The Police and Transportation Departments support this revision.
ORDINANCE NO. 2017-________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS AMENDING SECTION 82.128 OF THE SAN MARCOS CITY CODE TO CLARIFY THE EXCEPTIONS ALLOWING LARGE COMMERCIAL TRUCKS WEIGHING MORE THAN ONE TON TO DEVIATE FROM ESTABLISHED TRUCK ROUTES; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Section 82.128 of the San Marcos City Code is hereby amended as set forth below (Added text is indicated by underlining. Deleted text is indicated by strikethroughs.)

Sec. 82.128. Departure from routes.

(a) The operator of a vehicle restricted to truck routes under this division may depart from these routes under the following conditions:

(1) When departure is necessary to reach a terminal or to load or unload materials at a location situated off the applicable route and such departure follows the shortest practical route consistent with the reasonable operation of the vehicle; and

(2) When departure follows the shortest practical route consistent with the reasonable operation of the vehicle; and

(3) The operator of the vehicle keeps in the operator's possession a log book, delivery slips or other evidence of the operator's destination and point of origin.

(b) The operator shall allow a police officer, upon request, to inspect the log book, delivery slips or other evidence of the operator's destination and point of origin.

SECTION 2. If any word, phrase, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance is held to be unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the other provisions of this ordinance will continue in force if they can be given effect without the invalid portion.

SECTION 3. All ordinances and resolutions or parts of ordinances or resolutions in conflict with this ordinance are repealed.

SECTION 4. This ordinance will take effect after its passage, approval and adoption on second reading.
PASSED AND APPROVED on first reading on May 16, 2017.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on second reading on June 6, 2017.

John Thomaides
Mayor

Attest: Approved:

Jamie Lee Case  Michael J. Cosentino
City Clerk  City Attorney
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval of Ordinance 2017-32, on first and final reading, canvassing election returns of a Bond Election held within said city on May 6, 2017, for Public Safety Facilities in the aggregate principal amount of $17,450,000 and Library Improvements in the aggregate principal amount of $14,750,000; declaring an emergency creating the need to adopt this Ordinance with only one reading; and containing other provision incident and related to the purposes; and providing an effective date

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: City Clerk’s Office

Funds Required: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Funds Available: N/A
Account Name: N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL: N/A

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): N/A

BACKGROUND:
The official canvass of the 2017 Bond Election will be provided to the City Clerk following the posting of this item. The Official Report will be attached once it is received, but for now the unofficial report is attached for immediate review.
ORDINANCE NO. 2017-32
ORDINANCE CANVASSING ELECTION RETURNS OF A BOND ELECTION HELD WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS ON MAY 6, 2017 FOR PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $17,450,000 AND LIBRARY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $14,750,000; DECLARING AN EMERGENCY CREATING THE NEED TO ADOPT THIS ORDINANCE WITH ONLY ONE READING; AND CONTAINING OTHER PROVISION INCIDENT AND RELATED TO THE PURPOSES; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

THE STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF HAYS

CITY OF SAN MARCOS

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of San Marcos, Texas (the "City") ordered an election to be held in the City on May 6, 2017, on the PROPOSITIONS hereinafter stated; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has investigated all matters pertaining to the election, including the ordering, giving notice, officers, holding, and making returns of the election; and

WHEREAS, the election officers who held the election have duly made the returns of the result thereof, and the returns have been duly delivered to this City Council.

THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS, TEXAS:

1. The City Council officially finds and determines that the election was duly ordered, that proper notice of the election was duly given, that proper election officers were duly appointed prior to the election, that the election was duly held, that the City has complied with the Federal Voting Rights Act and the Texas Election Code, that due returns of the result of the election have been made and delivered, and that the City Council has duly canvassed the returns, all in accordance with law and the Ordinance calling the election.

2. The City Council officially finds and determines that the following votes were cast at the election on the submitted PROPOSITIONS by the resident, qualified electors of said City, who voted at said election.

CITY PUBLIC SAFETY PROPOSITION

THE ISSUANCE OF $17,450,000 TAX BONDS FOR CITY PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES TO INCLUDE THE POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS AND RELATED EMERGENCY AND TRAINING FACILITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Early Votes</th>
<th>Election Day</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR:</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY LIBRARY PROPOSITION

THE ISSUANCE OF $14,750,000 TAX BONDS FOR CITY LIBRARY FACILITIES AND PROJECTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Early Votes</th>
<th>Election Day</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR:</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The City Council officially finds, determines and declares the result of the election to be that all the Propositions so submitted received an affirmative vote and were approved by the voters at the election.

4. City Public Safety Proposition, relating to the issuance of $17,450,000 tax bonds for City Public Safety Facilities to include the Police and Fire Departments and related Emergency and Training Facilities, is hereby adopted.

5. City Library Proposition, relating to the issuance of $14,750,000 tax bonds for City Library Facilities and Projects, is hereby adopted.

6. The importance of this Ordinance creates an emergency and an imperative public necessity, and the provisions of the Charter requiring that ordinances be presented at two separate meetings be waived and, this Ordinance will take effect immediately upon adoption.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on this the 16th day of May, 2017.

________________________
John Thomaides, Mayor
City of San Marcos, Texas

ATTEST:

________________________
Jamie Lee Case, City Clerk
City of San Marcos, Texas

APPROVED:

________________________
Michael J. Cosentino, City Attorney
City of San Marcos, Texas
## City Public Safety Proposition  San Marcos Public Safety Prop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Early Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Election Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Total Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Percent Turnout</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY SM</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>15140</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY SM</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>17133</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>2252</td>
<td>32273</td>
<td></td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City Library Proposition  San Marcos City Library Prop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Early Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Election Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Total Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Percent Turnout</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY SM</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>15140</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY SM</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>17133</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>2252</td>
<td>32273</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City Public Safety Proposition San Marcos Public Safety Prop, Vote For 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cast Votes:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Over Votes:</th>
<th>Under Votes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97.74%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>98.18%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Precincts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts Counted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Ballots</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>32,273</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City Library Proposition San Marcos City Library Prop, Vote For 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cast Votes:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Over Votes:</th>
<th>Under Votes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>98.50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>98.58%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Precincts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts Counted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Ballots</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>32,273</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SMCISD Trustee, District 1 San Marcos CISD 1, Vote For 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cast Votes:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Over Votes:</th>
<th>Under Votes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>90.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Precincts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts Counted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Ballots</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider approval, by motion, authorizing the first Regular City Council meeting of July to be moved to July 5, 2017 due to the Independence Day holiday.

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: City Clerk

Funds Required:
Account Number:
Funds Available:
Account Name:

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): [add the Plan elements and Goal # and Objective(s)]

BACKGROUND:

Due to the Independence Holiday falling on the first Tuesday of July. Staff is requesting that council approve Wednesday, July 5, 2017 as the Regular City Council Meeting date.
AGENDA CAPTION:
Discuss and consider appointments to fill vacancies on the San Marcos Commission on Children and Youth, and provide direction to staff.

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: City Clerk

Funds Required: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Funds Available: N/A
Account Name: N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): Youth Master Plan

BACKGROUND:
On May 2, 2017 the City Council approved the extension of Key Constituency Members to two year terms on the San Marcos Commission on Children and Youth. The current key constituency members that have been held over are:
Kristin Sheffield
Billy Stokes
Marty Nelson
Jeff Baergen
(3) Three Vacant Spots

The City Council shall appoint seven at-large key constituency group representatives. The seven at-large members appointed shall endeavor to represent key constituency groups in the community to include:

- Family Member - through parent and guardian groups such as PTO/PTA/Booster Clubs/Home School Association.
- Youth service providers.
- Faith based community.
- Non-profit.
- Public Safety.
- Community members that have experience as teachers and/or expertise in early childhood, youth or general education policy.
Staff is asking council to appoint members to fill these terms. Terms will be through February 28, 2019. Applications have been provided separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Key Constituency</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jeff Baergen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1. Jeff Baergen, Executive VP, San Marcos Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marty Nelson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2. Suad Hooper, Head Start Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Billy Stokes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4. Alexandra Mylius, Home Visiting Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Marty Nelson, Sunset After School Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. David Ross, Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Kristen Sheffield, Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Billy Stokes, Retired Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. David Swain, Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SMCCY Representative Needed**

| Austin Community College - Vacant | 1. Dana Washington, ACC Center Supervisor |
AGENDA CAPTION:
Discuss and consider a request by Becky Collins, Walton Development and Management, to allow an early Preferred Scenario Amendment Process to begin in May, 2017 for Project Zircon and other applicants, and provide direction to staff.
Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: Planning & Development Services

Funds Required: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Funds Available: N/A
Account Name: N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL: Recruit employers that will provide job opportunities for knowledge and skilled manufacturing workers.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s): EDG4: An enhanced and diverse local economic environment that is prosperous, efficient and provides improved opportunities to residents.

