

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2016.**

2. Party Making Request: **City Secretary, Ann Franklin**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No
This is to receive approval of accuracy from Council for the minutes recorded during the January 12, 2016 Council Meeting.

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A
 Bid Amount: _____ Budgeted Amount: _____
 Under Budget: _____ Over Budget: _____
 Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing:	<u>NAME/TITLE</u>	<u>INITIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>CONCURRENCE</u>
a)	_____	_____	_____	_____
b)	_____	_____	_____	_____
c)	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested: **Approval of the January 12, 2016 Council Minutes.**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
BASTROP CITY COUNCIL
JANUARY 12, 2016**

The Bastrop City Council met in a Regular Meeting on Tuesday, January 12, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. at the Bastrop City Hall Council Chambers, located at 1311 Chestnut Street, Bastrop, Texas. Members present were Mayor Ken Kesselus, Mayor Pro Tem Willie DeLaRosa, and Council Members Dock Jackson, Gary Schiff, Kay Garcia McNally and Kelly Gilleland.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kesselus called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Kesselus led the Pledge of Allegiance and the Pledge to the Texas Flag.

INVOCATION

Police Chaplain Phil Woods gave the Invocation.

PRESENTATIONS - NONE

PROCLAMATIONS

1. Martin Luther King

The proclamation was accepted by Council Member Jackson.

D. NEW BUSINESS

D.1 Discussion and conversation about the Mayor's intentions to deal with citizen comments in light of advice offered to him by the City Attorney, and explained by her at the December 8, 2015, City Council meeting.

Mayor Kesselus read his views on the citizen comments process into record. Council Member Gilleland stated that she too had researched the law regarding the citizen comments process and stated that the Mayor may have misinterpreted the transparency of the Attorney General's Open Meetings Act. She also stated that the Mayor stated that he had checked with other cities and none of them did it this way and she Googled a couple of other City Councils and she found there were a few who did use the process that the City Attorney suggested. Council Member Gilleland stated the way she understood the law is that if the Council knows in advance of the agenda being published that a citizen wants to speak during citizens comments on a particular subject the Council is obligated to put it not on as an agenda item but under citizens comments with what the citizen wants to speak about with their name so that everyone in the community knows that this particular subject is going to be discussed and the citizens can determine if they want to attend the meeting. If the Council is not aware of a topic the Council does nothing and the citizen is still allowed to show up and speak, either way the citizen still says the exact same thing whether it is posted or not this does not take away from the citizen. Council Member Gilleland stated that she has read thoroughly and if the Mayor does not want to put the list of people speaking on the agenda he is putting the Council in a precarious position because the Council might be liable for participating in this action, what the City Attorney says is the law and what the Attorney General says is the law is

that the Council needs to inform someone if they know in advance of an item a citizen is going to speak on. Council Member Gilleland stated that it is not prohibiting the citizens from speaking. Council Member McAnally stated that she believed the purpose was to be inclusive not exclusive, considering the entire public in order for them to come and hear what is going on at their City Council. It is a way to include citizens not to shut them up, allow them to express themselves. Council Member McAnally stated that each of the Council Members took an oath to uphold the laws and she does not want to take any risk of breaking the law and in her opinion the Attorney General has put the law down and interpreted it very clearly, the trusted City Attorney who has been the City Attorney for the last twelve years who has led and guided the City through thick and thin for twelve years has explained how this is inclusive and she is an attorney and the Mayor is not so Council Member McAnally believes it is important that the Council listens to the City Attorney. Council Member McAnally stated that she intends to follow the directions of the City Attorney and not be a part of citizen comments that are breaking the law. Council Member Jackson stated that it is true that citizens should have the right during citizen communication to speak and the problems the Council has had at the meetings is the fact that the Council is only to listen to the comments not to engage in conversation with the citizens and this is the problem that he has seen from this Council. Council Member Jackson stated that as the Parliamentarian he has tried to keep open communication but the Council cannot go back and forth in conversation with the citizens if it is during citizen communication he stated that he feels that this will be found to be legal as well.

Carol Rice – Stated that the Attorney General Cornyn’s opinion is a fifteen year old opinion. Ms. Rice read the AG’s opinion into record.

Council Member Gilleland stated that she has the same document in her hand as the one Ms. Rice just read. She read from it and stated what the Council needs to go by what the City Attorney has told the Council and not by what the Mayor says, respectfully not by what Ms. Rice says but the Attorney or the Council is liable for their actions.

The Mayor appealed to the citizens to read what he has written concerning the citizen comment period. It has been decided that this will be put on the agenda for the annual retreat at the Hyatt Regency.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Deborah Jones – Ms. Jones spoke on transparency and communication between the citizens and Council. She stated that she has seen and received documents that have resulted in miscommunication and has brought the City into a lawsuit. She stated in the past lawsuits have not been something that the City has been engaged in especially against its own citizens.

Judith Hoover – Ms. Hoover stated that she filled out a “how are we doing” survey on the City’s website and discussed the litter and graffiti. The website stated that someone would respond within 24 hours and asked how you would like to be communicated with...she has not as of yet heard back from anyone so she decided to come down in person. Ms. Hoover asked the council for their attention to the litter and graffiti in the City.

Carol Rice – Ms. Rice provided a letter to the council to clarify comments made during the November 24, 2015 Council meeting regarding Joe Beal’s representation as co-chair of the Capital Campaign Steering Committee of the Lost Pines Art Center. She states that Mr. Beal did not serve as co-chair, it was a typographical error and the minutes have been corrected and reposted. She expressed regrets of the board for any confusion that this error may have created. Ms. Rice asked that the letter be included as part of the public record.

Debbie Moore – Ms. Moore announced the following filming projects have been/are being shot in the City Of Bastrop: a new regional Toyota commercial and there will be the second consecutive H.E.B. regional commercial shot on Thursday, January 14TH. It will be shot at Neighbors, the Opera House and the Pledges House. The commercials will be aired during the Super Bowl.

D. NEW BUSINESS CONTINUED

D.3 Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding approval of a resolution of the City Council of the City of Bastrop, Texas, calling for the formation of a new City Department Of Marketing, Tourism And Public Affairs; enumerating purposes and objectives related to the formation of same; providing a severability clause; and providing an effective date.

This item was postponed to the January 23, 2016 retreat agenda without objection.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Update on Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee – Kay Garcia McAnally and Dock Jackson

Council Member McAnally invited Connie Schraeder from the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee to come up and speak. Ms. Schraeder informed the Council of the activities of the steering committee as follows:

- Public engagement.
- Working on Housing and Neighborhood, Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan. (“My Sidewalk” which is on the City of Bastrop website is a way to encourage public participation.”)
- The last public engagement was the Open House on December 3, 2015.
- Anticipate the next meeting during the end of January and will be reviewing Chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Plan at that time.

B. Farewell Open House honoring Pat Orr and former Mayor Terry Orr, Sunday, January 24th from 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. at the Episcopal Church Parish Hall –The community is invited. – Mayor Kesselus

Mayor Kesselus announced the open house and stated that it was a come and go event and invited everyone to come out.

C. Election schedule for May 7, 2016 Election and official announcement of Council Member Jackson’s resignation from the council – Ann Franklin

Ms. Franklin stated that Council Member Jackson had announced his candidacy for Commissioner and that the City would not be required to hold a special election to fill his seat on the Council. The seat will be filled during the May 7, 2016 Council Election. Ms. Franklin announced that the candidate packets were available in the Office of the City Secretary. Ms. Franklin announced that the first day to file an application for a place on the ballot will be January 20, 2016 and the deadline to file will be February 19, 2016.

D. Statement by Council Member Jackson about his service on the Council.

Council Member Jackson stated that it has been an honor to serve the City for 24 plus years as a Council Member. He wanted to ensure the citizens that he will continue to serve up until his last day as a Council Member. He will give his undivided attention to the City business in which he was elected to serve.

E. Formal introduction of Mark Wobus, Fire Chief – Mike Talbot and Steve Adcock

City Manager Talbot stated in developing the fiscal year budget for 2016 with the Council a significant change was made in the makeup of the organization by elevating Chief Adcock to

Director of Public Safety and creating for the first time the position of Fire Chief which was needed for the public safety of the community. City Manager Talbot introduced the new Director of Public Safety, Steve Adcock. The Director of Public Safety thanked the Council for their support and explained that this was a very important decision, as a City there has not ever been a paid Fire Chief. The Director announced that Mark Wobus is a local individual and it was relevant that Mr. Wobus was local and had the experience and expertise that he brings. The Director explained that Mr. Wobus has been in the Bastrop Fire Department for eight years, he has approximately 30 years of service total and prior to being hired as the Fire Chief of the Bastrop Fire Department Mr. Wobus was the District Captain with the Fire Department. The Director swore Mr. Wobus in and introduced him as the new Fire Chief.

Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa acknowledged former Mayor Orr as being instrumental in leading the beginning discussion on having a paid Fire Chief.

City Manager's Informational Report for the January 12, 2016 City Council Meeting:

I. Meetings and Events Attended:

- A. Attended A Special Board Meeting of the Lost Pines Groundwater District on December 21, 2015.**
- B. Attended the Monthly Meeting of the Bastrop Main Street Advisory Board on January 4, 2016**
- C. Attended the Monthly Board Meeting of the Bastrop Art in Public Places on January 6, 2016.**
- D. Attended the Form Based Task Force Meeting on January 7, 2016.**

II. Update on City Projects and Issues:

- A. Discussion and Review of Water Usage for the period of December 1, 2015 through January 11, 2016.**
- B. Update on the proposed "Deal Points" for the construction of Wastewater Plant #3 to include West Bastrop Village.**
City Manager Talbot stated that the West Bastrop Village is involved in the project for the Wastewater Plant #3.
- C. Update on the Gills Branch Drainage Project**
City Manager Talbot stated that all of the possible cleaning to this point has been done. Possibly more cleaning will be done at a later time.
- D. Update and Discussion of the Annual City Council Planning Retreat scheduled for January 23, 2016.**
City Manager Talbot gave a reminder of the upcoming retreat for January 23, 2016 at the Lost Pines Hyatt in the Baron's Ballroom E and F beginning at 9:00.
- E. Update on Removal of the Sand Bar in Front of the Boat Ramp at Fisherman's Park.**
City Manager Talbot stated that the targeted time is around the middle of May, 2016 or first of June 2016 working around the clock for removal of the sand.
- F. Update on the Water Filtration Project – Willow Park Well Field**
- G. A Summary Report of the Facts Prepared by Mr. Charles Bundren Regarding Civil Action No. 124-21. City of Bastrop, Texas v. Lynn Rhonda and Scottie Vandiver. IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF BASTROP COUNTY TEXAS.**
City Manager Talbot stated that a copy of the summary received from Mr. Bundren is attached to the City Manager's Report and it is a summary of facts regarding the enforcement of the zoning ordinances and regulations regarding the rulings by the Zoning Board of

Adjustments stating that any new buildings needing to be built had to comply with the zoning setbacks. The report shows that the Vandivers went before the Board of Adjustments three times and was told three times that any new structures had to conform with the setback requirements but did not apply to the existing structures. As a result the building that was built without a building permit encroached into the right-of-way and there is potential safety hazard.

Judy Hoover – Ms. Hoover read into record her knowledge about this project from looking at documents and listening to tapes.

Chris Rubio – Ms. Rubio continued reading the document that Ms. Hoover previously read into record.

H. Update on filling the vacancy of the Main Street Director Position.

I. Update on the Texas Department of Transportation “Tahitian Village Overpass Project.”
City Manager Talbot stated that he had postponed the presentation from the TXDOT representative until the January 26th meeting.

J. Review and Discussion Regarding the Cost Associated with Certain Repairs to the Rodeo Arena at Mayfest Park.

K. Update Regarding Alley D and the BEDC Main Street Project.

L. Discussion and Review Regarding Legal Fees.

Judith Hoover – Ms. Hoover stated that the salaries of the City Attorney given by the City Manager doubled from one year to the next. Her opinion is that this salary is not sustainable if it doubles next year or even goes up by \$300,000.

M. Update on the Status of the XS Ranch PID

N. Management/Administrative Activities

III. Other City Activities:

A. City of Bastrop Convention Center Activities.

B. The City of Bastrop Main Street Program.

C. Planning Department – Inspection Report.

D. Update on the YMCA Program

Inviting input from the City Council related to issues for possible inclusion on future agendas related to issues such as (but not limited to) municipal projects, personnel, public property, development and other City/public business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: *The Council reserves the right to convene into Executive Session at any time during the meeting regarding any agenda item. In compliance with the Open Meetings Act, Ch. 551 Govt. Code, Vernon's TX Code, Annotated, the item below will be discussed in closed session.* 1. SECTION 551.071 – Consultations with Attorney related to legal matters

A. CONSENT AGENDA

All of the following items on the Consent Agenda are considered to be self-explanatory by the Council and will be enacted with one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Council Member so requests.

- A.1 **Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding approval of minutes from Regular Council Meetings of November 24, 2015 and December 8, 2015.**
- A.2 **Approval of the proposed tax rebates for designated Historic Landmarks.**
- A.3 **Approval of the Historic Landmark designation for 1014 Main Street.**
- A.4 **Approval of the statutory denial, for a period of 180 days from the date of Council action on a request for the Final Plat of Aldridge Place Subdivision being a +/- 1.000 acre tract out of the Mozea Rousseau Survey A-56, located east of Lone Star Circle within Area A of the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).**
- A.5 **Approval of the statutory denial, for a period of 180 days from the date of Council action on a request for the Final Plat of The Colony MUD 1A, Section 1, Phase 1 being a +/-23.925 acres (70 residential lots) within Area A of the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).**
- A.6 **Approval of the statutory denial, for a period of 180 days from the date of Council action on a request for the Preliminary Plat of XS Ranch, River Camp, Section 1 being a +/- 536.73 acres (752 single family residences) within Area A of the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).**
- A.7 **Approval of Bastrop Marketing Corporation's request for reimbursement of funds for November 2015 in accordance with the agreement to be spent on advertising and marketing the City of Bastrop area.**

Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa made the motion to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Council Member Schiff. The Consent Agenda was approved on a vote of 5-0.

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS, ORDINANCES, & OTHER ITEMS ELIGIBLE FOR CONSIDERATION AND/OR ACTION

- B.1 **PUBLIC HEARING: Conduct a public hearing to receive citizens input on a request to rezone +/-90.91 acres, for Piney Creek Bend, out of the A11 Bastrop Town Tract, from SF-9, Single Family Residential and A/OS, Agricultural/Open Space to PD, Residential Planned Development located north of the railroad tracks on the northwest corner of Riverwood/Hawthorne and Carter Street, within the city limits of Bastrop, Texas.**

Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that he asked the City Manager to explore and visit with the developer about one issue, the long and short term of the improvement of Carter Street on the North end of the railroad tracks. He stated that short term he believes that it is wrong for the City to discuss any proposal of the subdivision or zoning changes in that area until the City and/or the developer produce some sort of plan to improve the street in that area. The City Manager stated that the Mayor Pro Tem is correct, he did ask him to look into this and the City Manager did an extensive evaluation of Carter Street and developed a program for improvement to the street. The City Manager stated that he had explained to the Mayor Pro Tem that he had been provided an

opportunity to meet with the developer to determine what type of program could be put together to bring Carter Street up to City standards.

Council Member McAnally asked if the traffic study was conducted during peak hours of a regular work day or was it conducted during the Holiday period when there was less traffic. The City Engineer stated that the traffic counts that were collected as part of the study were run on Thursday, October 8, 2015 and the traffic counts were taken for an entire day and it was during the peak hours, the number of vehicles that travel through that intersection during the peak hours are taken and correlated to an average daily traffic and make an estimate as to how many trips per day would actually come through those intersections in total. Council Member McAnally asked if it was on a Holiday or a day with lower traffic. The Engineer stated no. Council Member McAnally asked how it is known that the survey was done properly. The City Engineer stated that as a precautionary measure the analysis were sent to Alliance Transportation who is sub-consultant under Halff and Associates and are responsible for preparing the Master Transportation Plan that is currently being developed, they reviewed the analysis and concurred with all of the assumptions and estimations that were provided in the analysis. Council Member McAnally asked if the City actually had any one that oversaw this or participated in the oversight in anyway of this besides sending it to Halff and Associates. The Engineer stated that throughout the process the way the analysis process development is supposed to work in terms of the ordinances is that the engineer sets up a scoping meeting with city staff and the staff defines the impact areas and the intersections that the City wants included in analysis and growth rates are included. The staff agrees on the scope of the analysis, the engineer prepares the analysis and staff reviews it and makes any comments and/or suggested changes. Council Member McAnally asked whether Halff and Associates or the City staff had any problems with the survey. The City Engineer stated no. The City Engineer added that the staff deployed some of the traffic counters in the area and they were out for over a week and part of that time was the Thanksgiving Holidays. The staff wanted to verify the traffic count and the traffic counts that staff collected were roughly half of what the analysis was. Council Member McAnally asked the Engineer if he thought that was because it was a Holiday. The Engineer stated that the staff did not do Thanksgiving, the day after Thanksgiving or the weekend, the staff mainly focused on the Monday through Wednesday before Thanksgiving. Council Member McAnally summarized the conversation as follows: the actual report was done on October the 8th on a regular day, a Thursday that was not part of a Holiday; the City's transportation consultants reviewed it and found it to be fine; the City reviewed it and found it to be fine; and the City did do some counts but it did include the Holiday period. The City Engineer agreed to the summary by Council Member McAnally. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that he found it odd that everything in the study graded out to an 'A'. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated from a public safety stand point the City is responsible for making sure the road is put up to a proper standard to allow for all future traffic that was talked about in the impact study and talked about at this meeting. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated for the City not to make a recommendation for the street to be upgraded to the area in his opinion states that no one looked at that area. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa asked the City Engineer if he was correct in saying no one from the staff looked at the area. The City Engineer stated yes the staff did go out and look. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that the staff did not know that it was ten foot shorter on one side of the tract than the other. The City Engineer stated that the staff was aware of the shorter side. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated to the Engineer that knowing this a recommendation still was not made by staff to ask the developer about what needed to be done to proceed with the development such as improving the street to handle the traffic. The City Engineer stated that the analysis focuses on the capacity of the street based on its width and geometry of the network and based on the resources that staff uses and other municipalities and agencies rely on to classify a collector street that has at least twenty feet of width as being able to serve up to 400 dwelling units. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that he does not agree with the amount of traffic recommended by the traffic study. Council Member Gilleland

asked what everything was zoned adjoining the subdivision. Council Member Gilleland asked if the property had been zoned SF9 the entire time. The Planning Director stated yes. Council Member Gilleland asked if the developer would have known that it was zoned SF9 when he purchased it. The Planning Director stated yes that all property owners know the zoning of the property when they purchase it. Council Member Schiff stated that he had asked the City Manager earlier that day if the property was built out at SF9 how many houses would fit on the property and that the City Manager responded 173 according to his count. Council Member Schiff stated that the proposed developer is planning 170 houses, if the developer did not ask for rezoning the developer could put 173 houses on the property which would have the same traffic load or three houses more than what is being proposed. The Planning Director stated that is correct. Council Member Gilleland asked for clarification in if SF9 has larger lots then how would there be less houses if the developer is wanting SF7. The Planning Director stated that she believes the developer is wanting to achieve smaller lots with less maintenance of yards which he can speak to as well as the ability to have greater open space, over half of the proposal is open space for trails. Council Member Gilleland asked the Planning Director if she was saying if the property is zoned SF7 it is 170 houses and SF9 it is 173 houses. The Planning Director stated it is a planned unit development so it is something different. Mayor Kesselus asked if the designation was changed would the number of 170 houses be solid or would it be subject to something down the road. The Planning Director stated yes it would be a solid number that is part of the planned unit application that was submitted. Council Member Schiff's comment was if the development was built out with the SF9 classification it would appear that more streets would be required, more impervious cover and the flooding issue complaints because of this development would be worse with the SF9 classification than it is with the planned development as it is proposed. The Planning Director stated that she would agree. Council Member Jackson asked with the planned development if there is more open space and more green space and more absorption which would protect some of the runoff and some of the other things that might occur in the neighborhood. The Planning Director stated yes if and when this would proceed to subdivision is when the drainage analysis would be looked at for the subdivision. Council Member McAnally stated for clarification that the reason the planned development can have fewer houses is because the foot print of each house is going to be a lot smaller and clustered. The Planning Director stated yes the developer is doing clustered development and less wide lots and in doing that the potential square footage is being cut out of actual lot size therefore the infrastructure is less so there are less roads being built. Council Member Schiff stated that the load of traffic down Carter, Wilson, Pecan and Main Streets is like one car every 30 seconds and that he does not currently see traffic as an issue. Council Member McAnally stated that she lives at Main and Cedar and she has been watching the stop signs at Cedar and Main and she has not seen a traffic problem. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that traffic outlets to 95 the only outlet at this time is at Cedar Street. The Mayor Pro Tem encouraged the City Manager to meet with the developer to determine the direction before making a decision.