BACKGROUND:
Becky Collins of Walton Development and Management has requested the opportunity to apply for a Preferred Scenario Amendment for the portion of the proposed Gas Lamp development to allow for a zoning change request from SmartCode Special District to Industrial.

The currently posted Preferred Scenario Amendment (PSA) calendar was released in March, 2017 with an application deadline of July 31, 2017 for a Fall Amendment cycle. Walton would like to begin the PSA process earlier than July to meet their timelines for construction, which would begin in the fall.

The Land Development Code allows for PSA requests to be considered twice per year on a schedule established by the Planning & Development Services Director. A schedule was posted for a spring cycle in late 2017 however no applications were received. The “additional” request could be considered the first process of the year and could be used for other applicants who missed the spring application deadline and wish to be considered earlier than the fall cycle. At this time, we have the potential for three additional applications.
Dear Mr. Daniels and Ms. Mattingly,

This letter is to respectfully request the City Council’s consideration of an application by Walton Texas, LP (‘Walton’) for a Preferred Scenario Amendment (‘PSA’), outside of the twice-annual application window established by the Planning and Development Services Department.

Walton is the owner of approximately 495 acres in the south east part of the City of San Marcos, a property commonly referred to as the Gas Lamp project. The property is designated as “Medium Intensity” and “Area of Stability” under the City’s comprehensive plan, and is zoned for SmartCode.

Walton is working with a spec office developer for 23.345 acres along Centerpoint Road (Project Zircon), as well as a potential future project that could bring Industrial, Manufacturing and Distribution projects on an additional 58 +/- acres (for a total of approximately 81 acres). These economic development projects necessitate a change from the current zoning districts, and a corresponding change to the underlying Preferred Scenario designations.

On April 12, 2017, the Zircon team met with the various City representatives to better understand the items necessary to bring this exciting project from the concept to delivery stage. Walton will be requesting a change in zoning from Smart Code to a more appropriate zoning to allow the project to move forward, along with a Preferred Scenario Amendment. As stated above, a portion of the property is currently in the Medium Intensity zone, and the balance is in the Area if Stability. We will be requesting a change to Employment Center. I have attached a copy of the parcel’s survey map that shows the existing Preferred Scenario in blue, and the request in a red color. I have also included the working draft of the Preferred Scenario Amendment Form.

We hope that the Staff and Council would look favorably on this request as we are working toward a goal of bringing quality jobs to San Marcos.

Please let me know if you would like to meet to discuss further or if you have any questions related to this request.

Best,

BECKY COLLINS
General Manager

Walton Development and Management | West USA
9811 South IH 35 Suite 4-200 | Austin, TX 78744
Main: 512.347.7070 ext. 2

Direct: 512.672.8682 | Mobile: 512.574-5332
Becky.Collins@Walton.com | Walton.com
May 2017

July 2017

August 2017

September 2017

Sun | Mon | Tue | Wed | Thu | Fri | Sat
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  
7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 
14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 
21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 
28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1  | 2  | 3  
4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 
11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 
18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 
25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 
2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  
9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 
16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 
23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 
30 | 31 | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  
6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 
13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 
20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 
27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1  | 2  
3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  

May 19 - Application Deadline

May 26 - Comparison Map & Summary to Website
* Courtesy Notices Sent

June 2017

July 2017

August 2017

September 2017

Sun | Mon | Tue | Wed | Thu | Fri | Sat
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  
8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 
15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 
22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 
29 | 30 | 31 | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  
5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 
12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 
19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 
26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1  
2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  
9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 
16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 
23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 
30 | 31 | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  
6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 
13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 
20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 
27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 1  | 2  
3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  

June 13 - Update to P&Z (non consent item)

June 20 - Update to Council (with possible direction)

June 21 - Stakeholder Meeting: update at Neighborhood Commission

July 11 - Hearing and Action by P&Z

August 1 - Hearing and Discussion by Council

August 15 - Hearing and Action by Council

September 5 - 2nd Reading by Council

*dates are subject to change

- Council Meeting
- P&Z Meeting
- Council Notification
- P&Z Notification
AGENDA CAPTION:
Consider a motion to reverse the City’s Policy and Plans to convert Guadalupe and LBJ Streets to two-way traffic, and provide direction to Staff.

Meeting date: May 16, 2017

Department: City Manager’s Office

Funds Required: N/A
Account Number: N/A
Funds Available: N/A
Account Name: N/A

CITY COUNCIL GOAL:

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ELEMENT(s):

BACKGROUND:
Mayor Pro Tem Hughson and Council Member Mihalkanin requested this item as a discussion item, but upon Staff’s review of the subject found that on March 1, 2016, this topic was postponed to allow an advisory opinion to be provided by the Ethics Commission at the request of Council Member Gregson. On April 20, 2016, that opinion was provided to Mr. Gregson allowing him to vote and provide direction on the subject. However, due to situations beyond Staff’s control the item was not back the remainder of 2016 so Staff has placed an action item on this agenda for Council’s consideration.
COUNCIL WORKSHOP

OCTOBER 14, 2015

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
It is 1965, and traffic has become a problem around the Square....

Something must be done....

And the issue is taken up at Council.
March 1965
Council discusses lack of traffic control around the Square. It is put forth that one-way streets may be a necessity in the future.

1967
Mayor and Council set up meeting with planning groups and officials for further discussion.

1968
Traffic engineer is hired to produce a traffic report.

1969
Traffic study is completed and priorities are set with the option for future one-way conversion.

1970
A revised traffic report that includes one-way conversion passes unanimously and is officially adopted.

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Local Citizens Drive Safely Despite One-way Changeover
Presentation Outline

Objective

Economic Analysis

Street Options

Background

Parking Impact

Recommendations Next Steps

Traffic Impact

Options Evaluations
Objectives of Analysis

- Consider Vision/Goals/Objectives from Downtown Master Plan & Vision San Marcos Comprehensive Plan
- Perform Economic Analysis of Downtown San Marcos and impact of one-way/two-way.
- Collect current traffic data and evaluate traffic operations
- Develop Roadway Cross-Section Options
- Evaluate Options
GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Downtown Master Plan
Vision/Goals

- Support idea that Downtown is a destination.
- Direct “through-traffic” around perimeter.
- Direct visitors into Downtown.
- Make Downtown accessible to all.
- Make mobility in Downtown a priority.
- Promote a range of transportation options (pedestrian, bicycle, rail & transit)
Downtown Master Plan Recommendations

- Implement comprehensive wayfinding.
- Reinforce character of primary & secondary streets.
- Convert streets to two-way.
- Create parking management plan & district.
- Make streetscapes pedestrian & bicycle friendly.
- Establish gateway corridors.
- Fund/promote commuter rail stop.
Vision San Marcos

Goals/Objectives

- Prioritize and complete infrastructure upgrades in Downtown
- Establish gateway corridors
- Develop high quality public spaces within Downtown
- A multimodal transportation network to improve accessibility and mobility
- Focus on non-vehicular transportation improvements
Objective

Background

Economic Analysis

Street Options

Traffic Impact

Parking Impact

Options Evaluations

Recommendations Next Steps

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Economic Analysis Report

Context: Recent Growth in San Marcos

Background: Pros and Cons of Street Conversion

Case Studies

Findings

Conclusion

Appendix One

Overall Trends/Downtown and the Study Area

Traffic

Lubbock

Traffic Speeds/Mobility

West Palm Beach

Public Safety

Louisville

Economic Vitality

Charleston

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION

The Benefits of Urbanist Development
There is often a conflation between street direction and vehicular speed

- Much of the benefit is derived from the slower rate of speed associated with vehicle traffic on two-way streets.
- Slower vehicle speeds are beneficial for both pedestrian safety/comfort as well as promoting a sense of vitality through improved storefront visibility and “good congestion” in commercial areas.
- Using measures such as signal timing to control traffic speed, San Marcos could derive the benefits of slower traffic on Guadalupe and LBJ Streets while at the same time not giving up the mobility bonus created by one-way streets during high traffic volume times of day.
Economic Analysis Findings

Not all streets (and communities) are equivalent

- Most of the negative impacts associated with one-way streets occur on multiple mile-long stretches of three-lane or four-lane streets with few street lights or other traffic control methods. These are streets in which the average rate of speed is high and the surrounding areas become inhospitable to pedestrians, shoppers, and residents.
- In San Marcos, the one-way pair of Guadalupe and LBJ Streets are 0.8 miles long and punctuated at each cross-street by stop lights or stop signs. Thus the greatest negative impacts of large one-way arterials are unlikely present.
Not all streets (and communities) are equivalent (continued)

• The overall size, density, and pattern of the built environment highly influences the impacts of changes in transportation infrastructure, with greater effects in large, dense, highly urban environments.
• There is almost no information available that reports on the impact of street conversion in communities that are comparable to San Marcos in terms of size, density, role in a broader regional economy, and stage of development.
• However, it seems safe to say that the relatively small study area, lack of density, and proximity to a major employment center that is a commuter destination undercuts the magnitude of possible gains.
Street direction isn’t a determinant of economic impact