Howard Nemerov – Stated that high density north of Bastrop is the particular issue. He stated that roof top tax revenues are not necessarily a positive on the ballot sheet. Mr. Nemerov stated that unless the traffic concern is dealt with before development it will be dealt with in a never ending cycle of catch up traffic amelioration which is very expensive. He stated there will be higher taxes for future generations. He stated the solution for Pine Creek and other subdivisions are larger lots.

Grace Garne – Ms. Garne stated that there aren't any more inventory of beautiful homes on large lots downtown. She stated that the development is being put on a street that goes nowhere which is Carter Street.

Mary Ellen Arbuckle – Ms. Arbuckle shared her experience of the downsizing of lots in her previous community prior to moving to Bastrop. She stated that when she inquired at City Hall

regarding a fence permit and was told that she could not put it out as far as she wanted because it was against the zoning and she thanked the employee for that information because it meant that she had moved to an area that respected zoning and that respected the current home owners. Ms. Arbuckle requested that the Council represent the citizens in this zoning matter and asked that they consider the Historic nature of the city. She stated that people are moving here from Austin and Houston because of less traffic.

Council Member McAnally stated that she wanted the audience to know that this is not a decision of whether to choose to build in the space or not this was decided by a previous Council, this section is going to be built one way or another. For those who oppose this development what is being looked at by the Council is making the best choice of a sad situation the City is growing and it is going to be built out, not a question of if it is going to be built out.

Stacy Woodruff – Ms. Woodruff stated that she lives on Juniper and her concern is that one of the entrances for the neighborhood lets out directly onto Juniper and traffic speeds down residential streets. She would rather have the traffic have to turn in order to slow the traffic down rather than have it go straight. Ms. Woodruff stated that the closeness of the houses seems like a fire hazard to her.

Council Member McAnally asked the Planning Director if the planning is left as it is if it is true that the Council does not get to tell the developer that they want certain things such as maybe a dead end here or there so that traffic would be rerouted but if it goes to the plan developing the Council has the opportunity to make demands of the developer and choices that can be made, homeowners association in order to have the choices put in place that is with the planning development option. The Planning Director stated correct, zoning is a discretionary tool that the City Council have through this plan development there are some give and take, negotiation or conversations about what can happen in the plan development. She stated with zoning that is another tool as well but if the development is not asking for a zoning change he could come and start the platting process and go through that process. Council Member McAnally stated the planning process as it is now would be larger lots on a grid or go with the planning development which clusters the housing and allows for more green space and not just grid there will be trails. She reiterated the Council's options which were to go with the larger home sizes and have no input or go with the clustered smaller home sizes and have some control over what goes there. The Planning Director stated that is correct. Council Member Gilleland asked the Planning Director if the picture of the grid she gave to her was the only way an SF9 could be developed. The Planning Director stated no that there are other opportunities and that is not the type of developments the developer builds and he definitely does not want to build in that way. Council Member Gilleland asked if the developer does not have to lay his plan out in a grid. The Planning Director stated that he doesn't that a plan development is an opportunity for the developer to look at it and propose a different set of standards that he wants to develop in and at this time the developer is proposing 170 lots and looking at doing his Urban 50 foot wide lot. Council Member Gilleland asked if the developer proposed the five feet in between the houses. The Planning Director stated that is correct she stated that the side set backs are something that home builders are looking to minimize, their opinion is that homeowners don't hang out in their side yards much they feel that useable lot is lost in the side yards and it allows for a larger foot print for the house. Council Member Gilleland stated that having the houses so close puts the housing right next to each other. The Planning Director stated that in total the houses would be ten feet away from one another. Council Member McAnally stated if the Council were to say that they wanted to keep the lot sizes the same the developer could still be creative with that and not have to use the grid system. The Planning Director stated yes and no, the grid system maximizes the amount the developer gets for their money. The Planning Director stated that the grid is not what the developer wants to do with the lot it was used to show

what could potentially happen on the property if the zoning standards of today were met. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa asked for a comparison between the Riverside Grove subdivision and this proposed subdivision. The Planning Director stated that Riverside Grove is zoned SF7 with minimum lot size of 60 foot wide and she does not believe there were any special plans given for that particular lot. Council Member Gilleland asked where there was an SF9 that this proposed subdivision could be compared to. The Planning Director stated that there are not any subdivisions zoned SF9 in the City limits that have been designed with the existing zoning standards and Tahitian Village has some SF9 but it was platted before the zoning classifications came into existence. Mayor Pro Tem stated that the lots in Riverside Grove is SF7 and the lots are 7,000 square foot the SF9 zoning would be 9,000 square foot. The Planning Director stated correct. Mayor Pro Tem stated that is the comparison he is trying to make.

David Singleton, Applicant – Mr. Singleton explained the process that has taken place up to now he stated that the traffic engineer is licensed by the state and has been in practice for more than forty years and the planner is licensed by the state. He stated that this is a zoning case and their intent is not to change the use. Mr. Singleton discussed the development of the land. Mr. Singleton stated that this project is not a low income housing project not an assisted living no Federal tract credits proposed. It is a market rate standalone single family residential development with a variety of lot sizes. Everything around it is SF7 and the average lot size is above 7,000 square feet and there are some lots below that. Mr. Singleton stated that infill development is the most cost effective development the City can realize. This site has always been proposed for single family and this what is being proposed today. The overall density is less than two units to the acre. Mr. Singleton stated that they are proposing a plan that meets the needs of the housing study consistent with the future land use plan and more topographic responsive to the site. This development proposes to open a portion of the greenbelt to the Piney Creek that is not open today and the developers will open and maintain the trail system.

Council Member Gilleland asked when the developer says there is density of two houses per acre she asked if they were including the Greenland. Mr. Singleton explained that density is based on the gross acreage by the number of lots. Council Member Gilleland asked if there was a way to calculate the density just in the area where the houses are. Mr. Singleton stated the average lot is over 7,000 feet and what is around the proposed subdivision is all SF7 7,000 square foot lots and the developers average is above 7,000 square feet. Council Member Gilleland asked what the setback would be on the 9,000 square foot lots. Mr. Singleton stated that the development has 7-1/2 and there may be fifteen feet between houses, these are minimums. Mr. Singleton stated that their development has a variety of lot sizes. Council Member Gilleland asked what the maximum size of a house he plans to build on any lot. Mr. Singleton stated that the builders will dictate that and he is not equipped to say what the maximum size would be but based on the market study and the input from the builder there will probably be a minimum housing. Council Member Schiff stated that the market is going to drive what people will buy the builders are not going to build things that people are not going to buy. Council Member Schiff stated that people are not going to put a 6,000 square foot home on a small lot and if you don't like the side setback area don't purchase a home there this is market driven. The Mayor asked if this was composed of a mixture of the use in the design. The Planning Director stated that the development would be very responsive to the creek and to the existing drainage and trail network that is there and the point is to design around the good things that are there. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that the drainage issue is important and there can't be anymore runoff after the subdivision is completed than exists at this time. Council Member McAnally asked if it is correct that there is a list of things that the City has to approve before actual building would begin that would protect the people in the neighborhoods and the City. The Planning Director stated that is correct. The City Manager stated that the preliminary and final plat of the subdivision would have to be approved. Council Member McAnally asked if

the list was available she would like to hear the list to know what is demanded of a developer before houses are built. The City Engineer stated that the major elements of the process between where the project is now and when you would see homes under construction: at this time the project is in the zoning process which is a concept plan submitted and the list of development standards that apply to the plan development, the zoning request requires a zoning and planning recommendation as well as City Council approval before it becomes effective and the traffic impact analysis was submitted as part of this process but is not required until the next phase; preliminary plat phase, traffic impact analysis, preliminary lot layout, preliminary infrastructure design, preliminary drainage floodplain analysis, P&Z recommendation and City Council approval; Construction Plans - final lot layout, detailed infrastructure design, detailed drainage analysis, engineer's cost estimate, escrow fiscal deposit (if required), and must be accepted prior to final plat approval by City Council; and Final Plat - City Council approval, complete improvements, two year maintenance bond, City Council acceptance of improvements, record final plat, and home construction begins. Council Member McAnally asked at what point does the homeowners association come in so it can be decided what will/will not be allowed in the area. The Engineer stated that typically the homeowner association rules are submitted or developed during the construction and plan process but before the final plat can be recorded there is a note on the plat that requires evidence of the formation of a homeowners association. Council Member McAnally asked what powers does the homeowner association have? The Engineer stated that it depended completely on the restrictions that apply to the neighborhood and it all comes back to defining who will maintain all of the common areas and any improvements that aren't accepted by the City but still required to be maintained by someone else other than a homeowner. Council Member McAnally asked who decides how this group is set up. The Engineer stated typically the developer would prepare those and the City certainly has input when it comes to those rules. The City Manager stated that the City does not have the authority to enforce the homeowner rules. Council Member McAnally asked Shawn Kirkpatrick of the Economic Development (EDC) Department a question about the planning study regarding the type of housing needed in Bastrop she asked him to speak to Mr. Singleton's statement about this subdivision being right on target for the need of Bastrop. Mr. Kirkpatrick replied by saying what the EDC is looking at in the zero to five year range that they are in now in the housing study his development meets all of the needs within the market today. Mr. Singleton's market research lined up with the market research of the BEDC identically as to where the market was. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated from their perspective as staff it will meet the market demand that are in Bastrop today. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that the planning study obtained by the BEDC is not being questioned but his argument is in the old part of town in the established neighborhoods this proposal may not work but in the west of town to the undeveloped neighborhoods the development might work. He stated that the people in the neighborhood have stated that they do not want this development in their neighborhood and his opinion is that Council should not make the decision to move forward and rezone this property before the City Manager has a chance to work out how the streets are going to be improved.

Brad Woodruff – Mr. Woodruff asked if the property is rezoned will the developer be able to go back and make all the lots smaller. The Director of Planning explained that is not possible. Mr. Woodruff also stated his concern with the traffic.

Margaret Silbernagel – Ms. Silbernagel stated that she lives on Magnolia Street. She explained to Council that this property is a gem in the City and it is centrally located. She stated that there is a huge market for individuals that are 55 plus empty nesters that are moving here from surrounding areas. She asked Council to look at this closely and to vote against it.

David Bellanie – Mr. Bellanie stated that he lives on Magnolia Street and he is a stay at home dad with a one year old. He stated that he walks the neighborhood with his child every day. He asked

Council to limit the amount of houses that are put in this neighborhood. He feels more houses built there will diminish his quality of life.

Council Member Jackson asked doesn't the development have fewer houses. The Planning Director stated yes. Council Member McAnally asked if the Council has the ability to limit the number of lots in the development. Council Member McAnally asked the City Attorney if she could address this question. The City Attorney stated not at this time, it is the zoning specification that would allow for 173 structures at this time, the owner purchased it with that right and if the City acted to reduce this amount it would be a taking of his property right and the City would have to compensate him for that. The City Attorney summed it up by saying no it is not something that is possible at this time under what is being proposed. Council Member McAnally stated that the Council is back to the better of two situations. The City Attorney stated yes.

Bob Rogers – Mr. Rogers expressed his concern with the Council asking the citizens for their input...the citizens give their input so he is asking Council to listen to them. He feels that the residents know their neighborhood better than the Council. Mr. Rogers feels that it is the developer verses the citizens. Mr. Rogers stated that there were a lot of citizens that attended the Planning and Zoning meetings that were opposed to the development. Council Member McAnally asked Mr. Rogers what it is specifically that he wants. Mr. Rogers stated that he wants the Council to consider each development as it goes along if it does not fit the community and the community does not want it make sure that it is developed properly. He stated that he challenge the traffic survey. He stated that the traffic study does not address the cut through traffic.

Marie Blazek – Ms. Blazek stated that she recently purchased a home on Carter Street. Ms. Blazek questioned the credibility of the traffic study that was done. She expressed her concern for the amount of traffic this will produce in the neighborhood. She stated that she does not believe that families walking their children and dogs will enter the subdivision to access the greenbelt. She feels the greenbelt will be of more use to the subdivision residence rather than the existing residents. Ms. Blazek is disappointed that she will most likely have to sell her home and she feels that the market value will have gone down because of the traffic. Ms. Blazek expressed her disappointment and that she feels that the development is too big.

Council Member McAnally reiterated that the Council does not get to determine how many houses get built in the subdivision and that there are limitations on what the Council can do. Council Member McAnally asked Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa to restate what he thinks should be done before a decision is made and she asked the City Manager to let Council know if he believes what Mayor Pro Tem thinks should happen is doable. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated: the citizens would like to have the development remain at SF9 and that is his recommendation; the City offer to buy some of the land from the property owner to create more parkland which would eliminate more lots and vehicles in that area; he would caution any of the Council Members to not make any type of vote unless they were listening to the neighbors and say no on the plan development before the City Manager and the developer had an opportunity to talk on the cost of the improvement on the street and how it would be funded. Council Member McAnally asked the City Manager if any or all of Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa's plan was possible. The City Manager stated that it is possible if the developer agrees to it. The City Manager encouraged the Council to be cautious as not to get into condition zoning because that relates to contract zoning which is not an acceptable criteria to approve a zoning request. The developer would have to be open to having the discussions regarding the subjects Mayor Pro Tem has mentioned there is normally a subdivision process which addresses the street issues which the City Manager stated that he believes the street is 21 foot and he feels that it is a valid concern that does need to be addressed.

Council to limit the amount of houses that are put in this neighborhood. He feels more houses built there will diminish his quality of life.

Council Member Jackson asked doesn't the development have fewer houses. The Planning Director stated yes. Council Member McAnally asked if the Council has the ability to limit the number of lots in the development. Council Member McAnally asked the City Attorney if she could address this question. The City Attorney stated not at this time, it is the zoning specification that would allow for 173 structures at this time, the owner purchased it with that right and if the City acted to reduce this amount it would be a taking of his property right and the City would have to compensate him for that. The City Attorney summed it up by saying no it is not something that is possible at this time under what is being proposed. Council Member McAnally stated that the Council is back to the better of two situations. The City Attorney stated yes.

Bob Rogers – Mr. Rogers expressed his concern with the Council asking the citizens for their input...the citizens give their input so he is asking Council to listen to them. He feels that the residents know their neighborhood better than the Council. Mr. Rogers feels that it is the developer verses the citizens. Mr. Rogers stated that there were a lot of citizens that attended the Planning and Zoning meetings that were opposed to the development. Council Member McAnally asked Mr. Rogers what it is specifically that he wants. Mr. Rogers stated that he wants the Council to consider each development as it goes along if it does not fit the community and the community does not want it make sure that it is developed properly. He stated that he challenge the traffic survey. He stated that the traffic study does not address the cut through traffic.

Marie Blazek – Ms. Blazek stated that she recently purchased a home on Carter Street. Ms. Blazek questioned the credibility of the traffic study that was done. She expressed her concern for the amount of traffic this will produce in the neighborhood. She stated that she does not believe that families walking their children and dogs will enter the subdivision to access the greenbelt. She feels the greenbelt will be of more use to the subdivision residence rather than the existing residents. Ms. Blazek is disappointed that she will most likely have to sell her home and she feels that the market value will have gone down because of the traffic. Ms. Blazek expressed her disappointment and that she feels that the development is too big.

Council Member McAnally reiterated that the Council does not get to determine how many houses get built in the subdivision and that there are limitations on what the Council can do. Council Member McAnally asked Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa to restate what he thinks should be done before a decision is made and she asked the City Manager to let Council know if he believes what Mayor Pro Tem thinks should happen is doable. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated: the citizens would like to have the development remain at SF9 and that is his recommendation; the City offer to buy some of the land from the property owner to create more parkland which would eliminate more lots and vehicles in that area; he would caution any of the Council Members to not make any type of vote unless they were listening to the neighbors and say no on the plan development before the City Manager and the developer had an opportunity to talk on the cost of the improvement on the street and how it would be funded. Council Member McAnally asked the City Manager if any or all of Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa's plan was possible. The City Manager stated that it is possible if the developer agrees to it. The City Manager encouraged the Council to be cautious as not to get into condition zoning because that relates to contract zoning which is not an acceptable criteria to approve a zoning request. The developer would have to be open to having the discussions regarding the subjects Mayor Pro Tem has mentioned there is normally a subdivision process which addresses the street issues which the City Manager stated that he believes the street is 21 foot and he feels that it is a valid concern that does need to be addressed.

Council Member Schiff asked if it would help the safety of the street if there were sidewalks that ran from Magnolia to Fisherman's Park. The City Manager stated when you put a sidewalk in it enhances the pedestrian safety. Council Member Schiff asked if that is something the developer could be asked to put in as part of this or would it get into the conditional zoning. The City Manager stated the length that Council Member Schiff is speaking of maybe in the front of the development and that would be the limit of what the developer would have to look at. Council Member McAnally stated that what she has heard is that the City Manager and the developer at this point can talk about some of the suggestions that have been made by the Mayor Pro Tem to determine if those can be worked out before the Council moves ahead. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that the point he was attempting to make was that those were the options if the Council did not vote no. Council Member McAnally asked the Mayor Pro Tem for clarification. The Mayor Pro Tem stated that he feels the property should be left at SF9. Council Member McAnally stated if the property is left at SF9 it is her understanding that the Council would not be able to request changes. The City Manager stated that there are issues that come up that are related to the subdivision development process that have to be addressed during the subdivision verses a zoning change when you are looking at the compatibility does that zoning change fit the surrounding zoning districts, you are trying to compare infrastructure improvements which is a subdivision issue verses a zoning issue which is the land use process. Council Member McAnally asked where that leaves the Council she wanted to know what could happen before the next meeting to address the concerns of the audience. The City Manager stated that he has found Mr. Singleton to be very open and he has been very responsive and he believes Mr. Singleton would be open to some level of discussion but he would caution that the City will ultimately have to make the decision based upon whether or not the Council thinks this is an appropriate zoning request regardless as to what the City Manager brings back to Council. Council Member McAnally asked Mr. Singleton if he would be willing to take part in a conversation with the City Manager in order to address the concerns to possibly work out something before the Council takes the next vote. Mr. Singleton stated that the discussion with the City Engineer staff has suggested if there is additional right-of-way along Carter it would be necessary for the future widening of that and is that something that the developer would consider and participate in. Mr. Singleton stated that there are State Statutes that limit what can be done but that they could voluntarily contribute more right-of-way if it is deemed appropriate and it was acknowledged to staff that they are willing to do so. He admitted that a mistake was made on their part by doing the TIA out of sequence. Mr. Singleton respectfully requested that they go back to the City's process. One of the things the developer did offer up in the PD was a sidewalk outside the right-of-way. Council Member Schiff asked if the sidewalk was part of the plan. Mr. Singleton replied yes. Council Member Gilleland asked if the developer would pay for the sidewalk. Mr. Singleton replied yes. The City Manager clarified the statement by saying "only in front of his development." The Planning Director stated that sidewalks would be part of the development internally as well as along Carter.

The Public Hearing was closed without objection.

Mayor Kesselus recessed the Council Meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Mayor Kesselus called the Council Meeting back to order at 9:30 p.m.

- B.2 **First reading of an ordinance granting a zone change for +/-90.91 acres, for Piney Creek Bend, out of the a11 Bastrop Town tract, from sf-9, single family residential and a/os, agricultural/open space to PD, residential planned development located north of the railroad tracks on the northwest corner of Riverwood/Hawthorne and Carter Street, within the city limits of Bastrop, Texas; and providing an effective date.**

Council Member Gilleland asked the Planning Director if the members of the Planning and Zoning Board that voted nay on this item expressed their concerns. The Mayor stated that there is a draft copy of the minutes from the Planning and Zoning meeting of which this item was heard in the back up and that he had spoken to the chairman of the Planning and Zoning Board who chose not to come before the Council to discuss what took place at this meeting. The Planning Director stated that she does feel that the draft minutes are accurate and reflective of what occurred at the meeting it was a 5-3 vote recommending approval of this item. Council Member Schiff suggested to the Council to approve the first reading and direct the City Manager, Planning Department staff and the developer to have a conversation regarding the street issues and place this as an item on the workshop agenda to talk about roads and street development in the future. Put this as a priority to the master plan and have the traffic individuals that have already reviewed the master plan look at the impact of this on the master plan and the impact of future growth on that road on the master plan possibly after the workshop there will be some direction by looking at the budget and what it would cost to improve that street and there needs to be a plan as to where the City is today and what will happen as the impact of this development. At the second reading hopefully this would be worked out if not the second reading isn't approved. Council Member Gilleland asked if the Council keeps the zoning at SF9 there could be 173 homes if it is changed to what the developer wants it is 170 homes either way there is a minimum of 170 homes. The Planning Director stated yes. Council Member Gilleland asked if the zoning was kept at SF9 is that the maximum and where did this number come from. The Planning Director stated that was a schematic of what could potentially be done. Council Member Gilleland asked if the zoning was left as is there is a potential of many more homes but if the zoning is changed it would be limited to 170. Council Member Jackson asked if it would be limited to 170 but what about the other amenities such as the parkland if it remains zoned as it is would the City still be afforded the amenities such as the things that were discussed that would improve the development. The Planning Director stated that the City would be afforded the sidewalks which is a minimum standard but more than likely not the forty acres of open space. Council Member Schiff stated having 173 houses on the development there would not be enough land left for forty acres of open space. Council Member Gilleland asked how that could be true if there are only an addition of three more houses. The Planning Director stated generally if the lot is being increased and additional streets are being added within a subdivision it takes up more space that would negate or lessen the forty seven acres of parkland. Council Member Gilleland stated that the things she heard were: the density of the housing and the traffic these were the two concerns of the community.

Council Member Schiff made the motion to approve the first reading of the ordinance and direct the City Manager to meet with the developer and staff and take into consideration the requests of the citizens and include them in the process, seconded by Council Member McAnally. The item was approved on a 3-2 vote. Those voting aye were: Council Members McAnally, Schiff and Jackson. Those voting nay were: Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa and Council Member Gilleland.

B.3 PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration, discussion and possible action on a Variance to the Subdivision Ordinance, Section 5.50.1 (A) subdivision layouts shall avoid the inclusion of flag shaped lots, 6.50.2 A – Access to Lots – Each lot in a subdivision shall abut on a public street and Section 7.10.2 (A). Suburban Subdivision Standards – minimum lot width requirements. The proposed Home Place Subdivision is +/-5.098 acres out of the Stephen F. Austin Survey, Abstract No. 2 located on Lovers Lane in the Bastrop, Texas Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).

Council Member Gilleland asked the Planning Director if she had stated that she was not in favor of the variances because she believed there were other options to access the street and what they were. The Planning Director stated that she does believe something could be done to provide

additional access and her understanding is that the parcel of land lock actually has access through a neighboring relative's property which may be an opportunity to add on an additional right-of-way frontage.

Zachary Stephenson, Developer - Mr. Stephenson stated that lot two is approximately 2.5 acre. This land is family land which has been divided into lots. Mr. Stephenson is proposing a dwelling in the middle of the land which has caused the flag lot. He does not believe that what the Planning Director suggest in the previous paragraph is possible unless he gives up additional land. Council Member McAnally asked if this land is all in the same family. Mr. Stephenson stated yes. Council Member McAnally clarified that Mr. Stephenson is wanting to build his house between the rental houses. Mr. Stephenson agreed with Council Member McAnally's statement and stated that what the Planning Director is denying is the property owner using land owned by him to get to another piece of land also owned by him and that this is only an issue because it is in the extra territorial jurisdiction. Council Member McAnally asked if he had an easement. Mr. Stephenson stated yes. Council Member McAnally asked if all of the property owners were in agreement. Mr. Stephenson stated yes. The Mayor asked Mr. Stephenson if he was in agreement with the staff recommendation. Mr. Stephenson stated that he agrees with the flag lot but he disagrees with the Planning Department denying the approval to the easement to the back lot. Council Member McAnally asked if the Council approves this is there a way for the City to be protected from having liability if the property is sold in the future. Council Member McAnally asked the City Attorney if the City could get in trouble for doing this. The City Attorney stated it is a variance it is not in compliance with the City's regulations, the decision is made on the factors that are presented any future owner would obtain it understanding the restraints that are on it. The City Attorney stated that her argument in support of the City's decision making would be that the buyer is coming to the problem. The City Manager asked the City Attorney if the City could put a plat note on the document that would reflect the fact that the family is in agreement to this and recognizes that it land locks a particular lot and accepts the responsibility of that land lock. The City Attorney stated that she would go further and say that they are indemnifying the City of any actions brought as a result. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa asked how this would meet the County standards, if this went before the County subdivision what would the County's answer be. The Planning Director stated that she is not an expert on that. James Garren, surveyor representing the Adams stated this would be exempt from platting under County rules because it is family division property. Council Member Gilleland asked the representative of the Adams family if they were willing to accept the indemnity. The representative of the Adams family stated yes.

There was a motion made by Council Member McAnally to approve the variance with the property owners indemnifying the City of Bastrop of any actions brought as a result, seconded by Council Member Schiff. The motion was approved on a 5-0 vote.

C. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

D. NEW BUSINESS CONTINUED

D.2 Consideration, discussion and possible action authorizing the City Manager to negotiate a new Bastrop Marketing Corporation (BMC) contract with the Hyatt Regency.

This item was postponed to the January 23, 2016 retreat without objection.

D.5 Consideration, discussion, and possible action regarding the expenditure of legal fees and the possibility of hiring an in-house city attorney.

This item was postponed to the January 23, 2016 retreat without objection.

- D.6 **Discussion regarding diversity on the City boards, commissions, committees, and task forces.**
This item was postponed to the January 23, 2016 retreat agenda without objection.
- D.7 **Discussion regarding presence of three council members on the BEDC board.**
This item was postponed to the January 26, 2016 regular Council Meeting without objection.
- D.8 **Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding clarification of appointment for Jimmy Crouch to the Construction Standards Board.**
This item was postponed to the January 26, 2016 regular Council Meeting without objection.
- D.9 **First reading of an ordinance of the City Council of the City of Bastrop, Texas, amending Chapter 8 of the city code, entitled "Offenses & Nuisances," and revising certain definitions in Section 8.07.001, amending Section 8.07.003 entitled "Carrying in City Building or Vehicle", providing for publication; providing a severability clause; and providing an effective date.**
This item was postponed to the January 26, 2016 regular Council Meeting without objection.
- D.4 **Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding instructing the City Manager to negotiate with the Greater Austin YMCA in the effort to reach an agreement for a joint venture between the City and the Y to build a recreational facility in Bastrop.**
Andrews Wiggins of the YMCA presented a presentation.

Council Member Gilleland asked Mr. Wiggins to explain where the building will be and who will own the land. Mr. Wiggins stated that the Y representatives are still working on where the building will be. The City Manager asked when this would be locked down. Mr. Wiggins stated that the representatives are working on this in the next quarter. The City Manager stated that he wants the Council to understand that this is a very important point. The City Manager stated that he felt blindsided because the Council had stated to him their desire to make sure that he had a plan to the county judge not only for the building but also the site, which he did in order to not lose the funding, the Council expressed to the City Manager that the City did not want to lose this funding. The City Manager stated that he put a time line together and he must know by March 1st if the site is locked down and can go forward if not by September 2017 his estimate is that the building will be 85% complete. The City Manager wanted to make everyone aware of this. The Mayor stated that he is comfortable with the deadline and believes it has to be met. Council Member Gilleland reiterated her question of where is the land and who does it belong to. Mr. Wiggins stated that the Y representatives absolutely do not want the City to lose the HUD funding and if the deadline the City Manager stated previously is one imposed by the county judge or the City Manager the Y is in total respect of that. The City Manager stated for clarification that this is a deadline by the grant guidelines which states the building is supposed to be completed by September 30, 2017, the City received a ninety day extension when the City Manager spoke to the judge and ask for an extension until December 30th which cut into the building time so the City Manager has laid out every step that needs to be covered to meet the grant guidelines, get a building built and get the funding for the City and if the architect is not allowed to start on March 1st when September 30, 2017 arrives the City will not be at the 85% mark which he has marked as the City having to be at in order to avoid losing the funding. The Mayor stated that the Y representatives must understand that the City will not lose the money and claw back procedures are being asked for to insure this does not happen. The Mayor stated there is no guarantee the information could be turned in on February 25th and HUD could say it is too late and pull the plug on the funding. The Mayor pointed out to the

Council that the land has to be suitable to the City. James Finkle, representative of the Y stated that the Land belongs to Seton there are two parcels of land that have been identified as a possibility for the recreation center. Mr. Finkle stated that he does agree with the City Manager regarding the hard deadline and the deadline is March 2 and if the Y cannot deliver on the land and promise that they are making they are out of the picture. The City Manager stated for a point of clarification because of the caveat that was placed upon the City Manager the 1.6 million did include furniture and fixtures and the fifty cots that will be needed in the event that the shelter will need to be opened up. The City Manager stated that the \$60,000 figure was a rough estimate that would put a person there equivalent to a clerk receptionist person that could schedule the use of the facility and possibly expand the duties to handle the special events since that would be a central location which is currently having to be spread around due to the number of special events and the salary would be around \$40,000 to \$50,000 with benefits. The City Manager added that there will be the expense of mowing, electricity, water etc. which will put the cost right at \$60,000 for a person to properly man. Council Member Schiff stated that this does not include a recreation director. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRoas asked where the \$60,000 would come from. The City Manager stated that it would have to be pulled from the general fund. Council Member Schiff read the proposal by Council Member Schiff and Mayor Kesselus for a joint City of Bastrop/Austin YMCA recreational facility into record. Mayor Kesselus stated at the January 11, 2016 BEDC Board meeting the BEDC board members passed a resolution that Steve Mills and Shawn Kirkpatrick work with the Mayor and City Manager about the BEDC's affirmation of providing the alternative \$700,000 it is proposed that the City Council and the BEDC have a joint workshop meeting in time to inform the public before the first meeting of February. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa stated that he thought the Council was in agreement to not use any general fund dollars that were generated by property taxes to help fund the YMCA other than the 1.6. He stated that he was supportive of the project but believes it should be funded with BEDC money. The Mayor responded by saying that the discussion that took place was regarding the Y wanting 2 million dollars and COs and a bond election were discussed and his point was that he does not feel that the City should sell COs for that amount of money he feels that the City should go to the citizens about it. The Mayor asked the City Manager when the City spends the \$60,000 on Plan B where is the money coming from. The City Manager stated that there are several line items that make up the general fund revenue the top two being property taxes, sales taxes, fines and fees, permits, municipal court revenues which add up to x amount of dollars. Council Member Gilleland stated that in December the Y did not have 2.5 to contribute and they have been discussing being able to raise this amount of funds since last Summer and they have not been able to come up with it yet. Council Member Gilleland asked the Y representatives if they are sure they can get the \$2.5 and if so how. Mr. Finkle stated that there has been discussion about a lot of different strategies and that is the process that you go through. Mr. Finkle stated that it was never said that there would be a capital campaign to raise the money but what was said was that it would take a partnership and the \$2.5 will come out of the Y's cash reserve. Council Member Gilleland ask Mr. Finkle if the Y has the money now and it does not have to be raised. Mr. Finkle stated that the Y does have it in cash reserve.

Tommy Claiborne – Mr. Claiborne wanted to know how the public would be notified. The Mayor stated that the BEDC proposed to the Council that a public hearing be held for a chance for the citizens to weigh in to allow both entities to be able to make an informed decision based on what is heard from the citizens and their own views.

Council Member McAnally stated that she wanted to make sure if the Council voted to approve this item that the Y representatives will deliver on their promises. Mr. Finkle stated that is correct and the clause that was put in states if the Y can't get the plan together to satisfy the City Manager the City will go to Plan B. Council Member McAnally asked the City Manager what timeframe

would the City have to come to an agreement with the Y before going to Plan B. The City Manager reiterated the timeline that he laid out earlier in the conversation.

Carlos Liriano – Mr. Liriano expressed his concern with the Y being the City's recreation partner for years to come and asked if this had been discussed. Council Member Schiff stated that a comprehensive recreation center plan has not been put together because until recently it was not evident that the City was going to spend the money. Mr. Liriano stated that if the Y is going to run the recreation department for the City there needs to be a discussion to understand what the Y's commitment will look like. Mr. Liriano stated that he previously brought an idea to Council that was to take the \$1.6 million and partner with the Y and also build a fire station on the west side of town or maybe partner with the Boys and Girls Club by building a gymnasium on the west side of town. Mr. Liriano stated that he brought to the City Manager four months ago the possibility of taking the \$1.6 million and bringing the Y as a partner into the equation. He also stated that the land next to his facility is in the PID and eventually the maintenance of the property will be the responsibility of the City he offered to donate some of his land for a building for the Y. Mr. Liriano stated that this would be option d which he stated all of the Council Members were aware of with the exception of Council Member Schiff. Mr. Liriano stated that all of the options except his was discussed at this meeting. The Mayor suggested that Mr. Liriano write up a proposal for what he spoke of. Mr. Liriano stated that he had already met individually with each Council Member. The City Manager stated that Mr. Liriano's plan is under consideration but that compliance with getting the grant to the County Judge had to be met first and the Council was briefed properly regarding Mr. Liriano's proposal.

Martha Harris – Ms. Harris wanted to follow up on Mr. Liriano's conversation and stated that Mr. Liriano had spoken with the Y representatives and she stated that she had met with Mr. Liriano. She stated that she likes Mr. Liriano's project but does not have enough information about it.

Council Member McAnally made the motion as follows, seconded by Council Member Gilleland. The motion passed on a vote of 4-0. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa voted nay. The motion was to instruct the City Manager to negotiate with the Greater Austin YMCA in the effort to reach an agreement for a joint venture between the City and the Y to build a recreational facility in Bastrop; include the points read into record; and the City Manager is to handle any City deals with the YMCA for the City of Bastrop and the Y is to listen to other individuals inclusions and determine if the inclusions are an asset to the project.

D.10. Consideration, discussion and possible action on acceptance of the unaudited Monthly Financial Reports for the period ending in Nov. 30, 2015.

Council Member McAnally made the motion to approve the unaudited monthly financial reports for the period ending in November 30, 2015, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa. The motion passed on a vote of 5-0.

D.11. Consideration, discussion and possible action on acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report for the period ending in Dec. 31, 2015.

Council Member Jackson made the motion to approve the quarterly investment report for the period ending in December 31, 2015, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa. The motion passed on a vote of 5-0.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Bastrop City Council met at 11:30 p.m. in a closed/executive session pursuant to the Texas Government Code, Chapter 551, Section 551.072, to discuss the following:

1. **SECTION 551.071(1)(A) & SECTION 551.071(2)** – Consultation with Attorney concerning: (1) potential, pending, threatened, and/or contemplated litigation or claims, including but not limited to water permits and supply and/or (2) matter upon which the Attorney has a duty and/or responsibility to report to the governmental body, concerning same, and/or any other matters posted on the agenda including contracts.

At 11:49 p.m. the Bastrop City Council reconvened into open session to discuss, consider and/or take any actions necessary related to the executive sessions noted herein, or regular agenda items, noted above, and/or related items.