- No studies found which indicated that converting streets from one-way to two-way (or vice versa) in and of itself caused significant private investment in an area, or yielded a measurable change in retail activity.
- However, a more comprehensive program of public investment in roadway-related infrastructure (including elements such as streetscaping, wayfinding, and parking improvements) has been shown in a number of cases to both increase retail activity and subsequently spur private redevelopment efforts.
Economic Analysis Conclusion

- Guadalupe and LBJ Streets are major arterials for traffic to flow between Texas State University and the rest of San Marcos;
- In addition to street conversion, streetscaping, wayfinding, public transportation infrastructure, and parking improvements are all fundamental parts of promoting a vibrant downtown;
- There is little to no analysis that considers the impact of the above potential improvements/tools in isolation, but a package tailored to fit this particular area in San Marcos is likely to facilitate the realization of downtown’s development potential; and,
- The relative lack of density and smaller-scale built environment suggests that weight be given to mobility, at least at this stage of the community’s development.
CITY OF SAN MARCOS  TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION

Objectives

Background

Economic Analysis

Street Options

Traffic Impact

Parking Impact

Options Evaluations

Recommendations Next Steps
Key Factors of “Urbanist Development”

- Providing a Sense of Community
- Creating a “Place Identity”
- Providing a Mix of Land Uses
- Creating Walkable Downtown/Neighborhoods
Improved Streetscapes

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Mid-Block Paseos

Work with property owners to create mid-block paseos on the large block bounded by LBJ, MLK, Guadalupe and San Antonio Streets.
Parking Options

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Safe Bicycle Movement

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option A
Two-Way Traffic Operations
Partial Cycle Tracks on Guadalupe, San Antonio and LBJ
Limited Multimodal Operations

Option C
Two-Way Traffic Operations
Continuous Cycle Tracks on Guadalupe & Hopkins
Partial Cycle Track on LBJ

Option E
One-Way Traffic Operations
Continuous Cycle Tracks on Guadalupe & Hopkins
No Cycle Track on LBJ
Option A – Two Way

Guadalupe

One Lane in Each Direction

LBJ

One Lane in Each Direction

San Antonio

Maintain Existing Lanes

Hopkins

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option C – Two Way

- Reduce WB Travel Lane to Accommodate Cycle Track
- One Lane in Each Direction

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option E – One Way

Guadalupe

Two Southbound Lanes

Two Northbound Lanes

Reduce WB Travel Lane to Accommodate Cycle Track

San Antonio

LBJ

Hutchison

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Objective

Background

Economic Analysis

Street Options

Traffic Impact

Parking Impact

Options Evaluations

Recommendations Next Steps

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Study Area

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Traffic Impact - Speed

Average Speed PM Peak Period
(miles per hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Traffic Impact - Travel Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time per Vehicle</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(minutes per vehicle)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Future Conditions - 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche St. and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and University Dr.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Hutchinson St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and San Antonio St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Martin Luther King Dr.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and University Dr.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and Hutchinson St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and San Antonio St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Gary St. and University Dr.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Gary St and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Allen Pkwy. and University Dr.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Build – One Way

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option C – Two Way

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option E – One Way

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Along Guadalupe Street</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along LBJ Drive</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along Hutchison Street</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along Hopkins Street</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along San Antonio Street</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>453</strong></td>
<td><strong>-98</strong></td>
<td><strong>-77</strong></td>
<td><strong>-39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking Loss: Option A (Two – Way)

Total of 98 parking spots removed

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Total of 77 parking spots removed

Parking Loss: Option C (Two – Way)

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Parking Loss: Option E (One – Way)

Total of 39 parking spots removed

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
CITY OF SAN MARCOS  TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
City provided weight for each criteria: 5-most important to 1-least important.

Consultant provided criteria performance for each option: 5 – highest to 1-lowest.

Each option receives total score by criteria reflecting weight & performance.

Max score = 25 points
## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations/Travel Time</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Land Use/Development; Business Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Modes; Complete Streets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost/Constructability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Options Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>Option E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations/Travel Time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Impact</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Land Use/Dev; Business Impact</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Modes; Complete Streets</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost/Conductability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
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Options Evaluations

Recommendations Next Steps

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option E – One Way

Guadalupe

Two Southbound Lanes

San Antonio

Two Northbound Lanes

Reduce WB Travel Lane to Accommodate Cycle Track

Hopkins

LBJ

Hutchison

Edward Gary St.

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Option E

- One-Way Operations
- Easily convertible to two-way operations in the future

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO - WAY CONVERSION
Cross Section: LBJ Drive Looking North

Parallel and reverse-angle parking

Sharrows with Two Northbound travel lanes

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Cross Section: Guadalupe Looking North

- Parallel parking on both sides
- Two-way cycle track
- Two Southbound travel lanes

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO – WAY CONVERSION
Downtown Improvements
Improved Streetscapes

Generous tree-lined sidewalks that enhance the destination appeal of Downtown, and that encourage “park-once” behavior.
Sharrows and Cycle Tracks

Create protected bikeways north-south and east-west through the Downtown core.
Downtown Parking Area

Develop Mid to Long Term Parking Resources.
Mid-Block Paseos

Work with property owners to create a mid-block paseos on the large block bounded by LBJ, MLK, Guadalupe and San Antonio Streets.
## Current 3-Year CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Projects</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Drainage Phase II Construction</td>
<td>$850K</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 Hutchison Parking Lot Construction</td>
<td>$85K</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Allen Reconstruction Design &amp; Const.</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ/Guadalupe Improvements Design</td>
<td>$200K</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Reconstruction Phase II Design</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ/Guadalupe Improvements Construction</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• City Council Direction
• Finalize Study with High Level Cost Estimates
• Complete Back-in parking survey/Council Direction
• Identify/Modify CIP projects
• Schedule projects through 2017-2026 CIP process
QUESTIONS?
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Introduction

The conversion of one-way streets to two-way traffic has been implemented in a number of cities across the country. Proposed in the 2008 Downtown Master Plan, San Marcos is now contemplating conversion of the one-way pair, Guadalupe Street and LBJ Street, in the downtown area. This is part of broader revitalization efforts in San Marcos’ historic Downtown area that seeks to rebalance the past few decades of rapid growth along the I-35 corridor. In general, street conversions are seen as a means to improve the downtown area’s economic vitality and reinforce existing or nascent redevelopment efforts.

Even so, there has yet to be a comprehensive, quantitative examination of impacts of street conversions, or in truth even the different benefits of one-way and two way streets, on the economic activity in areas adjacent to these roadways. In fact, the efforts to quantify the impact of street design have focused almost exclusively on traffic speeds, congestion modeling, and accident incidence. This report seeks to synthesize the existing available analysis of the economic implications of street design and related infrastructure improvements into a few major lessons to provide guidance to San Marcos policymakers.

Figure 1: City of San Marcos and Street Conversion Study Area

Source: TXP. Inc.
Context: Recent Growth in San Marcos

Overall Trends
Over the past decade and a half, San Marcos’ story has been one of growth. Since 2010, total population in San Marcos has grown 65.6 percent to nearly 60,000 residents. In 2012, San Marcos had the highest population growth of any city in the country at more than 8 percent. The demographics of the City of San Marcos are undoubtedly influenced by the large student population. Residents of San Marcos are younger, live in smaller households, and have a lower income than the state average. The current unemployment rate in San Marcos is also slightly higher than some other areas of Texas.

Figure 2: Population Growth in San Marcos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Housing Occupancy Rate</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos City</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>$15,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays County</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>$26,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>$26,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2008-2013 5 Year, US Census Bureau
Table 2: Employment by Sector in the City of San Marcos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of 2012 Jobs</th>
<th>Share of 2012 Jobs</th>
<th>Change since 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, &amp; Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>116.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies &amp; Enterprises</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>927.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Support &amp; Waste Management</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for Economic Studies, US Census Bureau

Employment opportunities have also expanded rapidly. In the decade between 2002 and 2012 (the most recent year data in available) employment located in San Marcos has increased by 24.4 percent to more than 30,000 jobs. Employment in San Marcos-based businesses is centralized in three sectors: Educational Services (which includes Texas State University) and Retail Trade and Accommodation and Food Services (businesses along I-35, specifically the Outlets). These three sectors account for nearly 60 percent of all employment in the City of San Marcos and have dominated the San Marcos economy for the past decade.

As Texas State has grown to more than 36,000 students and more than 3,200 faculty and staff in 2014-15 at its 491-acre San Marcos campus, it is the largest single employer in San Marcos. In Figure 3, it is possible to see that the highest concentration of employment is just north of the downtown area, with additional high employment areas located along I-35, including the Outlets at the furthest southwest portion of the city.
Figure 3: Employment Centers in San Marcos

Source: Center for Economic Studies, US Census Bureau

Figure 4: Enrollment Growth at Texas State University

Source: Office Institutional Research, Texas State University
The housing market in San Marcos has followed larger regional trends, with significant spikes in new construction activity at the beginning of both of the last decades and a trough in 2007 through 2009. Since the financial crisis and housing market collapse, San Marcos has rebounded to a level of new home construction previously unseen with nearly 350 new single family homes permitted for construction in 2014. Multi-family home construction has similarly exploded since 2009, though no building permits for multi-family construction were documented in 2014.