NO ACTION WAS TAKEN.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Schiff made the motion to adjourn at 11:50 p.m., Council Member Jackson seconded the motion which passed on a 4-0 vote. Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa was off the dais.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Mayor Ken Kesselus

City Secretary Ann Franklin

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: APPROVE RESOLUTION TO PREPARATION OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDAS IN COMPLAINE WITH THE STATE'S OPEN GOVERNMENT STATUES AND LAWS; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

2. Party Making Request: **Council Member Gilleland**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No _____

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested _____

RESOLUTION NO. R-2016 -03

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BASTROP,
TEXAS, RELATED TO PREPARATION OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDAS IN COMPLAINE WITH THE STATE'S OPEN GOVERNMENT
STATUTES AND LAWS; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; AND
PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

WHEREAS, the City Council of Bastrop is fully and unconditionally committed to transparency in its governance and operations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of Bastrop is committed to full compliance with the State's Open Government Statute, including the Open Meetings Act ("OMA"), as interpreted by the State's Attorney General, and as adopted by the State's Courts in judicial opinions; and

WHEREAS, in order to ensure that the City Council's public meetings legally, adequately and fairly inform all persons who read the City's agendas of the topics and individuals that are anticipated for presentation to the Council at meetings, under agenda topics such as "Announcements" and "Citizen's Comments," the City will, henceforth, include on such posted items information known to the City at the time of preparation and posting the agenda for an upcoming City Council meeting, to the extent required by the OMA.

WHEREAS, nothing in this Resolution is intended to limit or otherwise inhibit the ability or right of citizens to address the Council at its meetings, *impromptu*, in accord with the City's formally adopted 'Rules of Decorum,' as has been the Council's practice in the past. Rather, it is the purpose of this Resolution merely to ensure that the City comply to the fullest extent possible with the State's Open Government laws and regulations.

WHEREAS, the Council members agree and fully commit themselves to assisting the City Manager, City Secretary/Staff, and Mayor in timely obtaining and conveying all information in their possession, related to these agenda items, so that the agendas may be prepared in compliance with the OMA.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS, THAT:**

Part 1: The City shall prepare and post its meeting agendas in a manner that provides a reader with both the identity and the general topic of the subject(s) that will be presented to the Council, under agenda items posted as "Announcements" and "Citizen Comments" and/or any similar general postings if, at or before the time the agendas are prepared by the

City, the identity of the speaker and the general subject matter upon which the speaker desires to address the Council is known to the City.

Part 2: This Resolution is not to be interpreted or used to prohibit or limit any individual from the right to address or make 'citizens comments' to the City Council at its public meetings, on an *impromptu* basis, and/or when the Council is not made aware of the identity of the speaker or the topic before the time that the agenda for the meeting is being prepared. Under those circumstances, a person may make a 'citizen's comment' by following the City's adopted Rules of Decorum for same; however, as per State law, such 'citizen's comments' are limited in nature and not the subject of an exchange with the Council, at that time.

Part 3: Council members and City staff agree and fully commit themselves to assisting the City Manager, City Secretary/Staff, and Mayor in timely obtaining and conveying all information in their possession, related to these agenda items, so that the agendas may be prepared in compliance with the OMA

Part 4: If any section or part of this Resolution is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, that holding shall not invalidate or impair the validity, force or effect of any other section or part of this Resolution or Code of Ordinances, City of Bastrop, Texas.

Part 5: This Resolution supersedes and repeals all Resolutions or parts of Resolution, if any, in conflict herewith; however, such present Resolutions shall remain in full force and effect until the effective date of this Resolution.

Part 6: This Resolution shall take effect upon the date of passage noted below.

READ and ADOPTED on the 9th day of February, 2016.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Ken Kesselus
Mayor

Ann Franklin
City Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Jo-Christy Brown, City Attorney

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Approval of Bastrop Marketing Corporation's request for reimbursement of funds for December 2015 in accordance with the agreement to be spent on advertising and marketing the City of Bastrop area.**
2. Party Making Request: **Tracy Waldron, Chief Financial Officer**
3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

4. Policy Implication: _____
5. Budgeted: X Yes No N/A
 Bid Amount: _____ Budgeted Amount: _____
 Under Budget: _____ Over Budget: _____
 Amount Remaining: _____
6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____
7. Routing:

	<u>NAME/TITLE</u>	<u>INITIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>CONCURRENCE</u>
a)	_____	_____	_____	_____
b)	_____	_____	_____	_____
c)	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Staff Recommendation: **Approval of Bastrop Marketing Corporation's reimbursement request for December 2015.**
9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None
10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None
11. Motion Requested: **Approval of Bastrop Marketing Corporation's reimbursement request for December 2015.**

**CITY OF BASTROP
FINANCE
DEPARTMENT**

Memo

To: Mayor, City Council and City Manager
From: Tracy Waldron, Chief Financial Officer
Date: February 5, 2016
Re: Reimbursement of Accrued Bastrop Marketing Corporation Expenses

Attached is the request from Bastrop Marketing Corporation (BMC) for payment of funds in accordance with the Tourism Marketing Agreement that was signed with the City of Bastrop in November 2003.

This request is for the time period of December 2015. There is a month lag in the receipt of the hotel occupancy tax monies.

It is recommended that Council approve the reimbursement of funds in the amount of \$45,573.91 for December 2015 to BMC in accordance with our agreement to be spent on advertising and marketing the City of Bastrop area. This amount represents 43% of the tax collections.

If you have any questions regarding this agreement please contact me at 512-332-8820.

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Approval of the statutory denial, for a period of 180 days from the date of Council action on a request for the Administrative Plat of Sayers Estates Subdivision being a +/- 3.797 acre tract out of the Stephen F, Austin Survey, A-3, located east of Sayers Road within Area A of the Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).**

2. Party Making Request: **Melissa McCollum, Director of Planning and Development**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

A city must take action on a plat within 30 days or the plat is automatically approved.

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No N/A

Bid Amount: _____ Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____ Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: **Staff recommends approval of the statutory denial.**

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested: **Recommend approval of the statutory denial.**

PLAT MAP

SAVERS ROAD

LOT 1
1.000 ACRES

LOT 2
1.000 ACRES

LOT 3
1.000 ACRES

APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF LOT 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, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 8

ADDITIONAL MAPS
NOT TO SCALE

WATER

POND

ROAD

BUILDING

SITE

WATER

POND

ROAD

BUILDING

SITE

28

Journal of Management Education 36(10) 1039-1054

[illegible][illegible]

28

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **APPROVAL OF THE SECOND READING OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BASTROP AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE, CHAPTER 14, SECTION 36.2, ZONING USE CHARTS AND A.3 DEFINITIONS REGULATING THE MOVEMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING(S)/STRUCTURE(S); ADOPTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT PROCESS WITHIN RESIDENTIAL ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS FOR RELOCATION AND REHABILITATION OF SUCH MOVED BUILDINGS; AMENDING CHAPTER 3, "BUILDING REGULATIONS" ARTICLE 3.16.002 AND 3.16.006; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

2. Party Making Request: **Melissa McCollum, Director of Planning and Development**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ____ No ____

This item was considered at the November 10, 2015 City Council meeting. At this meeting there was a lot of discussion. The first reading was approved by a vote 4-0, but staff has since clarified some of the language related to this item.

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A
Bid Amount: _____ Budgeted Amount: _____
Under Budget: _____ Over Budget: _____
Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE
a) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: **Staff recommends the changes to Zoning Ordinance Section 36.2 and A-3, Definitions, adopting a Conditional Use Permit process and amend Chapter 3, Building Regulations.**

9. Advisory Board Recommendation: XX Recommended Approval ___ Denial ___ None

The Planning and Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing October 29, 2015 and unanimously voted six (6) in favor to recommend approval of the changes to Zoning Ordinance Section 36.2 and A-3, Definitions, adopting a Conditional Use Permit process and amend Chapter 3, Building Regulations.

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested **Recommend approval of the second reading.**

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-03

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BASTROP AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE, CHAPTER 14, SECTION 36.2, ZONING USE CHARTS AND A.3 DEFINITIONS REGULATING THE MOVEMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING(S)/STRUCTURE(S); ADOPTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT PROCESS WITHIN RESIDENTIAL ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS FOR RELOCATION AND REHABILITATION OF SUCH MOVED BUILDINGS; AMENDING CHAPTER 3, "BUILDING REGULATIONS" ARTICLE 3.16.002 AND 3.16.006; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the maintenance and enforcement of certain minimum building and safety standards governing the relocation and rehabilitation of existing residential structures onto property that is in the corporate limits of the City is governed by the City of Bastrop's Zoning Ordinance and Building Regulations and is in the interest of the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the City of Bastrop; and

WHEREAS, the Council finds that citizens of the City of Bastrop would be best served by amending Chapters 14 and 3 of the Bastrop Code of Ordinances to prohibit the movement of substandard existing single family structures into the City's corporate limits unless such structures are rehabilitated to meet all applicable safety and building regulations, under reasonable conditions and stipulations that are to be determined by the City's Planning and Zoning Commission and/or the City Council, on a case-by-case basis; and

WHEREAS, this Ordinance amends Chapter 14, the Zoning Ordinance, and Chapter 3, the City's Building Regulation Ordinance, to further regulate the movement and rehabilitation of "existing structures" into the City's residential zoning districts, and subjects these relocated structures to the requirements of a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP"); and

WHEREAS, the City Staff prepared recommendations for such Code amendments and presented them to the Construction Standards Board on April 21, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the City Construction Standards Board and the Planning and Zoning Commission held a joint public meeting on May 28, 2015, to discuss the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and Building Code noted herein; and

WHEREAS, subsequently, after concluding that a change to the City's regulations related to such relocated structures would be beneficial to the City and its citizens, the Construction Standards Board held a public meeting on October 1, 2015 and adopted the attached "Exhibit A" Resolution in support of the amendments to both Chapter 14, the Zoning Ordinance and Chapter 3, the City's Building Regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission conducted a public hearing on October 29, 2015 and unanimously recommended that the City Council approve amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance and Building Regulations to further regulate the movement and rehabilitation of "existing structures" that are relocated into the City within residential zoning districts, and to subject such structures to the requirements of a CUP; and

WHEREAS, after careful evaluation of the recommendations of the Construction Standards Board and the Planning and Zoning Commission concerning these matters, and after hearing the input from the City's staff and the public concerning same, the Council concurs with the recommendations made and desires to amend the City's Code of Ordinances as noted herein , to put additional requirements and conditions on the moving and rehabilitation of existing structures in residential zoning districts within the City of Bastrop, for the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the Citizens of the City.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS:

Part 1: Chapter 14 Exhibit "A" of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Bastrop, Section 36.2, shall be, and is hereby, amended so that Section 36.2 shall hereafter read as follows:

SECTION 36.2 ZONING USE CHART – Primary Residential Uses

Primary Residential Uses	AOS	SF20	SF9	SF8	SF7	2F	SFA	MF1	MF2	MH	O	NS	GR	CBD	CF	CT	C-1	C-2	IP	LI	PD	MHO
<u>Existing Residential Building(s)/ Structure(s) being "moved into/relocated" within the City</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>											<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>

Part 2: Chapter 14, Exhibit A, Appendix A-3 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Bastrop, shall be, and is hereby, amended to include the following definitions:

A-3 DEFINITIONS

EXISTING BUILDING(s)/STRUCTURE(s) – building(s)/structure(s) erected prior to the date of adoption of the currently applicable code and/or originally erected outside of the City's corporate limits. If such structure(s) is to be moved/placed within the City's corporate limits, then a CUP shall be required and must be obtained by the individual proposing to move the structure into the City corporate limits prior to moving same. The individual proposing to move and rehabilitate the structure into the City must additionally comply with all provisions of Chapter 3, Article 3.16, of the Code of Ordinances, governing "Moving of Structures."

Part 3: Chapter 3, Building Regulations, Article 3.16, Moving of Structures, Demolition and Site Work, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Bastrop, shall be, and is hereby, amended to hereafter read as follows:

ARTICLE 3.16 MOVING OF STRUCTURES, DEMOLITION AND SITE WORK

Sec. 3.16.002 Standards for moving existing buildings and existing structures.

(b) No moving permit shall be issued for an existing structure to be moved onto any property within the City's corporate limits from outside of the City unless the applicant first submits to the City Planning Department:

- (1) A certified third-party inspection of the condition of the existing structure;
- (2) Photographs of the existing buildings(s)/structure proposed to be moved and rehabilitated;
- (3) A detailed explanation of the proposed upgrades and other actions necessary to bring the existing structure up to all City requirements;
- (4) A site plan specifying where the existing building will be locate/placed during/after rehabilitation, and demonstrating that the proposed placement of the existing structure meets all existing City siting requirements; and.
- (5) A detailed explanation and request for any variances from the City's Ordinances required for the movement, relocation and/or rehabilitation of an existing structure,

(c) No moving permit shall be issued for an existing structure to be moved onto any property within the City's corporate limits from outside of the City unless the applicant first applies for and the City approves and issues a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") pursuant to the process set forth in this Chapter and Chapter 14, Section 33.

(d) No substandard or unsafe or hazardous existing structure will be allowed or permitted to be moved into the City's corporate limits unless the City has first issued a CUP containing a specific finding that the structure can be adequately brought to a safe, nonhazardous condition meeting City standards.

Sec. 3.16.003-3.16.005

[no changes]

Sec. 3.16.006 Moved buildings to comply with minimum building standards

(c) Time for compliance. All existing structures that are proposed to be moved or relocated into or within the City's corporate limits must be brought into compliance with City minimum building standards pursuant to a construction schedule that will be specified in the CUP, as set forth in subsection (d) below.

(d) Conditional Use Permit (CUP) For Existing Structures. No CUP for an existing structure shall be issued unless the applicant submits to the Planning Department a detailed construction

schedule for the entire moving and/or rehabilitation process of the structure. Following the issuance of a CUP containing the approved construction schedule for the moving and renovation/rehabilitation process, the applicant shall submit a project status report to the Planning Department on a monthly basis. Failure to complete all required repairs or renovations will cause the building to be subject to: (1) Article 3.12 of the Code of Ordinances regarding abatement of substandard structures; and (2) upon determination of the Building Official that construction is not consistent with the schedule or other requirements set forth in the CUP, the City may require that the moved existing structure be removed from the City's corporate limits and/or require demolition of the building and clearing of the lot. No CUP shall be issued for an existing structure that authorizes a term of more than one (1) year for completion of the rehabilitation and repair of the structure. No CUP shall be issued for an existing structure that authorizes a term of more than one (1) year for the applicant to obtain a certificate of occupancy for the structure.

(e) Enforcement. Absent a showing of good cause and receipt of a written exception issued by the City Planning Department, no rehabilitation or repair of an existing structure moved into the City's corporate limits subject to a CUP shall be completed later than one year following the issuance of a CUP for the structure. Any delay not caused directly by a force majeure event, as determined by the Building Official, shall be reviewed by the Director of Planning to determine whether the structure building has been abandoned or whether the developer/applicant is in breach of the terms of the CUP and, therefore, subject to enforcement proceedings by the City. Any individual or entity that obtains a permit and CUP for the rehabilitation of an existing building in the City, and subsequently fails to perform in accord with the applicable City Codes and/or the CUP conditions for the project to such an extent that the City finds it necessary to take any form of action to enforce same, shall be barred from seeking additional permits for moving and rehabilitating existing buildings in the City for a minimum period of five (5) years from the date the City commences efforts to enforce the City's Code and CUP on the prior project.

Part 4: The City Manager and/or his designees are hereby authorized and directed to make the necessary changes to all records of the City of Bastrop to reflect this amendment.

Part 5: All ordinances and resolutions, or parts of ordinances and resolutions, in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed, and are no longer of any force and effect. If any provision of this ordinance or application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions, or application thereof, of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable.

Part 6: This Ordinance shall become effective in accordance with the City Charter and the laws of the State of Texas.

READ and ACKNOWLEDGED on First Reading on the 11th day of January, 2016.

PASSED and ADOPTED on Second Reading on the 9th day of February, 2015.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Ken Kesselus
Mayor

Ann Franklin
City Secretary

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: FEB. 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: FEB. 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Consideration, discussion and possible action on acceptance of the unaudited Monthly Financial Reports for the period ending in Dec. 31, 2015.**

2. Party Making Request: **Tracy Waldron, Chief Financial Officer**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

Provide City Council monthly financial report overview for four major funds to include General Fund, Water-Wastewater Fund, Bastrop Power & Light and the Hotel Motel Fund.