**Figure 5: New Single Family Homes Built in San Marcos**

Source: Building Permits Survey, US Census Bureau

**Figure 6: New Multi-Family Homes Built in San Marcos**

Source: Building Permits Survey, US Census Bureau
Downtown and the Study Area

San Marcos’s downtown has not benefitted proportionately from the growth seen in other parts of the city. Anchored by the Hays County Courthouse and the Downtown Square, San Marcos’ downtown has become more of a thoroughfare for the students and staff heading to and from Texas State University. San Marcos is examining the potential impact of converting a 0.8-mile stretch of Guadalupe and LBJ Streets in its historic downtown area. Currently, these two streets form a north-south one-way pair between University Drive and Grove Street. Guadalupe and LBJ Streets, along with C M Allen and TX-80/Hopkins Street, form the major thoroughfares for access from I-35 to the downtown area and Texas State University, the city’s largest employer.

If the City of San Marcos implemented a one-way to two-way conversion on Guadalupe and LBJ Streets, the most significantly impact would occur in the properties and businesses immediately adjacent to these streets. There are 207 properties immediately adjacent to Guadalupe and LBJ Streets between University Drive and Grove Street. This area has been designated the Study Area for this report. Currently, the Study Area represents about two percent of the property value in San Marcos (within Hays County). The average assessed value of properties located in the Study Area has increased 12.8 percent over the past five years. Over the same period, the value of properties within the City of San Marcos (within Hays County) has increased 30.1 percent.

Figure 7: Study Area Parcels

Source: Hays County Appraisal District; TXP, Inc.
The majority of parcels located in the Study Area, in terms of number, acreage, and value, are commercial properties. The majority of the businesses in this area are restaurants, bars, and professional service offices.

Table 3: Study Area Property Values by Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Property Count</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>2015 Assessed Value</th>
<th>Value per Square Foot</th>
<th>Change in Value Since 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$576,528</td>
<td>$48.7</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$1,206,570</td>
<td>$68.6</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>$47,606,440</td>
<td>$59.0</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$183,380</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$4,059,300</td>
<td>$63.7</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmatched/Unknown</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>$808,210</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,440,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hays County Appraisal District; TXP, Inc.

*Average Value Per Square Foot is provided for parcels where Interior Square Footage data was available and value was greater than zero. Unmatched/Unknown parcels include properties for which the GIS shapefile data could not be matched to the appraisal dataset or where this data was missing in the appraisal dataset.
### Table 4: Study Area Property Values by Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>$576,528</td>
<td>$545,777</td>
<td>$540,670</td>
<td>$593,880</td>
<td>$593,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>$1,206,570</td>
<td>$1,206,570</td>
<td>$1,206,570</td>
<td>$1,200,370</td>
<td>$1,158,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$47,606,440</td>
<td>$46,895,520</td>
<td>$46,228,460</td>
<td>$44,076,580</td>
<td>$41,162,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$183,380</td>
<td>$183,380</td>
<td>$183,380</td>
<td>$183,380</td>
<td>$183,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$4,059,300</td>
<td>$4,059,300</td>
<td>$4,144,810</td>
<td>$4,144,810</td>
<td>$4,144,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmatched/Unknown</td>
<td>$808,210</td>
<td>$827,950</td>
<td>$926,550</td>
<td>$1,016,570</td>
<td>$1,016,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$54,440,428</td>
<td>$53,718,497</td>
<td>$53,230,440</td>
<td>$51,215,590</td>
<td>$48,259,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hays County Appraisal District; TXP, Inc.

### Figure 9: Development Potential

Parcels with development potential include those properties coded as vacant as well as parcels coded as commercial with no improvements or with a 2015 assessed value of less than $50 per square foot. These parcels total more than 18 acres in San Marcos’ downtown.

Source: TXP, Inc.
Currently, there are 191 active Sales Taxpayers in Study Area. These businesses accounted for less than one percent of the sales tax paid by San Marcos area businesses in 2014. Of those Study Area locations, the majority, 124 taxpayers or 65 percent, are located along Guadalupe and LBJ Streets. These businesses would be the most affected by the proposed one-way to two-way conversion.
Background: Pros and Cons of Street Conversion

The street system in a downtown area serves a variety of purposes for its users. At different points in the past century, traffic engineers and urban planners have advocated for the use of different tools to move cars and people around the urban environment. One-way and two-way streets are some of these tools.

Throughout the United States in the 1960s, rapid population growth in the suburbs and the ascent of the automobile as the dominant form of transportation created a new problem of traffic congestion. One-way street pairs were implemented in many urban environments along major arterials as a means to provide maximum mobility given the existing transportation infrastructure. One-way streets increased vehicle capacity without requiring the construction of major roadways to bypass downtown or conscripting existing on-street parking into additional lanes of traffic.

Over the next few decades, the downtown neighborhoods in most urban areas began to decline as businesses and residents relocated to the suburbs. As traffic volumes downtown declined and efforts to revitalize the central business districts gained popularity in the 1990s, city planners and other stakeholders began to reevaluate the use of vehicular mobility as the only metric for a successful street system. In fact, there are a number of measures which can be used to determine the best possible use of a city’s street system. These will be examined below in the context of street design. In some cases, there is a clear benefit to using either one-way or two-way streets. In others, experts differ in their conclusions from the available data.

Traffic Speeds

One of the significant impacts of one-way streets, and the reason most one-way street pairs were implemented, is that they allow for more vehicular traffic at higher speeds. One-way road pairs of more than 15 blocks in length tend to encourage higher operating speeds. Two-way streets, regardless of posted speed limits, tend to have slower vehicular speeds. Additionally, peak-hour volumes of more than 500 vehicles per lane can cause significant delays on two-way streets, due in part to left-turn movements.

However, many experts assert that higher vehicle speeds are less safe for pedestrians and slowed traffic reduces noise, fumes, and other negative externalities for pedestrians. Moreover, the synchronization of traffic lights can increase the rate of traffic speed and decrease the number of stops vehicles make. In this way, the higher average speed of one-way streets may not necessarily be a benefit, if the ultimate goal is additional foot-traffic in adjacent areas.
Public Safety
There is significant disagreement between experts as to the relative safety of one-way and two-way streets. One-way streets require both drivers and pedestrians to be aware of traffic travelling in only one direction. Moreover, because there is only one direction to the flow of traffic, head-on and left-turn accidents are decreased. However, some studies indicate that two-way streets are beneficial for pedestrians and bike traffic since vehicle traffic tends to travel more slowly, drivers pay more attention due to the conflicting traffic flow, and vehicular conflicts are more predictable. The clear link between traffic accidents and street design is that lower speeds decrease the seriousness of accidents. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports that fatality rates for pedestrians correlate strongly with the speed at which they are struck. At 40 mph the chance of death is 80 percent, at 30 mph it is 40 percent, and at 20 mph the chance of fatality is 5 percent. Data from Albuquerque and Cincinnati showed that on streets which were converted from one-way to two ways, while traffic speed was decreased the incidence of traffic accidents actually increased in over the same time period.

Moreover, there is some indication that multi-lane one-way streets which stretch on for several miles can create opportunities for crime in urban areas. With multiple lanes, a driver can pull over to conduct illegal activity – including make a drug deal, solicit the services of a prostitute, or conduct a drive-by shooting – without blocking traffic. It is also easier on a high-speed one-way street to monitor the area for police or flee from the scene of a crime. Areas of a city with higher crime rates tend to get caught in a vicious cycle of violence, foreclosures, and neglect.

Mobility
One-way street systems were originally implemented to create increased mobility for vehicle traffic. A pair of one-way streets has been determined to have as much as 50 percent more capacity than a pair of two-way streets of the same dimension. However, a shorter, more direct path is available with two-way streets. As one-way streets do not allow vehicles to directly access every destination from every direction, there is additional travel time when drivers must go around the block to reach their destination. This additional travel time created by a circuitous route is more pronounced along shorter distance trips and is most problematic for bikers. Moreover, vehicles tend to stop less on one-way streets which improves vehicle travel time but can be difficult for the navigation of those same streets by bikers and pedestrians. Additionally, two-way streets also allow for improve flexibility in the event of a street closure, as both directions are still available on to traffic. In sum, one-way streets allow traffic to flow more freely through an area; two-way streets allow vehicles, bikers, and pedestrians to most efficiently navigate within a specific area.
Economic Vitality

As the use of one-way streets corresponded with the overall decline of commercial business districts in downtowns across the country, some have been quick to seize upon this correlation as proof of one-way streets’ negative impact on the economic and cultural vitality of urban neighborhoods. Additionally, while local business support of one-way to two-way conversions is important, the fact that most cities who have enacted these conversions can point to favorable reports from local businesses may indicate nothing more than that local business support is a prerequisite for enacting a street conversion project. Little effort has been made to separate the impacts of street conversion projects from effect of other downtown revitalization efforts.

By the same token, there has been a renaissance in downtowns across the United States. A variety of factors have contributed to this resurgence, including:

• Demographics, specifically smaller household sizes;
• Changes in the structure of the economy, with a heightened emphasis on adding value through the provision of service and knowledge;
• Shifts in consumer tastes and preferences, including a greater acceptance of owner-occupied multi-family housing and a strong desire for “authenticity” and “experience”;
• Technology, especially as it enables decentralized work and informs consumer tastes;
• Transportation, including congestion and rising energy costs, and
• Cultural/entertainment, an element of society that is increasingly multi-faceted and diverse.

Underlying all of the above (which influence all of society) is the desire for what has been termed Walkable Urbanism. According to the Brookings Institute, “since the rise of cities 8,000 years ago, humans have only wanted to walk about 1,500 feet (approximately a quarter mile) until they begin looking for an alternative means of transport: a horse, a trolley, a bicycle, a car. This distance translates into about 160 acres – about the size of a super mall, including its parking lot. It is also about the size, plus or minus 25 percent, of Lower Manhattan, downtown Albuquerque, the financial district of San Francisco, downtown Atlanta, and most other major downtowns in the country.” Downtown San Marcos would also fit these criteria.

What makes walkable urbanism function is not merely distance, but the experience – a pedestrian trip where one encounters a mix of sights and sounds in the context of a range of land uses and a diverse built environment. The translation is that “critical mass” occurs when visitors can find enough to do for an afternoon or an evening, residents’ daily needs are largely met within easy access, and the underlying economics justify ongoing investment. When this happens (and is sustained), a dynamic system is in place that is expected to create
enhanced economic value. See Appendix One for more extensive discussion of the benefits associated with urbanism.

Proponents suggest that two-streets facilitate walkable urbanism. The basic premise is that slower traffic increases the activity on and around the street and that a certain degree of congestion is beneficial to promote a sense that an area is busy and vibrant. Business visibility is also improved with slower traffic; if traffic is travelling too quickly, drivers do not effectively observe storefronts, signs, and window displays. Additionally, storefront eclipsing occurs on one-way streets where some of the retail space in an intersection is not easily in the sightline of drivers. (North-facing storefronts at the intersection of a north-bound one-way street and a cross-street, for example.) The visibility of storefronts is essential for smaller businesses. Moreover, for shoppers, especially those who visit an area sporadically or are visiting from out of town, one-way streets can be confusing and frustrating. As these are among the people that revitalization efforts seek to attract, this presents a challenge.

Case Studies
Existing studies which quantitatively examine the economic impact of one-way to two-way street conversions are extremely scarce. The majority of quantitative analysis around street conversion focuses exclusively on traffic speeds, total time and distance to destination, and collisions. The economic impact of street design more generally and street conversions in specific is discussed anecdotally at best, if not ignored all together. Several studies have attempted to catalogue impressions from the business community regarding one-way to two-way street conversions. In the majority of cases these communities report positive results, including increased sales, business expansions, and declining vacancy rates. Most reported benefits focused on improved livability or sense of community. A few indicated mixed results, but no studies indicated a negative impact or negative perception of the street conversion from the local business community. Even so, in a few instances there has been an attempt to calculate the economic benefits derived from street conversions.

Lubbock
The City of Lubbock, Texas implemented a one-way to two-way conversion of the paired Main and 10th Streets in 1995. This street conversion project is referenced in a number of studies and articles advocating the benefits of street conversions. In a study for the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Lubbock’s City Traffic Engineer asserted that despite public anticipation of the conversion causing significant traffic problems, there has been no noticeable negative impact from the conversion. Total volume of traffic along Main and 10th Streets remained consistent after the directional conversion.

Main and 10th Streets were established as one-way streets in the 1960s; retail and commercial activity declined through the 1970s as these businesses relocated to major
shopping areas in the southwest part of the city. General consensus that the conversion was beneficial to the central business district which began experiencing growth after more than a decade of decline. Businesses in the area reported some growth following the street conversion, a change from the steady decline of the years previous. In fact, the City of Lubbock continued to implement other one-way to two-way street conversions in the ensuing years along the one-way pair of Buddy Holly Avenue and Texas Avenue due to the success of the earlier conversion of Main and 10th Streets.

**West Palm Beach**

In 1993, the City of West Palm Beach, Florida implemented a one-way to two-way street conversion project, including traffic calming and streetscape improvements, along Clematis Street. Historically, this was a thriving main street anchored by a plaza, library, and waterfront to the east and a historic train station on the west. A public investment of $10 million was made in street conversion, raised intersections, pedestrian amenities around the plaza, an interactive fount, and event spaces.

The City reported a dramatic decrease in the number of vacant retail shops, restaurants, residential housing units. Before 1993, 70 percent of the space along Clematis street was vacant; as of 1998, building space along Clematis Street was 80% occupied. Additionally, property values dramatically increased: in 1993 before the street conversion, property values along the street ranged from $10 to $40 per square foot and commercial space rented for an average of $6 per square foot. By 1998, property values ranged from $50 to $100 per square foot while commercial space rented for an average of $30 per square foot. Additional private investment in adjacent properties in these four years is estimated at $350 million. Vehicle traffic volumes remained steady at 2,500 vehicles per day, before and after the traffic calming and street conversion efforts. The City of West Palm Beach attribute the benefits to improved circulation routes from converting to two way streets as well as improve livability from streetscape design.

**Louisville**

In 2011, Louisville converted a pair of multilane one-way streets (Brook and First Streets) near downtown, each slightly more than a mile in length, to two-way single lane streets with a bike lane. The cost of the street conversion was approximately $250,000. In two years after the street conversions were implemented, a number of benefits were identified for the immediate area by John Gilderbloom, Director of University of Louisville’s Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods. Traffic collisions dropped steeply (36 percent on one street and 60 percent on another) even as the volume of vehicles, pedestrians, and bikes travelling these roads all increased. Crime dropped along these streets by 23 percent, even as crime rates throughout the city, and in an adjacent neighborhood with unconverted one-way streets, rose slightly. Property values, business revenue, and pedestrian traffic increased
– both in comparison to rates along these streets prior to conversion as well as relative to a pair of nearby streets which were not converted. Property tax values on Brook Street specifically increased by 39 percent on Brook Street, while property values on the nearby one-way streets which were not converted declined slightly. The owner of the local Burger Boy Diner reported that his revenue has increased enough that he was able to double the restaurant’s table space. Gilderbloom followed up the initial study with a census tract level analysis of street design citywide. They found that in census tracts with multilane one-way streets, the risk of traffic accidents is twice that for the rest of the city. Likewise, census tracts with one-way streets had average property values half that in the city’s other areas.

**Charleston**

Upper King Street in Charleston, South Carolina was converted from one-way to two way traffic in 1994. Originally it was a minor business corridor that experienced a dramatic increase in retail and service business after the street conversion. Vacancy rates along Upper King Street increased steadily from 1910 and peaked in 1990. Vacancy rates held steady or declined slightly between 1990 and 1996. Starting in 1996, benefits from the street conversion became apparent in the type of new businesses locating along Upper King Street and a steady decline in the vacancy rate. Prior to the 1994 street conversion, Upper King Street was home to primarily loan offices and low-end clothing stores. As of 2000, a variety of high-end restaurants, bookstores, cafes, art galleries and studios, and entertainment and cultural organizations had located along Upper King Street.

In a study which controlled for location (properties north of Calhoun Street are considered less desirable) and property size characteristics, it was determined that the one-way to two way conversion was significantly associated with higher property sales prices along King Street. The median price per square foot of commercial properties sold along Upper King Street increased by almost 50 percent from $36 per square foot before the one-way to two way street conversion to $62 per square foot after the conversion. During the same time period, commercial properties sold throughout the city of Charleston only increased by 13 percent, from $60 per square foot before the conversion to $67 per square foot afterwards.
Findings

The following findings are drawn upon major topical scholarship, local data evaluation, case studies, and discussions with local stakeholders and relevant experts, and represent TXP’s best professional judgment as to the potential impact of street conversion in this case. Every attempt was made to apply available data and lessons learned from other communities to the specific context of San Marcos’ downtown.

Street direction, per se, is not a determinant of economic impact

No studies were found which indicated that converting streets from one-way to two-way (or vice versa) in and of itself caused significant private investment in an area, or yielded a measurable change in retail activity. However, a more comprehensive program of public investment in roadway-related infrastructure (including elements such as streetscaping, wayfinding, and parking improvements) has been shown in a number of cases to both increase retail activity and subsequently spur private redevelopment efforts. For example, West Palm Beach, Florida reported $300 million in private investment in areas where the City had invested $10 million in public funds in streetscape, street conversion, and historic building renovation projects.