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: Yes No N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: **Acceptance of monthly financial reports**

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None

11. Motion Requested: **Acceptance of monthly financial reports**

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

REVENUES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
TAXES & PENALTIES						
00-00-4001 CURRENT TAXES M&O	1,267,931.90	2,956,945.00	1,185,591.80	1,398,457.60	1,558,487.40	47.29
00-00-4002 DELINQUENT TAXES M&O	8,537.93	35,750.00	1,356.46	9,421.86	26,328.14	26.35
00-00-4003 PENALTIES & INTEREST M&O	5,252.30	26,000.00	1,000.45	4,760.74	21,239.26	18.31
00-00-4004 FRANCHISE TAX	41,173.64	410,000.00	23,316.60	23,175.75	386,824.25	5.65
00-00-4006 CITY SALES TAX	319,444.57	3,996,190.00	322,221.71	987,830.11	3,008,359.89	24.72
00-00-4008 OCCUPATION TAX	835.00	8,000.00	80.00	1,505.00	6,495.00	18.81
00-00-4009 MIXED BEVERAGE TAX	0.00	48,000.00	0.00	0.00	48,000.00	0.00
00-00-4010 380 AGREEMENT PROP REFUND	0.00	(45,000.00)	0.00	0.00	(45,000.00)	0.00
TOTAL TAXES & PENALTIES	1,643,175.34	7,435,885.00	1,533,567.02	2,425,151.06	5,010,733.94	32.61
LICENSES & PERMITS						
00-00-4020 BUILDING PERMITS	31,056.32	120,000.00	6,538.24	17,322.10	102,677.90	14.44
00-00-4021 ZONING FEES	300.00	3,500.00	0.00	600.00	2,900.00	17.14
00-00-4022 PLATING FEES	3,020.00	40,000.00	39,987.50	40,907.50	(907.50)	102.27
00-00-4023 SPECIAL EVENT PERMIT FEE	200.00	2,000.00	0.00	200.00	1,800.00	10.00
TOTAL LICENSES & PERMITS	34,576.32	165,500.00	46,525.74	59,029.60	106,470.40	35.67
CHARGES FOR SERVICES						
00-00-4040 ANIMAL SERVICE RECEIPTS	85.00	200.00	0.00	20.00	180.00	10.00
00-00-4043 PARKS RECEIPTS	105.00	2,000.00	(70.00)	0.00	2,000.00	0.00
00-00-4044 PD ACCIDENT REPORTS	588.00	1,800.00	0.00	244.00	1,556.00	13.56
00-00-4046 SPECIAL EVENTS HOT REIMB	0.00	30,000.00	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.00
00-00-4049 TRANSFER STATION RECEIPTS	1,095.00	5,000.00	1,240.00	2,687.00	2,313.00	53.74
00-00-4051 SANITATION REVENUE	0.00	475,000.00	40,041.79	120,097.27	354,902.73	25.28
00-00-4052 SANITATION PENALTIES	0.00	7,500.00	657.87	1,821.78	5,678.21	24.29
TOTAL CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,873.00	521,500.00	41,869.66	124,870.06	396,629.94	23.94
FINES & FORFEITURES						
00-00-4070 MUNICIPAL COURT FINES	33,867.77	195,000.00	22,016.81	64,257.16	130,742.84	32.95
00-00-4076 LIBRARY RECEIPTS	3,633.15	16,000.00	1,036.69	3,674.00	12,326.00	22.96
00-00-4078 JUVENILE CASE MANAGER-M/C	1,338.32	7,500.00	751.68	2,151.62	5,348.38	28.69
00-00-4080 TEEN COURT (MC)	188.23	1,000.00	183.19	423.19	576.81	42.32
TOTAL FINES & FORFEITURES	39,027.47	219,500.00	23,988.37	70,505.97	148,994.03	32.12
OTHER REVENUE						
TOTAL						

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

REVENUES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
INTEREST INCOME						
00-00-4400 INTEREST RECEIPTS	824.47	4,000.00	777.27	2,149.81	1,850.19	53.75
TOTAL INTEREST INCOME	824.47	4,000.00	777.27	2,149.81	1,850.19	53.75
INTERGOVERNMENTAL						
00-00-4415 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	16,201.38	30,000.00	7,652.26	7,652.26	22,347.74	25.51
00-00-4490 ELECTRIC IN-KIND	129,069.99	449,405.00	(70,623.34)	0.00	449,405.00	0.00
00-00-4493 WATER/WASTEWATER IN-KIND	132,754.98	488,385.00	(75,860.00)	0.00	488,385.00	0.00
00-00-4493 BEDC IN-KIND	49,769.97	189,000.00	19,259.25	19,259.25	169,740.75	10.19
00-00-4495 CONVENTION CENTER IN-KIND	43,530.00	166,372.00	(26,543.34)	0.00	166,372.00	0.00
TOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL	371,326.32	1,323,162.00	(146,115.17)	26,911.51	1,296,250.49	2.03
MISCELLANEOUS						
00-00-4509 GENERAL DONATIONS	218.00	500.00	725.00	725.00	(225.00)	145.00
00-00-4512 SALE OF FIXED ASSETS	546.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
00-00-4536 MISCELLANEOUS	3,757.37	25,000.00	29,768.30	31,991.40	(6,991.40)	127.97
00-00-4537 INSURANCE PROCEEDS	1,428.12	0.00	0.00	341.00	(341.00)	0.00
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS	5,947.49	25,500.00	30,493.30	33,057.40	(7,557.40)	129.64
TRANSFERS-IN						
00-00-4703 TRANSFERS IN - ELECTRIC FUND	153,375.00	557,750.00	46,479.17	139,437.51	418,312.49	25.00
TOTAL TRANSFERS-IN	153,375.00	557,750.00	46,479.17	139,437.51	418,312.49	25.00
** TOTAL REVENUE **	2,250,125.41	10,252,797.00	1,577,585.36	2,981,112.92	7,371,684.08	29.10

101-GENERAL FUND

EXPENDITURES

PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

NON-DEPARTMENT

00-NON-PROGRAM

TOTAL

LEGISLATIVE

00-NON-PROGRAM

PERSONNEL SERVICES
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS
OCCUPANCY
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES
OTHER CHARGESTOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM
TOTAL LEGISLATIVE

ORGANIZATIONAL

00-NON-PROGRAM

PERSONNEL SERVICES
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES
OTHER CHARGES
CONTINGENCY
CAPITAL OUTLAY
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM
TOTAL ORGANIZATIONAL

CITY MANAGER

00-NON-PROGRAM

PERSONNEL SERVICES
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS
OCCUPANCY
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES
OTHER CHARGES
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM
TOTAL CITY MANAGER

1,446.72	7,015.00	565.18	1,745.94	5,269.06	24.89
1,045.24	4,530.00	144.90	429.44	4,100.56	9.48
1,823.41	8,000.00	652.00	2,117.83	5,882.17	26.47
225.00	10,900.00	0.00	0.00	10,900.00	0.00
1,369.03	16,090.00	(3,416.16)	(1,507.57)	17,597.57	9.37
5,909.40	46,535.00	(2,054.08)	2,785.64	43,749.36	5.99
5,909.40	46,535.00	(2,054.08)	2,785.64	43,749.36	5.99

35,362.60	68,842.56	1,883.96	6,971.80	61,870.76	10.13
5,077.40	16,590.00	1,544.07	3,926.33	12,663.67	23.67
2,257.01	14,300.00	1,819.00	2,022.00	12,278.00	14.14
134,691.66	456,000.00	68,197.68	123,380.42	332,619.58	27.06
129,210.92	508,648.00	(1,762.26)	7,345.48	501,302.52	1.44
0.00	340,000.00	0.00	0.00	340,000.00	0.00
0.00	4,717.00	0.00	8,717.00	(4,000.00)	184.80
306,599.59	1,409,097.56	71,682.45	152,363.03	1,256,734.53	10.81
306,599.59	1,409,097.56	71,682.45	152,363.03	1,256,734.53	10.81

68,204.16	307,631.00	24,708.59	68,239.46	239,391.54	22.18
1,188.74	7,200.00	102.08	1,604.85	5,595.15	22.29
1,941.89	9,400.00	656.50	2,168.77	7,231.23	23.07
87.50	350.00	87.50	87.50	262.50	25.00
4,624.98	10,940.00	(7,740.58)	(4,522.58)	15,462.58	41.34
76,047.27	335,521.00	17,814.09	67,578.00	267,943.00	20.14
76,047.27	335,521.00	17,814.09	67,578.00	267,943.00	20.14

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

CITY SECRETARY

<u>00-NON-PROGRAM</u>						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	17,164.29	92,853.00	7,065.82	20,280.34	72,572.66	21.84
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	151.92	5,975.00	95.82	421.71	5,553.29	7.06
OCCUPANCY	534.48	2,190.00	221.46	685.85	1,504.15	31.32
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	1,715.00	5,600.00	0.00	0.00	5,600.00	0.00
OTHER CHARGES	5,798.83	40,190.00	(18,980.99)	(14,536.15)	54,726.15	36.17
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	25,364.52	146,808.00	(11,597.89)	6,851.75	139,956.25	4.67
TOTAL CITY SECRETARY						

FINANCE

<u>00-NON-PROGRAM</u>						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	75,190.46	350,748.00	26,838.81	75,247.18	275,500.82	21.45
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2,255.37	9,530.00	415.93	1,886.36	7,643.64	19.79
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	1,314.34	34,000.00	1,380.06	1,380.06	32,619.94	4.06
OCCUPANCY	1,710.84	7,550.00	536.48	1,746.16	5,803.84	23.13
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	0.00	49,150.00	0.00	4,673.49	44,476.51	9.51
OTHER CHARGES	3,540.35	10,140.00	(39,812.55)	(37,646.23)	47,786.23	371.26
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	84,011.36	461,118.00	(10,641.27)	47,287.02	413,830.98	10.25

METER SERVICE

PERSONNEL SERVICES	83,450.52	261,587.00	21,671.43	60,299.78	201,287.22	23.05
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	6,255.14	33,190.00	2,093.67	4,587.85	28,602.15	13.82
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	3,645.07	5,500.00	0.00	4,465.79	1,034.21	81.20
OCCUPANCY	1,978.55	12,620.00	663.95	2,099.97	10,520.03	16.64
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	2,384.57	466,050.00	35,069.50	70,818.54	395,231.46	15.20
OTHER CHARGES	972.47	5,780.00	(47,981.86)	(47,910.89)	53,690.89	828.21
TOTAL METER SERVICE	98,686.32	784,727.00	11,516.69	94,361.04	690,365.96	12.02
TOTAL FINANCE	182,697.68	1,245,845.00	875.42	141,648.06	1,104,196.94	11.37

HUMAN RESOURCE

<u>00-NON-PROGRAM</u>						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	23,310.23	126,021.00	8,729.71	23,771.26	102,249.74	18.86
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	113.40	6,875.00	41.99	311.67	6,563.33	4.53
OCCUPANCY	666.78	3,445.00	295.06	763.36	2,681.64	22.16
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	0.00	325.00	1.00	1.00	324.00	0.31
OTHER CHARGES	5,160.06	18,335.00	(71,610.32)	(71,575.32)	89,910.32	390.38
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	29,250.47	155,001.00	(62,542.56)	(46,728.03)	201,729.03	30.15
TOTAL HUMAN RESOURCE	29,250.47	155,001.00	(62,542.56)	(46,728.03)	201,729.03	30.15

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	W-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY00-NON-PROGRAM

PERSONNEL SERVICES	25,186.68	173,365.00	13,962.64	39,174.29	134,190.71	22.60
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	1,548.56	15,050.00	4,454.50	4,769.44	10,280.56	31.69
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	39,694.12	129,100.00	2,787.17	32,088.42	97,011.58	24.86
OCCUPANCY	1,714.84	11,128.00	1,171.90	2,085.90	9,042.10	18.74
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	435.00	15,471.00	500.00	500.00	14,971.00	3.23
OTHER CHARGES	305.02	7,000.00	(16,051.04)	(15,901.04)	22,901.04	227.16-
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	25,000.00	0.00	0.00	25,000.00	0.00
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	69,884.22	376,114.00	6,825.17	62,717.01	313,396.99	16.68
TOTAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	69,884.22	376,114.00	6,825.17	62,717.01	313,396.99	16.68

POLICEADMINISTRATION

PERSONNEL SERVICES	99,721.11	469,325.00	36,875.02	102,928.14	365,396.86	21.98
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	7,372.94	28,145.00	770.41	7,417.02	20,727.98	26.35
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	439.98	38,260.00	171.50	3,551.46	34,708.54	9.28
OCCUPANCY	20,656.96	56,380.00	3,191.62	10,294.21	46,085.79	18.26
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	48,700.11	197,345.00	632.78	863.88	196,481.12	0.44
OTHER CHARGES	4,270.49	29,305.00	2,215.75	8,633.90	20,671.10	29.46
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	375.00	0.00	0.00	375.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	181,161.59	818,135.00	43,857.08	133,688.61	684,446.39	16.34

CODE ENFORCEMENT

PERSONNEL SERVICES	12,452.93	56,996.00	4,355.81	12,603.46	44,392.54	22.11
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	369.86	5,200.00	77.05	229.60	4,970.40	4.42
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	92.07	1,950.00	0.00	38.99	1,911.01	2.00
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	2,380.00	12,875.00	0.00	130.00	12,745.00	1.01
OTHER CHARGES	3,193.72	21,945.00	2.07	2.07	21,942.93	0.01
TOTAL CODE ENFORCEMENT	18,488.58	98,966.00	4,434.93	13,004.12	85,961.88	13.14

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	0.00	2,300.00	14.49	14.49	2,285.51	0.63
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	0.00	1,500.00	0.00	0.00	1,500.00	0.00
OTHER CHARGES	0.00	2,000.00	364.00	564.00	1,436.00	28.20
TOTAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	0.00	5,800.00	378.49	578.49	5,221.51	9.97

POLICE-CID

PERSONNEL SERVICES	26,447.99	247,540.00	18,924.07	54,734.40	192,805.60	22.11
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	786.40	4,400.00	76.47	387.04	4,012.96	8.80
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	76.48	3,360.00	0.00	49.49	3,310.51	1.47
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	327.38	3,600.00	0.00	0.00	3,600.00	0.00
OTHER CHARGES	295.00	4,750.00	0.00	993.25	3,756.75	20.91
TOTAL POLICE-CID	27,933.25	263,650.00	19,000.54	56,164.18	207,485.82	21.30

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
POLICE-PATROL						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	278,380.15	1,386,860.00	108,522.51	304,407.10	1,082,452.90	21.95
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	18,092.92	183,025.00	9,333.58	16,537.27	166,487.73	9.04
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	2,208.41	20,900.00	611.41	3,760.45	17,139.55	17.99
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	4,266.80	12,870.00	207.46	1,459.45	11,410.55	11.34
OTHER CHARGES	2,785.71	12,800.00	609.00	868.15	11,931.85	6.78
CAPITAL OUTLAY	85,386.89	94,500.00	0.00	0.00	94,500.00	0.00
TOTAL POLICE-PATROL	391,120.88	1,710,955.00	119,283.96	327,032.42	1,383,922.58	19.11
POLICE-CRIME PREVENTION						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	19,677.09	0.00	324.60	0.00	0.00	0.00
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	111.78	2,650.00	365.92	445.01	2,204.99	16.79
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	130.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	532.00	900.00	0.00	0.00	900.00	0.00
OTHER CHARGES	0.00	1,150.00	0.00	295.00	855.00	25.65
TOTAL POLICE-CRIME PREVENTION	20,450.87	4,700.00	41.32	740.01	3,959.99	15.74
ANIMAL SERVICES						
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	76.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	252.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	340.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER CHARGES	434.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ANIMAL SERVICES	1,104.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL POLICE	640,259.71	2,902,206.00	186,996.32	531,207.83	2,370,998.17	18.30
FIRE-VOLUNTEER						
00-NON-PROGRAM						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	1,507.01	109,291.00	0.00	1,336.27	107,954.73	1.22
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2,762.92	61,560.00	896.99	4,735.31	56,824.69	7.69
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	12,372.36	96,750.00	2,165.55	10,756.23	85,993.77	11.12
OCCUPANCY	6,200.23	46,650.00	1,628.84	6,147.65	40,502.35	13.18
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	14,971.05	25,500.00	20,068.95	20,068.95	5,431.05	78.70
OTHER CHARGES	3,471.36	22,325.00	1,776.67	5,306.53	17,018.47	23.77
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	120,800.00	0.00	0.00	120,800.00	0.00
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	41,284.93	482,876.00	26,537.00	48,350.94	434,525.06	10.01
TOTAL FIRE-VOLUNTEER	41,284.93	482,876.00	26,537.00	48,350.94	434,525.06	10.01
MUNICIPAL COURT						
00-NON-PROGRAM						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	70,425.63	227,530.00	18,856.85	51,180.60	176,349.40	22.49
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2,121.32	11,250.00	1,399.98	2,841.51	8,408.49	25.36
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	7,938.40	9,300.00	55.00	7,656.52	1,643.48	82.33
OCCUPANCY	2,373.44	10,310.00	706.95	2,298.24	8,011.76	22.29
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	8,017.78	35,750.00	2,174.82	4,362.41	31,387.59	12.20
OTHER CHARGES	2,993.07	7,300.00	517.86	2,054.08	5,245.92	28.14
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	93,869.64	301,440.00	23,711.46	70,393.36	231,046.64	23.35

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	W-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
TOTAL MUNICIPAL COURT	93,869.64	301,440.00	23,711.46	70,393.36	231,046.64	23.35
<u>PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT</u>						
<u>00-NON-PROGRAM</u>						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	109,335.85	497,825.00	40,449.57	112,079.12	385,745.88	22.51
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2,416.00	14,550.00	365.82	1,438.80	13,111.20	9.89
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	19.95	2,000.00	0.00	1,627.38	372.62	81.37
OCCUPANCY	2,488.19	12,700.00	851.99	2,683.24	10,016.76	21.13
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	41,756.78	192,600.00	10,833.64	25,533.80	167,066.20	13.26
OTHER CHARGES	7,425.78	63,800.00	(14,630.21)	(7,540.69)	71,340.69	11.82
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	163,442.55	783,475.00	37,870.81	135,821.65	647,653.35	17.34
TOTAL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	163,442.55	783,475.00	37,870.81	135,821.65	647,653.35	17.34
<u>HEALTH</u>						
<u>00-NON-PROGRAM</u>						
TOTAL						
<u>PUBLIC WORKS</u>						
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	149,297.53	695,310.00	46,708.82	139,965.40	555,344.60	20.13
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	19,986.97	88,700.00	5,337.71	12,475.90	76,224.10	14.07
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	9,496.13	68,000.00	20,988.59	38,649.73	29,350.27	56.84
OCCUPANCY	2,337.37	14,010.00	944.79	3,106.20	10,903.80	22.17
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	4,821.34	35,925.00	7,013.09	10,182.26	25,742.74	28.34
OTHER CHARGES	17,726.13	14,400.00	1,232.26	2,137.42	12,262.58	14.84
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	989,000.00	0.00	0.00	989,000.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	203,665.47	1,905,345.00	82,225.26	206,516.91	1,698,828.09	10.84
<u>RECREATION</u>						
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	549.00	42,500.00	0.00	0.00	42,500.00	0.00
TOTAL RECREATION	549.00	42,500.00	0.00	0.00	42,500.00	0.00
<u>PARKS</u>						
PERSONNEL SERVICES	112,146.36	581,360.00	41,054.45	114,155.20	467,204.80	19.64
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	8,395.21	44,200.00	1,627.14	5,484.08	38,715.92	12.41
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	13,056.45	75,050.00	11,232.02	23,499.27	51,550.73	31.31
OCCUPANCY	12,329.61	51,740.00	4,749.74	16,050.89	35,689.11	31.02
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	1,938.30	21,380.00	1,014.31	3,990.52	17,389.48	18.66
OTHER CHARGES	3,061.08	10,250.00	257.21	2,132.97	8,117.03	20.81
CAPITAL OUTLAY	104.00	142,000.00	0.00	0.00	142,000.00	0.00
TOTAL PARKS	150,823.01	925,980.00	59,934.87	165,312.93	760,667.07	17.85

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

101-GENERAL FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

BUILDING MAINTENANCE

PERSONNEL SERVICES	32,921.88	176,265.00	11,360.79	31,751.94	144,513.06	18.01
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2,360.87	10,100.00	1,147.16	2,987.11	7,112.89	29.58
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	136.98	2,600.00	45.87	171.46	2,428.54	6.59
OCCUPANCY	87.42	1,800.00	29.33	101.56	1,698.44	5.64
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	166.96	1,690.00	125.18	366.13	1,323.87	21.66
OTHER CHARGES	90.20	300.00	(21,905.43)	(21,905.43)	22,205.43	7,301.81-
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	30,000.00	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.00
TOTAL BUILDING MAINTENANCE	35,770.31	222,755.00	(9,197.10)	13,472.77	209,282.23	6.05
TOTAL PUBLIC WORKS	390,807.79	3,096,580.00	132,963.03	385,302.61	2,711,277.39	12.44