There is often a conflation between street direction and vehicular speed

Many urban planners emphasize the benefits of two-way streets for downtown commercial corridors. However, much of the benefit is derived from the slower rate of speed associated with vehicle traffic on two-way streets. Slower vehicle speeds are seen as beneficial for both pedestrian safety and comfort as well as promoting a sense of vitality through improved storefront visibility and “good congestion” in a commercial area. By using other measures, such as signal timing, to control traffic speed, San Marcos could derive the benefits of slower traffic on Guadalupe and LBJ Streets while at the same time not giving up the mobility bonus created by one-way streets during high traffic volume times of day.

There is also a perceived tension between vehicular and pedestrian traffic

The debate between one-way and two way streets among planning and traffic engineering experts often comes down to a disagreement as to the purpose of the roadway system. Advocates of one-way streets emphasize their mobility benefits, while detractors insist that the higher rates of speed are dangerous for pedestrians, detrimental to retailers, and damaging to the adjacent quality of life and place. Both points of view presuppose that pedestrians are not drivers and vice versa or that little overlap can exist between commuters and patrons of downtown commercial establishments.
Not all streets (and communities) are equivalent

In determining the benefits of one-way or two-way streets, it is important to distinguish between multiple types of one-way streets. Most of the negative externalities associated with one-way streets are exacerbated with multiple mile-long stretches of three-lane or four-lane streets with few street lights or other traffic control methods. These are streets in which the average rate of speed is high and the surrounding areas become inhospitable to pedestrians, shoppers, and residents. In San Marcos, the one-way pair of Guadalupe and LBJ Streets are 0.8 miles long and punctuated at each cross-street by stop lights or stop signs. Thus the greatest negative impacts of large one-way arterials are unlikely present. In that same vein, the overall size, density, and pattern of the built environment has a significant impact on the impacts of changes in transportation infrastructure. In simple terms, the effect of changes tends to be greater in large, dense, highly urban environments. There is almost no information available that reports on the impact of street conversion in communities that are comparable to San Marcos in terms of size, density, role in a broader regional economy, and stage of development. However, it seems safe to say that the relatively small study area, lack of density, and proximity to a major employment center that is a commuter destination undercuts the magnitude of possible gains.

Conclusions

Good planning is often a balancing act, as goals such as increased mobility and downtown revitalization can come into conflict. In setting policy and spending programs, it is important to carefully evaluate the actual factors at work in San Marcos. To that end:

• Guadalupe and LBJ Streets are major arterials for traffic to flow between Texas State University, the city’s largest employer, and the rest of San Marcos;
• In addition to street conversion, streetscaping, way-finding, public transportation infrastructure, and parking improvements are all fundamental parts of promoting a vibrant downtown;
• There is little to no analysis that considers the impact of the above potential improvements/tools (street conversions, streetscaping, etc.) in isolation, but a package tailored to fit this particular area in San Marcos is likely to facilitate the realization of downtown’s development potential; and,
• The relative lack of density and smaller-scale built environment suggests that weight be given to mobility, at least at this stage of the community’s development;

The translation is that conversion of Guadalupe and LBJ Streets from one-way to two-way is not likely, in and of itself, to have a significant economic impact. However, other policy tools and investments related to enhancing the pedestrian and visitor experience can serve to facilitate and support the goal of downtown revitalization in this area.
Appendix One – The Benefits of Urbanist Development

Urbanism (also referred to as “new urbanism”) is a dynamic urban design movement that is seen as part of a broader trend toward the restoration of community and concern for a more sustainable environment. Charles Bohl, in his seminal book *Place Making*, defines urbanism as an innovative design concept that applies “the best urban design practices from the ‘traditional urbanism’ found in historic town centers and main streets, while pragmatically adapting them to modern lifestyles, business practices, and technologies.” Urbanism has been characterized by New York Times architecture critic Herbert Muschamp as the “most important phenomenon to emerge in American architecture in the post-Cold War era.”

Underlying new urban development ideals is a belief that the physical design of many communities and regions is seriously impairing quality of life, contributing to traffic congestion, environmental degradation, and a lost sense of community. Todd Bressi writes,

...the New Urbanism is not a romantic movement; it reflects a deeper agenda. The planning and design approaches...revive principles about building communities that have been virtually ignored for half a century: public spaces like streets, squares, and parks should be a setting for the conduct of daily life; a neighborhood should accommodate diverse types of people and activities; it should be possible to get to work, accomplish everyday tasks (like buying fresh food or taking a child to day care) and travel to surrounding communities without using a car.

Bressi continues by stating that urbanists pay close attention to architecture – particularly to where a building sits on the lot, its mass, and exterior details, arguing that only certain types of buildings can create the range of public and private spaces that successful communities require. He notes that “the primary purpose of design rules is to force greater attention to detail, thereby invigorating urban and suburban architecture and imparting a greater level of civility to the streetscape.”

**Key Factors of New Urban Developments**

A common characteristic of conventional real estate development is the presence of formula-driven designs that follow a set script, regardless of the place where the project is built. As Charles Bohl has noted, “while the real estate industry has become very good at building these projects, the projects themselves are not very good at building communities.” Urbanism, on the other hand, is about reforming the design of the built environment. It revives the lost art of “place-making” and creates environments that are distinctly different from the standard product types. Bressi contends that:

Buildings should not be conceived as objects isolated from their surroundings; they should contribute to the spatial definitions of streets, parks, greens, yards, and other
open spaces. The New Urbanists draw upon a range of design traditions for inspiration. Their ideas about the relationships between planning and architecture reach back to the City Beautiful and Town Planning movements, which in turn reach back to Renaissance and Classical cities.

Some of the key factors of this approach to project development are outlined below.

**Providing a Sense of Community**
Thinking about public space in new ways that encourages sociability among residents and creates a sense of community is a key component of new urban design. Numerous studies have pointed to Americans’ growing dissatisfaction with the feeling of “separateness” that comes from living and working in traditional suburbs and have identified a “quest for community” that is felt across society.

Sociologist Ray Oldenburg has described this phenomenon by naming the various places that humans live and interact. The home is the “first place,” the workplace is the “second place,” and community gathering places outside of home or work such as town squares, village greens, cafes, or taverns are identified as “third places.” Oldenburg maintains that “third places” are what is absent in suburban neighborhood development and they are the missing ingredient that people in those areas are searching for today.

New urban developments fulfill this need and, if properly designed, have become magnets for residents and visitors alike. As Bohl notes,

...today’s town center projects typically revolve around a central plaza or park that establishes a public atmosphere and provides an ideal setting for the cafes, taverns, and bistros celebrated by Oldenburg. In fact, it is the space between buildings – the public realm of plazas, greens, squares, and walkable streets – that enables a town center or a main street to act as the third place for nearby neighborhoods and communities.

**Creating a “Place Identity”**
Physical places that promote sociability have become critical for building strong communities and creating a unique sense of “place.” Booth, Leonard & Pawlukiewicz from the Urban Land Institute note that place making is the essence of real estate development, and “establishing a live-work-shop environment with a sense of place is a community need as well as an aspiration.” Places that are desirable appeal to all the senses - sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch. Rather than relying on formulaic real estate products, new urban developments are a rich mix of local activities, aesthetic design, quality, and price.

As noted on Smart Growth Online, new urban developments are designed to:
...create interesting, unique communities which reflect the values and cultures of the people who reside there, and foster the types of physical environments which support a more cohesive community fabric. Smart growth promotes development which uses natural and man-made boundaries and landmarks to create a sense of defined neighborhoods, towns, and regions. It encourages the construction and preservation of buildings which prove to be assets to a community over time, not only because of the services provided within, but because of the unique contribution they make on the outside to the look and feel of a city.

Whereas many conventional developments, such as shopping malls or retail strip centers, are focused exclusively on trade, Bohl notes that new urban market and town squares are designed to be not only “consumer space,” but are clearly recognized and experienced as “public space,” with a civic character that transcends the commercial activities that take place there.

**Providing a Mix of Land Uses**

A critical component of achieving better places to live is an integration of mixed land uses. Mixed uses create a critical mass and a sense of place by affording the community a wider range of goods, services, and experiences at one location, thereby increasing connectivity and choice. By putting uses in close proximity to one another, alternatives to driving, such as walking or biking, become viable.

Providing a mix of land uses generally refers to offering residential, retail, and office space within close proximity to one another. Booth, et al. note the economic synergy that happens from mixed uses in an new urban development:

Office uses feed retail operations by supplying customers for stores and restaurants both during the day and after work. Retail uses within walking distance of employment or residences – restaurants, bookstores, clothing stores, gift shops, and coffee bars – reinforce amenities that allow and encourage employees and residents to go out to lunch or run errands without relying on their cars. The addition of theaters, museums, art galleries, libraries, post offices, and town halls that are properly integrated...attracts significant pedestrian traffic, which supports a range of other uses.