LIBRARY

00-NON-PROGRAM

PERSONNEL SERVICES	117,847.82	533,514.00	44,233.77	119,019.61	414,494.39	22.31
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	15,850.07	58,229.00	7,731.71	17,965.75	40,263.25	30.85
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	5,514.01	15,475.00	1,450.77	2,562.27	12,912.73	16.56
OCCUPANCY	10,339.89	42,234.00	2,765.84	9,111.21	33,122.79	21.58
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	7,180.40	23,765.00	5,850.20	7,600.20	16,164.80	31.98
OTHER CHARGES	1,685.52	11,921.00	544.53	1,931.51	9,989.49	16.20
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	158,417.71	685,128.00	62,576.82	158,190.55	526,937.45	23.09
TOTAL LIBRARY	158,417.71	685,128.00	62,576.82	158,190.55	526,937.45	23.09

BEDC ADMINISTRATION

00-NON-PROGRAM

CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	0.00	0.00	843.38	843.38	(843.38)	0.00
TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM	0.00	0.00	843.38	843.38	(843.38)	0.00
TOTAL BEDC ADMINISTRATION	0.00	0.00	843.38	843.38	(843.38)	0.00

*** TOTAL EXPENSES ***

	2,182,835.48	11,966,626.56	492,501.42	1,717,325.78	10,249,300.78	14.35
REVENUES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES	67,288.93	(1,713,829.56)	1,085,083.94	1,163,787.14	(2,877,616.70)	67.91-

*** END OF REPORT ***

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

202-WATER/WASTEWATER FUND

REVENUES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	W-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
----------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

CHARGES FOR SERVICES

TOTAL

WATER REVENUES

00-00-4101 WATER SALES-RESIDENTIAL	308,070.79	1,362,500.00	105,770.36	319,689.62	1,042,810.38	23.46
00-00-4102 WATER SALES-COMMERCIAL	271,909.66	1,100,900.00	95,715.43	298,633.01	802,266.99	27.13
00-00-4150 PENALTIES	7,822.45	32,700.00	3,075.58	9,351.03	23,348.97	28.60
00-00-4152 WATER TAPPING FEES	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	1,300.00	3,700.00	26.00
00-00-4154 WATER SERVICE FEES	4,990.00	22,000.00	1,100.00	3,790.00	18,210.00	17.23
00-00-4156 OTHER	0.00	0.00	0.00	400.00	400.00	0.00
TOTAL WATER REVENUES	592,792.90	2,523,100.00	205,661.37	633,163.66	1,889,936.34	25.09

WASTEWATER REVENUES

00-00-4201 WASTEWATER SALES-RESIDENTIAL	220,356.04	904,700.00	78,205.74	214,944.37	689,755.63	23.76
00-00-4202 WASTEWATER SALES-COMMERCIAL	171,519.84	686,700.00	64,532.88	177,239.71	509,460.29	25.81
00-00-4250 PENALTIES	5,418.66	23,980.00	2,019.57	5,597.47	18,382.53	23.34
00-00-4252 SEWER TAPPING FEES	0.00	2,000.00	300.00	300.00	1,700.00	15.00
00-00-4256 OTHER	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.00
TOTAL WASTEWATER REVENUES	397,294.54	1,622,380.00	145,058.19	398,081.55	1,224,298.45	24.54

OTHER REVENUE

TOTAL

INTEREST INCOME

00-00-4400 INTEREST RECEIPTS	678.05	3,000.00	591.36	1,804.53	1,195.47	60.15
TOTAL INTEREST INCOME	678.05	3,000.00	591.36	1,804.53	1,195.47	60.15

INTERGOVERNMENTAL

TOTAL

MISCELLANEOUS

00-00-4519 BACKFLOW TESTING COST	800.00	3,000.00	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	0.00
00-00-4547 BY THE WAY CAMPGROUND	7,340.59	22,000.00	0.00	0.00	22,000.00	0.00
00-00-4548 LCRA/WCID	18,915.00	85,000.00	10,412.33	29,585.88	55,414.12	34.81
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS	26,955.59	110,000.00	10,412.33	29,585.88	80,414.12	26.90

TRANSFERS-IN

TOTAL

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

202-WATER/WASTEWATER FUND

REVENUES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	N-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
OTHER SOURCES						
00-00-4010 INSURANCE PROCEEDS	0.00	0.00	0.00	441.85	(441.85)	0.00
TOTAL OTHER SOURCES	0.00	0.00	0.00	441.85	(441.85)	0.00
** TOTAL REVENUE **	1,017,721.08	4,258,480.00	361,723.25	1,063,077.47	3,195,402.53	24.96

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

202-WATER/WASTEWATER FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

NON-DEPARTMENT

00-NON-PROGRAM

TOTAL

TOTAL

WATER/WASTEWATER DEPT.

ADMINISTRATION

PERSONNEL SERVICES	157,160.29	890,111.00	64,472.92	193,151.13	696,959.87	21.70
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	7,598.13	47,210.00	1,712.96	7,616.58	39,593.42	16.13
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	3,028.50	19,430.00	279.48	4,080.21	15,349.79	21.00
OCCUPANCY	5,186.42	23,470.00	1,475.33	5,053.23	18,416.77	21.53
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	175,844.89	713,560.00	62,804.59	152,152.39	561,407.61	21.32
OTHER CHARGES	6,540.73	46,000.00	1,969.70	4,029.03	41,970.97	8.76
CONTINGENCY	0.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	310,682.01	1,460,311.00	107,591.21	322,773.63	1,137,537.37	22.10
TRANSFERS OUT	43,000.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	709,040.99	3,210,092.00	240,306.19	688,856.20	2,521,235.80	21.46

W/W DISTRIBUT/COLLECT

SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	402.83	9,800.00	407.92	2,694.70	7,115.30	27.39
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	4,039.30	80,400.00	7,522.12	21,293.22	59,106.78	26.48
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	307.80	9,840.00	0.00	149.15	9,690.85	1.52
OTHER CHARGES	0.00	1,500.00	0.00	497.50	1,002.50	33.17
TOTAL W/W DISTRIBUT/COLLECT	4,749.93	101,540.00	7,930.04	24,624.57	76,915.43	24.25

WATER PRODUCTION/TREAT

SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	6,864.66	31,000.00	1,071.95	7,131.93	23,868.07	23.01
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	4,970.15	134,900.00	3,288.71	14,090.18	120,809.82	10.44
OCCUPANCY	36,342.95	116,000.00	6,382.20	27,383.64	88,616.36	23.61
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	29,179.34	126,350.00	14,350.05	31,625.72	94,724.28	25.03
TOTAL WATER PRODUCTION/TREAT	77,357.10	408,250.00	25,092.91	80,231.47	328,018.53	19.65

WM TREATMENT PLANT

SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	5,172.29	29,800.00	2,462.00	5,064.26	24,735.74	16.99
MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS	16,259.76	245,100.00	5,866.20	10,390.55	234,709.45	4.24
OCCUPANCY	37,076.06	150,000.00	15,145.31	44,388.12	105,611.88	29.59
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	20,904.00	77,000.00	2,948.00	19,472.11	57,527.89	25.29
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	93,692.00	0.00	0.00	93,692.00	0.00
TOTAL WM TREATMENT PLANT	79,412.11	595,592.00	26,421.51	79,315.04	516,276.96	13.32
TOTAL WATER/WASTEWATER DEPT.	870,560.13	4,315,474.00	299,750.65	873,027.28	3,442,446.72	20.23

*** TOTAL EXPENSES ***

870,560.13	4,315,474.00	299,750.65	873,027.28	3,442,446.72	20.23
------------	--------------	------------	------------	--------------	-------

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

202-WATER/WASTEWATER FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

REVENUES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES	147,160.95	(56,994.00)	61,972.60	190,050.19	(247,044.19)	333.46-
-------------------------------------	------------	--------------	-----------	------------	---------------	---------

*** END OF REPORT ***

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

501-HOTEL/MOTEL TAX FUND

REVENUES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	4-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
----------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

TAXES & PENALTIES

00-00-4007 MOTEL/HOTEL TAX RECEIPTS	660,232.20	2,800,000.00	190,679.42	688,389.77	2,111,610.23	24.59
TOTAL TAXES & PENALTIES	660,232.20	2,800,000.00	190,679.42	688,389.77	2,111,610.23	24.59

INTEREST INCOME

00-00-4400 INTEREST EARNED	348.99	1,500.00	232.83	744.29	755.71	49.62
TOTAL INTEREST INCOME	348.99	1,500.00	232.83	744.29	755.71	49.62

INTERGOVERNMENTAL

TOTAL

MISCELLANEOUS

00-00-4514 MISCELLANEOUS INCOME	152.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS	152.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

** TOTAL REVENUE **

	660,734.00	2,801,500.00	190,912.25	689,134.06	2,112,365.94	24.60
--	------------	--------------	------------	------------	--------------	-------

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2015

501-HOTEL/MOTEL TAX FUND

EXPENDITURES	PRIOR Y-T-D	CURRENT BUDGET	M-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ACTUAL	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
--------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

NON-DEPARTMENT

00-NON-PROGRAM

TOTAL

TOTAL

HOTEL/MOTEL TAX FUND

00-NON-PROGRAM

CONTRACTUAL SERVICES

OTHER CHARGES

TRANSFERS OUT

TOTAL 00-NON-PROGRAM

TOTAL HOTEL/MOTEL TAX FUND

*** TOTAL EXPENSES ***

REVENUES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES

*** END OF REPORT ***

360,128.80	1,109,893.00	92,759.49	364,099.49	745,793.51	32.80
0.00	45,000.00	0.00	0.00	45,000.00	0.00
296,642.49	1,362,813.00	113,567.75	340,703.25	1,092,109.75	25.00
656,771.29	2,517,706.00	206,327.24	704,802.74	1,812,903.26	27.99
656,771.29	2,517,706.00	206,327.24	704,802.74	1,812,903.26	27.99
656,771.29	2,517,706.00	206,327.24	704,802.74	1,812,903.26	27.99

3,962.71	293,794.00	(15,414.99)	(15,668.68)	299,462.68	5.52-
----------	------------	--------------	--------------	------------	-------

CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS
MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT AND
QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT
FOR PERIOD ENDING Dec. 31, 2015



**CITY OF BASTROP
SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
AS OF DEC. 31, 2015**

Fiscal year 2016 is 3 month or 25% completed as of Dec. 31, 2015.

Revenues

Expenditures

	FY 2016 Budget*	FY 2016 YTD Actual	% of FY2016 Budget	FY 2016 Budget*	FY 2016 YTD Actual	% of FY2016 Budget
General Fund	\$ 10,252,797	\$ 2,881,113	28.1%	\$ 11,966,627	\$ 1,717,326	14.35%
W/WWF Fund	\$ 4,258,480	\$ 1,063,077	24.96%	\$ 4,315,474	\$ 873,027	20.23%
Electric Fund	\$ 7,528,000	\$ 1,568,227	20.83%	\$ 7,851,474	\$ 1,587,750	20.22%
Hotel Motel Fund	\$ 2,801,500	\$ 689,134	24.6%	\$ 2,517,706	\$ 704,803	27.99%

*Budget amounts reflect any budget amendments approved by Council during the Fiscal Year



GENERAL FUND REVENUE & EXPENDITURES AS OF DEC. 31, 2015

- ❑ Revenues will increase in December, January, and February due to collection of the Ad Valorem Taxes.
- ❑ Due to an audit adjustment that accrues our revenue into the period it was earned, the Sales Tax revenue earned in October and November are estimated.
- ❑ The Revenue spiked in May 2015 due to the transfer from BP&L of \$200,000 for the Comprehensive Plan and the donated land from BEDC of \$183,000 in-kind income
- ❑ FY2016 reflects a re-class of the overhead allocation from W/W/W, BP&L and Convention Center for Administrative support. This use to come in as revenue but do to auditors adjustments, are being re-classed as a reduction of expense in each department. (This amounts to approximately \$86,500 a month)




	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	August	Sept
FY2015 Revenues	\$591,926	\$688,101	\$1,579,90	\$1,585,35	\$1,101,05	\$607,480	\$586,161	\$998,976	\$956,472	\$670,946	\$702,625	\$945,567
FY2015 Expenses	\$663,660	\$700,904	\$818,271	\$751,303	\$1,027,45	\$822,206	\$672,916	\$832,928	\$1,084,10	\$761,772	\$798,934	\$1,607,82
FY2016 Revenues	\$520,273	\$783,254	\$1,577,58									
FY2016 Expenses	\$592,109	\$640,105	\$492,501									




GENERAL FUND REVENUE & EXPENDITURES AS OF DEC. 31, 2015

FY 2015 & 2016 Revenues



FY 2015 & 2016 Expenditures




NEW in FY16 expense reflects a credit amount in each fund for the allocated overhead for Admin. support from W/WW, BP&L and Convention Center



GENERAL FUND REVENUE AS OF DEC. 31, 2015


Sales Tax



FY2016 Budgeted \$3,996,190

FY2016 YTD \$987,830

Ad Valorem Taxes




FY2016 Budget \$2,956,945

FY2016 YTD \$1,398,458



GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES AS OF DEC. 31, 2015

General Fund Expenditures Comparison




- General Government includes Legislative, Organizational, City Manager, City Secretary, Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology, Public Works, and Building Maintenance
- Public Safety includes Police Department, Fire Department, Health, and Municipal Court
- Development Services includes the Planning Department
- Community Services includes Recreation, Parks, and Library




WATER WASTEWATER FUND REVENUE & EXPENDITURES AS OF DEC. 31, 2015

☐ Water/ Wastewater Fund Revenues Year-to-date (YTD) as of Dec. 31, 2015 are \$1,063,077 or 24.96% of the year.




WATER WASTEWATER FUND REVENUE & EXPENDITURES AS OF DEC. 31, 2015

FY 2015 & 2016 Revenues




FY 2015& 2016 Expenditures



BASTROP POWER AND LIGHT / ELECTRIC FUND REVENUE AS OF DEC 31, 2015


☐ Electric Fund Revenues Year-to-date (YTD) as of Dec. 31, 2015 are \$1,568,227 or 20.83% of the FY2016 adopted budget.




HOTEL MOTEL TAX REVENUE FUND REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES AS OF DEC 31, 2015

- Revenues as of Dec. 31, 2015 represent YTD earned revenue of \$689,134. Due to an audit adjustment that accrues our revenue into the period it was earned, the revenue earned in October is an estimate.
- Expenses in October are increased due to the one-time disbursement of funds to Hotel Motel funded organizations. The spike in August 2015 was the additional funding transfer to General Fund for Bastrop Art Guild and double payments to BMC.

Hotel / Motel Fund Revenue



Hotel / Motel Fund Expenses



FINANCIAL STATEMENT REPORTS ARE ATTACHED

- GENERAL FUND
- WATER/ WASTEWATER UTILITY FUND
- HOTEL MOTEL FUND



STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: FEB. 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: FEB 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE OF A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS ADDING THE CITY'S EXPENSES ASSOCIATED WITH THE OPERATION OF THE RODEO ARENA TO THE CITY'S HOTEL/MOTEL TAX REVENUE "TIER ONE" FUNDING.**

2. Party Making Request: **Tracy Waldron, Chief Financial Officer**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes **X** No

- #### 4. Policy Implication:

- | | | | |
|--------------|-----|----|-----|
| 5. Budgeted: | Yes | No | N/A |
|--------------|-----|----|-----|

Bid Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining:

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

- | 7. Routing: | NAME/TITLE | INITIAL | DATE | CONCURRENCE |
|-------------|------------|---------|------|-------------|
|-------------|------------|---------|------|-------------|

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: Approval and acceptance of a Resolution adding the Rodeo Arena as an approved “Tier One” funded expense.

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None

11. Motion Requested: Approval and acceptance of a Resolution adding the Rodeo Arena as an approved "Tier One" funded expense

notify and submit the relevant information to the comptroller.

(b) The comptroller shall review the information submitted by a municipality under Subsection (a) and determine whether to proceed with collection and enforcement efforts. If the information results in the collection of a delinquent tax under Chapter 156 and the assessment has become administratively final, the comptroller shall distribute a percentage of the amount collected to the municipality as provided by Section 156.2513 to defray the cost of the municipal audit.

Added by Acts 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., Ch. 1152 (H.B. 2048), Sec. 3, eff. September 1, 2011.

SUBCHAPTER B. USE AND ALLOCATION OF REVENUE

Sec. 351.101. USE OF TAX REVENUE.

(a) Revenue from the municipal hotel occupancy tax may be used only to promote tourism and the convention and hotel industry, and that use is limited to the following:

(1) the acquisition of sites for and the construction, improvement, enlarging, equipping, repairing, operation, and maintenance of convention center facilities or visitor information centers, or both;

(2) the furnishing of facilities, personnel, and materials for the registration of convention delegates or registrants;

(3) advertising and conducting solicitations and promotional programs to attract tourists and convention delegates or registrants to the municipality or its vicinity;

(4) the encouragement, promotion, improvement, and application of the arts, including instrumental and vocal music, dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture, design and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, motion pictures, radio, television, tape and sound recording, and other arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of these major art forms;

(5) historical restoration and preservation projects or activities or advertising and conducting solicitations and promotional programs to encourage tourists and convention delegates to visit preserved historic sites or

museums:

(A) at or in the immediate vicinity of convention center facilities or visitor information centers; or

(B) located elsewhere in the municipality or its vicinity that would be frequented by tourists and convention delegates;

(6) for a municipality located in a county with a population of one million or less, expenses, including promotion expenses, directly related to a sporting event in which the majority of participants are tourists who substantially increase economic activity at hotels and motels within the municipality or its vicinity;

(7) subject to Section 351.1076, the promotion of tourism by the enhancement and upgrading of existing sports facilities or fields, including facilities or fields for baseball, softball, soccer, and flag football, if:

(A) the municipality owns the facilities or fields;

(B) the municipality:

(i) has a population of 80,000 or more and is located in a county that has a population of 350,000 or less;

(ii) has a population of at least 75,000 but not more than 95,000 and is located in a county that has a population of less than 200,000 but more than 160,000;

(iii) has a population of at least 36,000 but not more than 39,000 and is located in a county that has a population of 100,000 or less that is not adjacent to a county with a population of more than two million;

(iv) has a population of at least 13,000 but less than 39,000 and is located in a county that has a population of at least 200,000;

(v) has a population of at least 70,000 but less than 90,000 and no part of which is located in a county with a population greater than 150,000;

(vi) is located in a county that:

(a) is adjacent to the Texas-Mexico border;

(b) has a population of at least 500,000; and

(c) does not have a municipality with a population greater than 500,000;

2-9-2016

63

(vii) has a population of at least 25,000 but not more than 26,000 and is located in a county that has a population of 90,000 or less; or

Text of subparagraph as added by Acts 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., Ch. 541, Sec. 1

(viii) has a population of at least 7,500 and is located in a county that borders the Pecos River and that has a population of not more than 15,000;

Text of subparagraph as added by Acts 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., Ch. 546, Sec. 1

(viii) is located in a county that has a population of not more than 300,000 and in which a component university of the University of Houston System is located; and

(C) the sports facilities and fields have been used, in the preceding calendar year, a combined total of more than 10 times for district, state, regional, or national sports tournaments;

(8) for a municipality with a population of at least 70,000 but less than 90,000, no part of which is located in a county with a population greater than 150,000, the construction, improvement, enlarging, equipping, repairing, operation, and maintenance of a coliseum or multiuse facility;

(9) signage directing the public to sights and attractions that are visited frequently by hotel guests in the municipality;

(10) the construction of a recreational venue in the immediate vicinity of area hotels, if:

(A) the municipality:

(i) is a general-law municipality;

(ii) has a population of not more than 900; and

(iii) does not impose an ad valorem tax;

(B) not more than \$100,000 of municipal hotel occupancy tax revenue is used for the construction of the recreational venue;

(C) a majority of the hotels in the municipality request the municipality to construct the recreational venue;

(D) the recreational venue will be used primarily by hotel

guests; and

(E) the municipality will pay for maintenance of the recreational venue from the municipality's general fund;

(11) the construction, improvement, enlarging, equipping, repairing, operation, and maintenance of a coliseum or multiuse facility, if the municipality:

(A) has a population of at least 90,000 but less than 120,000; and

(B) is located in two counties, at least one of which contains the headwaters of the San Gabriel River; and

(12) for a municipality with a population of more than 175,000 but less than 225,000 that is located in two counties, each of which has a population of less than 200,000, the construction, improvement, enlarging, equipping, repairing, operation, and maintenance of a coliseum or multiuse facility and related infrastructure or a venue, as defined by Section 334.001 (4), Local Government Code, that is related to the promotion of tourism.

(b) Revenue derived from the tax authorized by this chapter shall be expended in a manner directly enhancing and promoting tourism and the convention and hotel industry as permitted by Subsection (a). That revenue may not be used for the general revenue purposes or general governmental operations of a municipality.

(c) The governing body of a municipality by contract may delegate to a person, including another governmental entity or a private organization, the management or supervision of programs and activities funded with revenue from the tax authorized by this chapter. The governing body in writing shall approve in advance the annual budget of the person to which it delegates those functions and shall require the person to make periodic reports to the governing body at least quarterly listing the expenditures made by the person with revenue from the tax authorized by this chapter. The person must maintain revenue provided from the tax authorized by this chapter in a separate account established for that purpose and may not commingle that revenue with any other money. The municipality may not delegate to any person the management or supervision of its convention and visitors programs and activities funded with revenue from the tax authorized by this chapter other than by contract as provided by this subsection. The approval by the governing body of the municipality of the annual budget of the person to whom the governing body delegates those functions creates a fiduciary duty in the person with respect to the revenue provided by the tax authorized by this chapter.

RESOLUTION NO. R-2016-05

**A RESOLUTION OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF BASTROP, TEXAS REGARDING FUNDING AND
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR HOTEL/MOTEL TAX REVENUE
GRANTS BY THE CITY, FOR PUBLICITY AND TOURISM GRANTS, AND
PROCESSES FOR FUTURE GRANT CYCLES**

WHEREAS, the City of Bastrop, Texas, ("City"), is a Home Rule municipality incorporated and operating under the Laws of the State of Texas and, accordingly has been granted full legal authority to enact rules and procedures related to its grant of Hotel/Motel Tax revenue funds ("HOT Funds") to local recipients to enhance and encourage tourism in the City of Bastrop, as per the Texas Tax Code, Chapter 351.001 *et seq.*; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that identifying certain "tiers" of priorities, related to the City's allocation and expenditure of HOT Funds, is advisable and will assist both the City and the Grant Recipients in accomplishing their grant objectives, as well as assist the City in ensuring compliance with applicable State laws pertaining to the use of HOT Funds; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined that identification of the City's HOT Fund priorities, and implementation of a "Tiered Priority" process for evaluation, allocation and use of the City's HOT Funds, should be adopted, as set out herein, below

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BASTROP, TEXAS:

Part 1: The Council hereby adopts the following Tiered Priority process for its annual evaluation, establishment of priorities, and approval of City expenditures/commitments of the City's Hotel/Motel Tax revenue funds (HOT Funds):

- A. **"TIER ONE"** - The "Tier One" priority for the City's HOT FUND expenditures shall be placed on those budget items which the Council has determined necessitate the City's use of HOT Funds, as set forth in the City Manager's rolling, five year debt/expenditure projection. The following list comprises the City's agreed upon "Tier One" priority expenses, and the Council hereby agrees that these identified payment and retention obligations of the City shall have priority on approval and expenditure of HOT Funds, by the Council, each year during the Council's HOT Fund disbursement process:

1. Payment of debt service and operational expenses associated with the City's Convention and Exhibition Center;
2. Payment of expenses associated with the City's "Main Street Program" commitments;
3. Payment of expenses associated with the City's operation of the Rodeo Arena;

4. Payment of administration and City staffing expenses related to the City's provision of support for any HOT Funded events, projects, or programs; and
5. Retention of HOT Funds, as appropriate, for maintaining the reserve funds related to maintaining the City's bond rating.

B. **"TIER TWO"** - The "Tier Two" priority for the City's HOT FUND expenditures shall be placed on those annual HOT grant programs, that are customarily evaluated and approved for HOT Fund grants, by the Council.

C. **"TIER THREE"** – In approximately April of each year, the City Manager will report to the Council as to whether, during that annual HOT Funding cycle, HOT Funds remain available in the City's HOT Fund reserves/account, after the Tier One and Tier Two priorities are approved and committed by the Council, then the following additional "Tier Three" HOT Fund expenditures may be considered for approval and funding by the Council:

1. Any action(s) taken in a prior HOT Funding year that binds the Council to appropriate and utilize HOT Funds for authorized projects, programs and events; and
2. Projects, events, programs that the Council has identified for evaluation and consideration as a "Tier Three" priority during the prior 12 month period; and
3. Accelerated payment on the debt of the City related to the City's Convention and Exhibition Center.

Part 2: This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon passage, subject to publication as required by State law.

PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 9th day of February, 2016.

APPROVED:

KEN KESSELUS, MAYOR

ATTEST:

ANN FRANKLIN, CITY SECRETARY

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Approval of request to accept the Public Improvements for Pecan Park, Section 5A located east of Childers Drive within the City limits of Bastrop, Texas.**

2. Party Making Request: **Wesley Brandon , PE, City Engineer**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

Site location map and Concurrence Letters from Wesley Brandon, City Engineer. Lynn Alderson, Engineer for Developer and Dave Coombs, PE, Coombs Environmental Engineering, Inc. are included with this request.

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

Bid Amount: _____ Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____ Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: **Staff recommends acceptance of the Public Improvements for Pecan Park, Section 5A. The applicant has complied with all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance and completed all necessary testing and documentation with regards to the construction of the public improvements. A two year maintenance bond has been submitted to the City.**

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested: **Recommend acceptance.**



Property Location Map for Pecan Park Section 5A



Legend

-  Pecan Park Residential Sections 4 and 5
-  Pecan Park Residential Section 5A

February 3, 2016

The Honorable Ken Kesselus, Mayor
& Members of the Bastrop City Council
Bastrop City Hall
1311 Chestnut Street
Bastrop, Texas 78602



RE: Pecan Park – Section 5A
Acceptance of Subdivision Improvements

Dear Mayor Kesselus and Members of the City Council:

I am pleased to report that the construction of public improvements for the above-referenced project is complete and ready for acceptance into the City's maintenance program.

The improvements for this project were reviewed and inspected by City personnel, and all appropriate close-out documents (2-year maintenance bond, easements, as-built drawings, etc.) have been received by the contractor and/or design engineer.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Wesley Brandon

Wesley Brandon, P.E.

City Engineer

Texas Registration No. 109732



Cc: File



February 2, 2016

Mr. Wesley Brandon, P.E. – City Engineer
City of Bastrop
1311 Chestnut Street
Bastrop, Texas 78602

Re: Engineering Concurrence Letter
Road and Utility – Pecan Park Single Family Section 5A
Childers Rd.
Bastrop, Texas 78602

Dear Mr. Brandon:

Please find this letter as our formal engineering concurrence for the referenced project. On this date, a visual observation of the improvements for this project was made. The project to be in substantial compliance with the approved construction plans. This visual observation was made to assure the project is complete with regards to roadway, utility, grading, and drainage facilities.

I, therefore, verify the adequate completion of the following items: roadway, curbs, storm-sewers, public utilities, outlet flow structures, and similar construction items.

Through our visual observation of the site, we have found the following items, which must be completed. These items are as follows:

1. Complete fencing for lift station area.
2. Complete revegetation all right-of-way and common areas, (areas have been seeded but vegetation needs to be established.)

We hereby request engineering release of the above referenced project.
Sincerely,

Lynn Alderson, P.E.
Principal

Cc: Duke McDowell-Pecan Park
Coy Lowden - Excavating, Inc.



Alderson Group Inc.

16746 Fitzhugh Rd. • Ste. 102 • Dripping Springs, Texas 78620

P (512) 364-0989 • F (512) 858-2455

Texas Registered Engineering Firm F-11820

2-9-2016

71



CEE, Inc.

Coombs Environmental Engineering, Inc.
1610 Williams Drive
Georgetown, TX 78628

Consulting Engineers

TBPE #F-3742
(512) 763-1600 ph
(512) 519-7364 fax

January 29, 2016

City of Bastrop
P.O. Box 427
Bastrop, TX 78602

Attention: Wesley Brandon, P.E.,
City Engineer

Subject: Letter of Concurrence for Pecan Park Waste Water Lift Station

Dear Mr. Brandon:

This is to certify that the above referenced lift station installation has been inspected to my satisfaction, and that the installation appears to be complete and in substantial accordance with my plans and specifications except for the following items yet to be completed:

1. Security fencing and gate are incomplete.
2. Need backflow prevention device on potable water hydrant.
3. Need to re-build driveway culvert to allow return radii for driveway pavement.
4. Need to install SCADA tower.

If you have any further comments regarding this installation, please call me at (512) 763-1600.

Sincerely,
Coombs Environmental Engineering, Inc.

David W. Coombs, P.E.



STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **A PUBLIC HEARING ON APPROVAL OF SIGNIFICANT BEDC EXPENDITURES AND POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO A JOINT CITY/YMCA RECREATION BUILDING.**

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes _____ No _____ **X** _____

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: **NAME/TITLE** **INITIAL** **DATE** **CONCURRENCE**

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested:

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CITY'S POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO A JOINT CITY/YMCA RECREATION BUILDING AND RELATED REQUIREMENTS.**

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ☒ No ☐

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested:

PROPOSAL BY COUNCIL MEMBER SCHIFF AND MAYOR KESSELUS FOR A JOINT CITY OF BASTROP / AUSTIN YMCA RECREATIONAL FACILITY.

Key deal points:

1. Y building would be owned by the City.
2. Construction cost of new facility would exceed \$6.5 Million and would be a minimum 25,000 square feet including indoor pool(s) and gymnasium.
3. HUD grant would fund \$1.6 Million.
4. Y would fund at least \$2.5 Million.
5. Alternate source would fund \$700,000.
6. City would fund \$1.8 Million via:
 - a. 20 year loan from Y at 0% interest (\$90,000 per year).
 - b. \$40,000 of annual City payment would be from current reimbursement.
 - c. \$50,000 would be from City coffers (note that according to the City Manager, Plan B would cost at least \$60,000 annually to operate in addition to the \$40,000 current annual Y reimbursement).
 - d. Therefore, City would save at least \$10,000 per year compared to Plan B and have a much better facility.
7. Y would fund balance of project including land suitable to the City. Note that Seton has suggested that the Y go on their property behind HEB.
8. Y would receive a 20 year lease at \$1 per year.
9. City would maintain mechanical and structural portions of the property and the Y would maintain the rest including day-to-day cleaning and maintenance.
10. Y would collect all fees and fund operations.
11. Project would be completed within HUD grant time limits.

Notes:

- *The cost of maintaining mechanical and structural portions of the property should be near zero for many years. Long-term, big items are air conditioner compressors (7 to 10 year life) and roof membrane (20 to 40 year life). The agreement needs to stipulate that the Y, at a minimum, will do small AC maintenance, replace fan motors, change filters, service thermostats and VAV units if used, as well as maintain pool equipment: pumps, filters, heaters, etc. The \$10,000 per year savings (compared to Plan B) should more than cover the City's responsibility for maintaining mechanical and structural portions of the property.*
- *In order to protect the city from losing the \$1.6 million grant in case the building for some reason fails to materialize, the deal should include reasonable claw back provisions at various stages of the project: before construction initiation, before building completion, and after completion.*
- *The deal needs to include clarification of the Y's policy for providing service free for those who cannot afford membership and service fees.*
- *The Y will stipulate how it will work with the Boys and Girls Club and will form an agreement with the city manager about how it will coordinate with the City's recreation department and its programs.*

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A CONTRACT WITH THE YMCA.**

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes _____ No _____ **X** _____

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: **NAME/TITLE** **INITIAL** **DATE** **CONCURRENCE**

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested:

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **RESOLVED THAT THE COUNCIL INSTRUCTS THE CITY MANAGER TO PROCEED WITH FINISHING A PARKING LOT ON ALL AVAILABLE AND APPROPRIATE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ALLEY D, AND THAT HE MAKE NECESSARY REPAIRS TO THE VACANT LOT AT 921 MAIN STREET SO THAT THIS LOT CAN CONTINUE TO BE USED AS A GATHERING PLACE.**

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ☒ No ☐

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested:

We have worked hard to improve downtown parking in several ways. The main one involved purchasing and razing the former *Advertiser* building. It is time to finish Ally D as a parking lot.

The tentative ideas for building a gather place in the midst of Ally D is not the best plan, and we need to provide all the parking spaces in Ally D that we can.

We need to make improvements on the vacant lot at 921 Main, and the city manager has begun such a process. When this work is done, it can continue as a gathering place with limited usage. Maintaining it as such can keep the lot free for improvements when the time is right and HOT money is available.

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE EXPENDITURE OF LEGAL FEES AND THE POSSIBILITY OF HIRING AN IN-HOUSE CITY ATTORNEY AND A PROPOSED RESOLUTION.**

2. Party Making Request: **Council Member Schiff and Mayor Ken Kesselus**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested:

City of Bastrop

LEGAL EXPENSE ANALYSIS (all vendors)

Dept	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
Organizational	\$ 204,544	\$ 190,517	\$ 205,483	\$ 186,235	\$ 354,304
Court	\$ 4,618	\$ 1,194	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,224
Police	\$ 12,738	\$ 1,310	\$ 16,667	\$ 7,759	\$ 377
Planning	\$ 4,508	\$ 16,137	\$ 14,282	\$ 23,476	\$ 31,402
Public Works	\$ 18,777	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Water	\$ -	\$ 31,175	\$ 49,342	\$ 54,954	\$ 238,014
Electric	\$ 4,811	\$ 5,882	\$ 10,649	\$ 16,469	\$ 2,284
Hotel/Motel	\$ 925	\$ 1,796	\$ 5,568	\$ 2,596	\$ 3,963
Conv Ctr	\$ 6,540	\$ 10,736	\$ 5,565	\$ 6,278	\$ 3,710
Total	\$ 257,460	\$ 258,747	\$ 307,556	\$ 297,767	\$ 637,278
BEDC	\$ 48,898	\$ 21,025	\$ 35,645	\$ 25,311	\$ 40,816
Hunter's Crossing PID	\$ 26,741	\$ 6,200	\$ -	\$ 1,030	\$ 1,153

List of legal services handled by Attorneys

Employment
 Property (purchase/sale)
 Open Record Requests
 Council meetings (only JC charged)
 Grants
 Contracts
 RFP
 Boards/Commissions
 Planning issues
 Legislative (ordinances/resolutions)

Special Circumstances:

FY2015

Pine Forest Unit #6 (about \$80,000 will be reimbursed to the City when the lots are sold)

Red Light Camera Suit

Solid Waste RFP and litigation to follow

West Bastrop Village (MUD)

XS Ranch PID

Water Permit

Litigation against Planning Dept

Aqua CCN Litigation

RESOLUTION NO. R-2016-06

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF BASTROP, TEXAS,
REGARDING THE REQUESTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS AND OTHERS.**

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council instructs the city attorney regarding requests from council members and others as follows:

The city attorney will not receive nor respond to individual requests from city council members but will deal with any such request under the same process as the city manager uses for staff requests in legal review sessions, and after council members have addressed such questions for the city attorney through the office of the city manager; and further

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the city council instructs the city attorney not to respond to requests from other citizens of Bastrop or anyone else seeking legal advice and rather to refer them to the city manager's office for possible inclusion in the same legal review process, provided that the city manager may ask the city attorney to communicate with others when such communication can better be handled outside the legal review process.

READ and ADOPTED on the 9th day of February, 2016.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Ken Kesselus
Mayor

Ann Franklin
City Secretary

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: 1-26-2016

MEETING DATE: 2-8-2016

1. Agenda Item: **REQUIRED REPORTING OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENTS RACIAL PROFILE REPORTING FOR 2015.** I will have a short power point presentation to show the council. I am requesting this be for the Feb 9th council meeting.

2. Party Making Request: Steve Adcock

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

4. Policy Implication: This report is required by State law under the CCP 2.135

5. Budgeted: Yes No **N/A**

Bid Amount: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget:

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining:

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing:	NAME/TITLE	INITIAL	DATE	CONCURRENCE
-------------	------------	---------	------	-------------

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested _____

**Partial Exemption Racial Profiling Reporting
(Tier 1)
January 2015 - December 2015**

BASTROP POLICE DEPARTMENT

Number of motor vehicle stops:

Mark only 1 category per vehicle stop

1.	<u>1694</u>	Citation Only
2.	<u>60</u>	Arrest Only
3.	<u>122</u>	Both
4.	<u>1876</u>	Total

Race or Ethnicity:

5.	<u>203</u>	African
6.	<u>30</u>	Asian
7.	<u>1166</u>	Caucasian
8.	<u>467</u>	Hispanic
9.	<u>7</u>	Middle Eastern
10.	<u>0</u>	Native American
11.	<u>1873</u>	Total

Race or Ethnicity known prior to stop?

12.	<u>6</u>	Yes
13.	<u>1870</u>	No
14.	<u>1876</u>	Total

Search Conducted?