**Creating Walkable Neighborhoods**

At the heart of new urban design is the concept of walkable neighborhoods; walkable communities are desirable places to live, work, learn, worship, and play. These neighborhoods respect the human scale by providing pedestrian-friendly spaces that ensure that users feel at home and can navigate easily by foot within an area. As Bohl notes, “the
way that streets and pathways weave through the town center, connecting its buildings and public spaces, can provide pedestrians with a sense of discovery and delight that is seldom experienced in the suburban landscape, and that is essential to the town center experience.”

Creating a sense of enclosure on a street is important in honoring the human scale and helping to define an area. It is thus crucial to pay attention to the proportion between the height of the buildings and the amount of open space; ideally, new urban designs achieve a tight 1:1 relationship and thus are much easier for pedestrians to navigate. By contrast, Bohl notes that:

Streets in suburban areas are typically many times wider than the heights of the buildings that line them, often reaching ratios of 1:6 and more. Such wide streets prevent any sense of spatial enclosure from being achieved and are more difficult for pedestrians to cross.

Henton & Walesh, discussing the vital role of well educated, technically savvy young people in the growth of the new economy, note that these workers are attracted to places that have a lively mix of activity that need not be accessed by car. As one young worker told the Wall Street Journal, “It’s a lot more fun to be in a locale where you can go for a walk and have a nice dinner, or shop and take in a sports game, than it is to be isolated in some sprawling suburban office park where a little truck comes by at lunch and sells microwave burritos.” Providing pedestrian-friendly activities thus give new urban communities an edge in attracting and retaining workers and residents.

In addition to creating a more walkable environment, good urban design can also incorporate “traffic calming” changes to streets and sidewalks to make them safer, more attractive, and more livable to both pedestrians and bicyclists alike. Researcher Emily Drennen conducted a 2003 study of the economic effects of traffic calming measures on twenty-seven small businesses in the Mission District of San Francisco. Merchants were interviewed about how the Valencia Street bicycle lanes had impacted their businesses. Four and a half years after the bike lanes were built, the vast majority of the business owners expressed support for the bike lanes. Respondents generally felt that the bike lanes had made the street more attractive and had a generally positive impact on their business and/or sales.

Preserving Open Space
Greenspace or “open space” is broadly referred to in new urban design to mean natural areas both in and surrounding developments that provide important community space, habitat for plants and animals, recreational opportunities, places of natural beauty, and critical environmental areas (e.g., wetlands).
Increasing numbers of people are concerned about the natural environment and value access to open space in both their private life and in their workspace. A healthy environment, rather than viewed as an added bonus, is now seen as one of an area’s prime economic assets. Fortunately, the divide that existed in the past between developers and environmentalists is gradually being eroded as both sides realize the interconnection and interdependence of a development’s preservation of the natural environment and its economic viability.

New urban developments are designed to protect and preserve open spaces, thereby providing environmental quality and health benefits that are significant. According to Smart Growth Online,

Open space protects animal and plant habitat, places of natural beauty, and working lands.... Additionally, preservation of open space benefits the environment by combating air pollution, attenuating noise, controlling wind, providing erosion control, and moderating temperatures. Open space also protects surface and ground water resources by filtering trash, debris, and chemical pollutants before they enter a water system.

In addition to environmental benefits, the preservation of open spaces can give a region a competitive economic edge. Open spaces can offer an amenity that a region may not currently possess in abundance, enabling the region to retain the people that currently live and work there by giving them a disincentive to relocate. Open spaces can also help a region compete with other communities in attracting businesses and residents, as well as enabling it to compete for tourist dollars. And, research has shown that oftentimes it makes good economic sense to preserve a parcel of land rather than develop it; a number of recent studies show that parks and open space development in many instances increases residential property values and the property tax base of communities.

**Economic Development and Public Sector Benefits**

Urbanism in many ways reflects the changing nature of the American economy and in turn the values of the American people. New urban developments provide numerous benefits to residents in the form of a higher quality of life, better places to live, work, and play, higher and more stable property values, and a healthier lifestyle with more walking and better access to the natural environment. Businesses and municipalities also benefit from urbanism; the economic development and public sector benefits of new urban communities will be discussed below.
Economic Development Benefits
According to Henton & Walesh, quality of life has become a community's most valuable asset in the new economy. As Smart Growth Online reports, “recent trends in the global economy – industrial clustering and specialization, diversification of the workforce, reintegration of work and home – are placing a premium upon community character and quality of life.”

New economy companies are attracted to new urban communities for a variety of reasons. Companies realize their workers want to work and live in areas that offer a vibrant social life, environmental amenities, and a reasonable commute. Talent is attracted to sociable communities – places with destinations, public and civic spaces, plenty of open spaces – where they can come together with colleagues or friends either through planned or chance encounters. In addition, as business is increasingly being conducted outside the boardroom – in restaurants, health clubs, and other public spaces – access to places where people can come together, converse, network, and share ideas is paramount. Muro and Puentes note that:

Regional economic performance is enhanced when areas are developed with community benefits and the promotion of vital urban centers in mind. Studies show that productivity and overall economic performance may be improved to the extent compact, mixed-use development fosters dense labor markets, vibrant urban centers, efficient transportation systems, and a high “quality-of-place.”

Richard Florida, who has written extensively about the new knowledge economy, notes that knowledge workers like to mix fun with work, to be close to stimulations from colleagues, in close proximity to outside activity and recreation, and live and work in places convenient to services and recreation. He goes on to say:

In this milieu, talent is scarce. Everybody is competing for the best people, and if you don’t have quality of life and quality of place, you won’t get talented people. Skilled talent calls the shots in where and how they want to work.

Companies must locate in such locales to attract and retain quality employees. In discussing how the state of Wisconsin can successfully integrate into the new economy, commentators noted that:

A higher level of diversity in urban environments can be achieved through the creative design of our built environments and through the emphasis we place on innovative small businesses and attractions. New Urbanism ideas also help create diversity by emphasizing mixed-use developments and attractive architectural styles. Finding new uses for historic buildings also provides a mixture of old and new charm to urban
environments. Local governments can also encourage small business startups of ethnic restaurants and unique shops to increase diversity in their region.

In essence, the private sector in the new economy equates competitive advantage with the ability of being where the action is, and to them, the action is in new urban communities.

**Public Sector Benefits**

*Tax Base Enhancement*

In order to properly assess the fiscal benefits of new urban developments to the public sector, it is important to understand how these developments operate financially and how they are different from traditional suburban developments. According to Christopher Leinberger in a paper for *The Brookings Institution*, the investment cycle for many income-oriented conventional developments peaks around year seven. When comparing new urban and conventional developments on a short-term basis, therefore, conventional developments often project better cash flows as evaluated by internal rates of return. New income peaks can be achieved in subsequent years, but this often requires a major investment of additional capital. If a suburban development is no longer “cutting-edge,” i.e. maintaining its viability, the influx of capital does not occur, and the development begins to decline. This has become a common occurrence in suburbia, and has created a “throwaway built environment” that has largely contributed to urban sprawl. The area formerly known as the “Miracle Mile” in 1980’s Atlanta is an example of such a decline; it is now filled with over 15 dead or dying strip malls because the market has moved farther out and developers are not inclined to reinvest in it.

New urban developments, on the other hand, generally create and sustain value in excess of conventional developments, though their short-term performance may not be as attractive. This can be due, in part, to the quality (and thus cost) of architecture and construction intrinsic to new urban design, the amount of open space provided in the overall development, or the higher cost of financing. However, what may be lost in the short-term is made up for in the mid- and long-term. Leinberger notes that:

> The major reason progressive development seems to yield higher mid- and long-term returns and has a longer life is the pedestrian nature of its design. In stark contrast to conventional development with its car-dominated character, progressive developments create special places that are rather rare in this country.

The desirable nature of new urban developments, including the mix of land uses and physical context, translates into increased property values in the shorter run; in the longer run, Muro and Puentes note that these developments
...may enhance regions’ tax bases, create wealth through housing appreciation, and boost property tax collections. In that sense, smart growth may well create substantial value by enhancing the real estate market.

Increased real estate values in turn can make a tremendous difference in the overall value of the local tax base, and it is possible to develop some indication of the impact of a new urban development approach through evaluation of residential values. Researchers at George Washington University developed estimates of the incremental gain per unit attributable to traditional neighborhood design at the Kentlands, a new urban project in Maryland. The researchers estimated the price that homeowners were willing to pay for houses in Kentlands and comparable homes in surrounding traditional subdivisions. Based on their analysis, housing units in the new urban development commanded an 11.7 percent market premium, all other factors held constant. This premium existed in both new and resale markets.

Cost of Service Reduction
Muro and Puentes reviewed the best academic empirical literature on fiscal effects of growth and development for the Brookings Institution and reported that overall, the cost of providing public infrastructure and delivering services can be reduced through thoughtful design and planning. The logic is straightforward; compact, less sprawling development patterns can reduce the capital and operations costs governments incur from new growth. The authors identify two related ways urban form can decrease costs:

- **Economies of scale** – because the marginal cost of serving additional population decreases as more residents cluster within a small geographic area. Also referred to as “density efficiencies.”

- **Economies of geographic scope** – because the marginal cost of serving each additional person decreases as each person locates more closely to existing major public facilities.

Muro and Puentes report that over the year 1999-2000 states and localities nationwide spent nearly $140 billion on capital outlays for infrastructure shaped by development patterns such as elementary and secondary schools, highways, sewer lines, solid waste management, and utility systems. More than $200 billion was spent on recurring expenditures to provide such services such as highway maintenance, police and fire protection, trash collection, and utility service. The authors note that:

Considering that these outlays represent almost 20 percent of the $1.7 trillion states and localities spent during 1999-2000, realizing even modest percentage savings from smart
growth could save taxpayers billions. Such savings grow only more attractive in light of economic stagnation, weakening federal support for states and cities, and the twin challenges many states face with shrinking revenue bases and increasing mandatory spending.

Several studies reported by the authors predict that rational use of more compact development patterns from 2000 to 2025 promise the following sorts of savings for governments nationwide: 11 percent, or $110 billion, from 25-year road-building costs; 6 percent, or $12.6 billion, from 25-year water and sewer costs; and roughly 3 percent, or $4 billion, for annual operations and service delivery.
Legal Disclaimer
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COUNCIL WORKSHOP

March 1, 2016
Recap

Workshop on October 14, 2015

Presented 6 Alternatives

Downtown/City wide surveys
Additional 2-way alternative
Divert traffic to reduce impact
Public Input

- Downtown Master Plan
- Vision San Marcos
- Council Directed Surveys: Parking & 1-way/2-way
  - On-line survey:
    - Dec 9, 2015 – Feb 1, 2016
    - 1292 responses
  - Face to Face Business/Owner
    - Dec 2015 & Feb 2016
    - 56 responses
Downtown Business vs. Citywide Survey Comparison

Have you used back-in angle parking in downtown San Marcos?

- **Yes**: 72% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 72% (Citywide Survey)
- **No**: 19% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 14% (Citywide Survey)
- **No answer**: 9% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 13% (Citywide Survey)
Downtown Business vs. Citywide Survey Comparison

What type of on-street parking do you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Parking</th>
<th>Downtown Businesses Survey</th>
<th>Citywide Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head-in angle</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-in angle</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which traffic operations configuration do you prefer on Guadalupe/LBJ?

- **One-way**: 61% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 59% (Citywide Survey)
- **Two-way**: 28% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 17% (Citywide Survey)
- **Not Sure**: 0% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 11% (Citywide Survey)
- **No answer**: 11% (Downtown Businesses Survey), 13% (Citywide Survey)
Public Input

New Alternative “Option F”

Intersection Operations

Interim Option

Quiet Zone Changes

Next Steps

Guadalupe & LBJ – Downtown Mobility
Alternate F Changes

- 2-way Guadalupe (Grove to University) with turn bays
- 2-way LBJ (Grove to Hopkins) with turn bays
- Maintain LBJ 1-way Hopkins to University
- Change University to 3-lane with parking
- Ultimate cross section with reconstruction
- Interim cross section w/o reconstruction
Option F - Two Way

Guadalupe

One Lane Each Direction

San Antonio

One Lane Each Direction

Two Northbound Lanes

Reduce WB Travel Lane to Accommodate Cycle Lanes

Hopkins

GUADALUPE & LBJ - DOWNTOWN MOBILITY
CITY OF SAN MARCOS
TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

GUADALUPE & LBJ – DOWNTOWN MOBILITY

Public Input

New Alternative “Option F”

Intersection Operations

Interim Option

Quiet Zone Changes

Next Steps
Analysis Assumptions

- 2035 PM Peak Conditions
- 15% Ped, Bike Conversion
- 20% Through Traffic Diversion from Hopkins Street To:
  - Future Craddock Extension
  - Enhanced Wonder World Interchange
  - CM Allen Parkway
Traffic Impact - Speed

Average Speed PM Peak Period (miles per hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build 2035</th>
<th>Option F 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed (miles/h)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Travel Time per Vehicle
PM Peak Period (minutes per vehicle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build 2035</th>
<th>Option F 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUADALUPE & LBJ – DOWNTOWN MOBILITY
Traffic Impact - Travel Time

Travel Time per Vehicle
PM Peak Period
(minutes per vehicle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No-Build 2035</th>
<th>Option F 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing vs 2035 Intersection Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Option F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comanche St. and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and University Dr.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Hutchinson St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and San Antonio St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Martin Luther King Dr.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe St. and Roosevelt Street</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and University Dr.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and Hutchinson St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and San Antonio St.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ Dr. and Cheatham St.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Gary St. and University Dr.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Gary St and Hopkins St. (SH 80)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Allen Pkwy. and University Dr.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interim Option

- Signals and striping changes
- Enhance bike safety
- Maximize parking
- 6 intersections @ $125K - $350K/int.
- Striping & signage @ $300,000
- Signal/Stripe Budget ~ $1M - $2.4M
A First Mile Problem

14% of trips are less than one mile

80% are less than five
Option F – Interim Lane Striping

Guadalupe

One Lane Each Direction

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow

One Lane Each Direction

Two Northbound Lanes

University

One Lane Each Direction

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow

One Lane Each Direction

Sharrows

GUADALUPE & LBJ – DOWNTOWN MOBILITY
Interim Option - Parking

- No change to existing curb lines
- Parallel & angle parking on LBJ & Guadalupe (Square remains angle)
- Parallel parking on University
- Need to consider existing lot access
- Potential of 130 additional spaces
Public Input

New Alternative “Option F”

Intersection Operations

Interim Option

Quiet Zone Changes

Next Steps

GUADALUPE & LBJ – DOWNTOWN MOBILITY
Quiet Zone Changes

CARTS TRANSIT HUB

PROPOSED ONE-WAY RIGHT TURN LANE

PROPOSED DRIVEWAY RELOCATION

PROPOSED DRIVEWAY RELOCATION

LEGEND

PROPOSED PAVEMENT

PAVEMENT REMOVAL

PROPOSED QUAD GATE
Quiet Zones Changes

- 4 new Quad gates - $800,000 each
- Cheatham/Guadalupe modification.
  - No exit from Cheatham to Guadalupe
  - ROW acquisition
- 2 Driveway relocations
- QZ Budget ~$3.4M
Quiet Zones Changes

- New Quad Gate ROW for Right Turn Lane
- Remove Road

GUADALUPE & LBJ – DOWNTOWN MOBILITY
Public Input

New Alternative “Option F”

Intersection Operations

Interim Option

Quiet Zone Changes

Next Steps
Next Steps

- TxDOT Take Back Program
  - Can be multi year program
  - TxDOT Improvement project prior to turn back
  - Deferred maintenance costs spent on other TxDOT roads in City

- UPRR Quiet Zone update process

- Begin signal/striping design
Next Steps

- Revise Current CIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Projects</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBJ/Guadalupe Improvement Design Funded</td>
<td>$200K</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Reconstruction Phase II Design</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ/Guadalupe Improvements Construction</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ/Guadalupe Interim Imp</td>
<td>$5.0M*</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TxDOT Take Back Program & potential revisions to Quad gates could reduce
Questions ?
GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO - WAY CONVERSION

Guadalupe & LBJ Two-Way Conversion

- Option F: Two Way
  - Reduce WB Travel Lane to Accommodate Cycle Lanes
  - Two Northbound Lanes
  - One Lane Each Direction
  - One Lane Each Direction
  - San Antonio
  - Edward Gary St.
Option F

Two-Way Operations

GUADALUPE & LBJ TWO - WAY CONVERSION
Parking Loss: Option F (w/ Cycle Tracks)

Total of 11 parking spots added
Ultimate Cross Section: Guadalupe Street

Two-Way Cycle Lane
On-Street Parallel Parking
Ultimate Cross Section: LBJ Drive

- Sharrows
- On-Street Reverse Angle
- and Parallel Parking
Ultimate Cross Section: Hopkins Street

Two-Way Cycle Lane
On-Street Reverse Angle Parking
Ultimate Cross Section: University Drive

- Sharrows
- On-Street Parallel Parking
Downtown Two-Way Evaluation

Option F
Interim Cross Section: University Drive

Sharrows
On-Street Parallel Parking
Interim Cross Section: Guadalupe Street North of Hopkins

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow
On-Street Parallel & Angle Parking
Interim Cross Section 2: Guadalupe Street @ Courthouse

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow
On-Street Angle Parking
Interim Cross Section 2: Guadalupe South of San Antonio

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow
On-Street Parallel & Angle Parking
**Interim Cross Section 2: Hopkins St**

- No Change to Lanes or Parking
- Sharrows Added to Outside Lane

**Courthouse**
Interim Option 2: LBJ @ Courthouse

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow
Current On-Street Angle Parking
Interim Option 2: LBJ, South of San Antonio

NB Bike Lane/SB Sharrow
Current On-Street Parallel & Angle Parking