15.	<u>145</u>	Yes
16.	<u>1731</u>	No
17.	<u>1876</u>	Total

Was search consented?

18.	<u>46</u>	Yes
19.	<u>99</u>	No
20.	<u>145</u>	Total Must equal #15

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVING A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE LEASE TERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A VENDOR AND LEASE PROGRAM ON THE PROPERTY WEST OF BASTROP CONVENTION CENTER.**

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Pro Tem DeLaRosa**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ___ **X** ___ No ___

4. Policy Implication: _____

5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None

11. Motion Requested:

RESOLUTION NO. R-2016-04

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF BASTROP, TEXAS,
REGARDING THE LEASE TERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A VENDOR AND
LEASE PROGRAM**

BE IT RESOLVED that the city council instruct the city manager to give notice to the appropriate representatives of Bastrop 1832 Farmers Market that we will end their lease in sixty days (from the notice) and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager develop within sixty days a vendor and lease program for use of the city-owned lot between the Convention Center and RR tracks at a fair rate for short-term use for social, civic, business, or personal uses that are deemed appropriate by the city manager.

READ and ADOPTED on the 9th day of February, 2016.

APPROVED:

Ken Kesselus
Mayor

ATTEST:

Ann Franklin
City Secretary

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Discussion, consideration and possible action on the Preliminary Plat for the Colony MUD 1A, Section 1 being +/-45.487 acres out of the Manuel Bangs Survey A, within Area A of the Bastrop, Texas Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).**
2. Party Making Request: **Melissa McCollum, Director of Planning and Development**
3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X X No
4. Policy Implication: _____
5. Budgeted: _____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A
Bid Amount: _____ Budgeted Amount: _____
Under Budget: _____ Over Budget: _____
Amount Remaining: _____
6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____
7. Routing:

	<u>NAME/TITLE</u>	<u>INITIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>CONCURRENCE</u>
a)	_____	_____	_____	_____
b)	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Staff Recommendation: **Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat for The Colony MUD 1A, Section 1 being +/-45.487 acres out of the Jose Manuel Bangs Survey A-5 within Area A of the Bastrop, Texas, Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).**
9. Advisory Board Recommendation: _____ Recommended Approval _____ Denial _____ None _____
- The Planning and Zoning Commission conducted a meeting January 28, 2016 and unanimously voted seven (7) in favor to recommend approval of Preliminary Plat for The Colony MUD 1A, Section 1.**
10. Manager's Recommendation: _____ Approved _____ Disapproved _____ None _____
11. Motion Requested: **Recommend approval of the preliminary plat.**

City of Bastrop Agenda Information Sheet:



City Council Meeting Date:

February 9, 2016

Project Description:

Preliminary Plat for The Colony MUD 1A, Section 1 being +/-45.487 acres out of the Jose Manuel Bangs Survey A- 5 within Area A of the Bastrop, Texas, Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).

Item Summary:

Owner: Forestar Real Estate Group, Inc.
Applicant: Darlene Louk
Location: FM 969 and Sam Houston Boulevard
Utilities: The Colony MUD Water and Wastewater and Bluebonnet Electric

Background:

This property is located within the Colony Subdivision north of State Highway 71 and west of FM 969. The developer, Forestar Real Estate Group, Inc. is proposing to develop raw land that will consist of 143 residential lots, streets, landscape, drainage, P.U.E. and pedestrian access lots.

The subdivision will be developed in accordance with the MUD Consent Agreement (dated February, 2004) approved by City Council. The Consent Agreement required a Master Plan, a Traffic Impact Analysis, as well as, development standards that are generally consistent with City regulations.

Basis of Support:

Staff supports the request for approval of the Preliminary Plat. City staff has reviewed the Preliminary Plat and determined that it appears to conform to the approved Consent Agreement for the Colony Municipal Utility District No.1.

Special Considerations: None.

Comments: Three (3) surrounding property owner notifications were mailed January 8, 2016. At this time we have not received any responses.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat for The Colony MUD 1A, Section 1 being +/-45.487 acres out of Manuel Bangs Survey A-5 within Area A of the Bastrop, Texas, Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ).

Planning and Zoning Commission Recommendation:

The Planning and Zoning Commission conducted a meeting January 28, 2016 and unanimously voted seven (7) in favor to recommend approval of Preliminary Plat for The Colony MUD 1A, Section 1.

City Contact:


Melissa McCollum, Director of Planning and Development
Wesley Brandon, PE, City Engineer

Attachments:



Location map and Preliminary Plat




Preliminary Plat Colony MUD 1A, Section 1



Legend





1.6



SCALE: 1" = 100'

- [illegible]

[illegible]

SHEET NO. 1 OF 2

Carlisle, Briggance & Doering, Inc.
 PAPER DESIGNER
 ARTS & CRAFTS
 C&B&D
 One of the following: • Acrylic, Tissue, Paper
 Ink, Wet, Water, Plastics • Acrylic, Tissue, Paper
 Plastics • C&B&D • Acrylic, Tissue, Paper

Year	Large	Small	First 100	Top 100
2006	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2007	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2008	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2009	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2010	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2011	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2012	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2013	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2014	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2015	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2016	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2017	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2018	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2019	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2020	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2021	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2022	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2023	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2024	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2025	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2026	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2027	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2028	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2029	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2030	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2031	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2032	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2033	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2034	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2035	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2036	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2037	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2038	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2039	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2040	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2041	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2042	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2043	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2044	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2045	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2046	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2047	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2048	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2049	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2050	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2051	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2052	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2053	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2054	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2055	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2056	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2057	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2058	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2059	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2060	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2061	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2062	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2063	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2064	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2065	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2066	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2067	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2068	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000
2069	20,320	10,320	1,000	1,000

[illegible]

SHEET NO. 2 OF 2

Carlson, Briggner & Doering, Inc.
PRINTED BY: MAIL & FREIGHT

Ordering Information: • **Shipping Method:**
MAIL (U.S. POSTAGE) • AIR MAIL (U.S. POSTAGE)
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 2000 • PHONE: (712) 286-1111

STANDARD PLANT-IRE COUNTRY MILD 1A, SECTION

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item:

APPOINTMENT BY MAYOR, SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION BY CITY COUNCIL OF JIMMY CROUCH TO PLACE 3 ON THE CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS BOARD.

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ☒ No ☐

4. Policy Implication: This report is required by State law under the CCP 2.135

5. Budgeted: ☐ Yes ☐ No **N/A**

Bid Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing:

	<u>NAME/TITLE</u>	<u>INITIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>CONCURRENCE</u>
a)	_____	_____	_____	_____
b)	_____	_____	_____	_____
c)	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: ☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ None10. Manager's Recommendation: ☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved ☐ None11. Motion Requested: **Appointment of Jimmy Crouch to Place 3 on the Construction Standards Board.**

To: City Council Members

From: Mayor Kesselus

As you remember, at the last meeting I sought your advice about an easy way to retain Jimmy Crouch on the Construction Standards Board, despite a misunderstanding between him and me about his inadvertently not having written a letter of resignation when I appointed him to the Park's Board.

Since that plan did not work, I asked him to resign from CSB, and he did. You will find his letter of resignation in the packet.

Now, I act to appoint him again to the Construction Standards Board. You will find his application in the packet, as well as a list, provided by the city secretary, of those who have active applications for boards.

Chair, Charlie Schroeder, told me that he would be very much pleased and greatly aided to have Mr. Crouch on the board.

Please remember that you previously confirmed Mr. Crouch for a current member of the Parks Board.

I am mindful of an important conversation the council engaged in during a time when only Council Member McAnally and I (of the present council) were on the council, involving having citizens serve on more than one board only in special circumstances.

As far as I can tell, we only have 2 citizens in this position – Lisa Patterson, who serves on P&Z, is an ex-officio member of the Historic Landmark Commission, chosen by P&Z to fill that required position – and Dan Hays-Clark, who fills the “design professional” position on the Historic Landmark Commission and serves on the Zoning Board of Adjustment. In Dan's case, he is uniquely qualified for the professional position on HLC and is a very key member of ZBA. This is why Mayor Orr appointed him to both positions, and it is why, I believe, that the council confirmed both appointments.

I believe that Mr. Crouch is one of those individuals whom we need to have serving on both boards. He can serve well on the Parks Board and also fill a unique professional position on the Construction Standard Board that requires specific technical experience among its members and which meets irregularly.

Jimmy Crouch
605 Buttonwood Street
Bastrop TX 787602
January 28, 2016

Mayor Kesselus
City of Bastrop
1311 Chestnut Street
Bastrop TX 78602

Dear Mayor Kesselus:

It is with regret that I tender my resignation from the City of Bastrop Construction Standards Board, effective immediately due to a misunderstanding on my behalf when appointed to the Parks Board that I was to resign from the Construction Standards Board.

I am grateful for having had the opportunity to serve on the board, and I offer my best wishes for its continued success. If this position remains available to me in the future I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to serve as a member.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Crouch



received
1/29/16

CITY OF BASTROP

City Secretary's Office
1311 Chestnut Street
Bastrop, Texas 78602
(512) 332-8800
<http://www.cityofbastrop.org>

Application for City Board/Commission/Committee Please Print or Type Clearly.

New Appointment: ☐

Request for Re-Appointment: ☒

SECTION A: APPLICANT INFORMATION

Last Name Crouch		First James (Jimmy)		Middle Robert	
Street Address 605 Buttonwood Street			Mailing Address 605 Buttonwood Street		
Apt/Unit #	City Bastrop	State TX	ZIP Code 78602		
Phone (801) 381-8883		E-mail Address jcrouch@big-d.com			
Date Available 02-01-2016	I have lived in Bastrop 3 years.		Place of Employment Big-D Construction Corp.		
Have you filed an application here before? YES ☒ NO ☐		If so, when? June 2015			
Have you ever been convicted of a crime? YES ☐ NO ☒		If so, when?			
Do you reside within the City Limits of Bastrop? YES ☒ NO ☐		Currently Employed YES ☒ NO ☐			
<i>Note: Various boards, commissions and committees of the City either allow for or require appointments of persons who reside in the County, the City's Extra Territorial Jurisdiction, and/or the Bastrop Independent School District. For more information on this please refer to the Articles of Incorporation or By Laws of the entities of interest. The City Secretary is able to assist in obtaining copies of the By-Laws, upon request.</i>					

SECTION B: REFERENCES

Please list three professional references.

Full Name Mr. Steve Talbot	Relationship Friend
Company TXDOT	Phone (830) 875-6740
Full Name Mr. Forrest McNabb	Relationship Employer
Company Big-D Construction Corp	Phone (801) 4515-6000
Full Name Mr Lance Reid	Relationship Friend
Company TMW	Phone (770) 332-6177

SECTION C: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Do you currently serve on any other boards, commissions, or committees? Please list any below:

Parks Board

What qualifies you to serve on the board(s) you are applying for?

35 years experience in the residential and commercial construction industry. Currently working for top 100 nationally recognized construction firms.

Why do you want to serve on the board(s) you are applying for?

I feel my extensive experience in the construction industry on a national level will help bring valuable experience to the Board

SECTION D: BOARDS/COMMISSIONS/COMMITTEES

Please indicate the Boards, Commissions or Committees you are interested in serving. List in order of preference.

☒ Bastrop Parks Board	☒ Bastrop Economic Development Corporation	☐ Bastrop Housing Authority
☒ Planning and Zoning Commission	☐ Board of Adjustment	☒ Construction Standards Board of Adjustments
☐ Main Street Advisory Board	☐ Fairview Cemetery Advisory Board	☐ Art in Public Places Board
☐ Hunters Crossing Local Government Corporation Board	☐ Bastrop Library Board (☐ City Resident / ☐ BISD Area Resident)	
☐ Automated Red Light Advisory Committee	☐ Other:	
☐ Historic Landmark Commission	*Please indicate which position(s) you are qualified to serve under. ☐ Architect, Planner, Designer ☐ Licensed Real Estate Professional ☐ Own Commercial Historic Structure/Property ☐ Own Residential Historic Structure/Property ☐ General Resident of City of Bastrop ☐ Planning and Zoning Member ☐ Bastrop County Historic Society Member	

DISCLAIMER AND SIGNATURE

- It is understood and agreed upon that any misrepresentation by me on this application will be sufficient cause for cancellation of this application and/or separation from the board/commission/committee.
- I give the City of Bastrop the right to investigate all references and to secure additional information about me, if related. I hereby release from liability the City of Bastrop and its representatives for seeking such information and all other persons, corporations or organizations for furnishing such information.
- This application is kept on active file at the City Secretary's Office for 1 year. At the conclusion of this time, if I have not heard from the City Secretary and still wish to be considered for a board/commission/committee, it will be necessary to fill out a new application.
- I understand that just as I am free to resign at any time, the City of Bastrop reserves the right to terminate my status as member at any time, with or without cause and without prior notice. I understand that no representative of the City of Bastrop has the authority to make any assurances to the contrary.
- I understand it is the City of Bastrop's policy not to refuse to hire a qualified individual with a disability because of this person's need for an accommodation that would be required by the ADA.
- I agree to participate and complete any required training the city deems necessary, such as Open Meetings Act training, as a condition of my board service, and I agree to submit a copy of completion documentation on file with the City Secretary.
- If selected, I agree to adhere to the City of Bastrop's Ethics Ordinance and to represent the City's business ethically at all times.

Signature


Date 01-28-2016

WRITTEN NOTICE

A hardcopy of this application with the original signature must be printed and mailed to be officially accepted for a board/commission/committee. Please return by mail or in person to:

City of Bastrop, TX
 City Secretary's Office
 1311 Chestnut Street
 Bastrop, Texas 78602

OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Application Received:	1/29/16	Application Received by:	
Position Appointed:		Date Appointed:	
Term Starts:		Term Expires:	

BOARD		APPLICANT		OR	DATE OF	CONFLICT FORM
				DER	APPLICATION	ATTACHED
AUTOMATED RED LIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE						
BASTROP ART IN PUBLIC PLACES		Thomson, Donna			17-Apr-15	
		Thorne-Francis, Debra Renae	5		20-Apr-15	
		Banks, Carolyn			22-Jan-16	
		Ngozi, Georgina	1		1-Feb-16	
BASTROP ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION		Breiland, Merle J.			26-Feb-15	
		Crawford, Pat A.			6-Apr-15	
		Gordon, Joshua Lee	2		16-Nov-15	
		Henson, Daren S			20-Apr-15	
		Howard, Clint C			15-Apr-15	
		Landwehr, John Christopher			15-Apr-15	
		Sartain, Elizabeth Ann			13-Apr-15	
BASTROP HOUSING AUTHORITY		Thorne-Francis, Debra Renae	1		20-Apr-15	
BASTROP LIBRARY BOARD		Thorne-Francis, Debra Renae	4		20-Apr-15	
		West, Dixie Gibbons			26-Jun-14	
BASTROP PARKS BOARD		Hewett, Allison Brooke	2		17-Aug-15	
		Thorne-Francis, Debra Renae			20-Apr-15	
		Tripp, Dianne D.			20-Apr-15	
CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS		Holan, Ron Lee			26-Jun-14	Mr. Holan withdrew on 1/27/16 per email. He has relocated to

	Moore, David A.	22-Apr-15	1/26/16	Mr. Moore withdrew (per email from Mayor on 1/26/16)
ETHICS COMMISSION				
	Enis, Jr., Troy Alonzo	29-Jul-15		
	Thomson, Donna	17-Apr-15		
	Yarbrough, Jeffrey, D.	16-Apr-15		
FAIRVIEW CEMETERY ADVISORY BOARD				
	Thomson, Donna	17-Apr-15		
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION				
	Crawford, Pat A.	6-Apr-15		
	Enis, Jr., Troy Alonzo	29-Jul-15		Mr. Holan withdrew on 1/27/16 per
	Holan, Ron Lee	26-Jun-14		
	Banks, Carolyn	22-Jan-16		
	Connell, Patrick Ernest	2-Dec-15		
HUNTERS CROSSING LOCAL GOVERNMENT CORPORATION BOARD				
	Smith, Carolyn Sue	17-Jun-14		
Bastrop Library Board				
	Gfeller, Kathleen	25-Jan-16		
MAIN STREET ADVISORY BOARD				
	Thorne-Francis, Debra Renae	20-Apr-15		
	Connell, Patrick Ernest	2-Dec-15		

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION				
	Gordon, Joshua Lee	3	16-Nov-15	
	Holan, Ron Lee		26-Jun-15	withdrew on 1/27/16 per email. He has relocated to
	Smith, Carolyn Sue		17-Jun-14	
	Connell, Patrick Ernest		2-Dec-15	
Vision Task Force	Silva, Tresha LaVern		29-Jan-16	
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT/MUNICIPAL SIGN REVIEW BOARD	Holan, Ron Lee		26-Jun-14	

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM THE BASTROP HOMECOMING COMMITTEE FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 8.02.001 OF THE CITY OF BASTROP CODE OF ORDINANCES TO ALLOW FOR THE SALE AND CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES DURING THE MAYFEST HILL DISASTER RELIEF RODEO EVENT SCHEDULED FOR MAY 13-14, 2016 AT THE MAYFEST HILL PARK LOCATED ON AMERICAN LEGION DRIVE.**

2. Party Making Request: **City Manager Mike Talbot**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ☒ No ☐

4. Policy Implication: This report is required by State law under the CCP 2.135

5. Budgeted: ☐ Yes ☐ No **N/A**

Bid Amount:

Budgeted Amount:

Under Budget:

Over Budget:

Amount Remaining:

6. Alternate Option/Costs:

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

- a)
- b)
- c)

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None

11. Motion Requested: **Approve the request from the Bastrop Homecoming Committee for a variance to Section 8.02.001 of the City of Bastrop Code of Ordinances.**



BASTROP

HOMECOMING COMMITTEE, INC.

P.O. Box 215 • Bastrop, Texas 78602

January 29, 2016

Mike Talbot, City Manager
City of Bastrop
PO Box 427
Bastrop, Texas 78602

Dear Mr. Talbot,

Bastrop Homecoming, Inc. is requesting a variance from the City of Bastrop to sell and allow consumption of alcoholic beverages during the Mayfest Hill Disaster Relief Rodeo event scheduled for May 13-14, 2016, at the area known as Mayfest Hill Park located on American Legion Drive.

All permits and liability insurance, to include liquor liability, in the amount required by the City of Bastrop, will be obtained and copies will be hand delivered to the city office by April 22, 2016.

A special event application was been submitted to the Parks Department January 14, 2016, requesting the use of the rodeo arena to include all parking areas, public picnic areas, electric/water hookups, trash cans, and public restrooms.

Please contact me as soon as possible if you have other concerns or questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Chapin, Treasurer
Bastrop Homecoming and Rodeo Committee
512-923-1440

February 10, 2016

TABC
7700 Chevy Chase Drive, Suite 200
Austin, TX 78752

To whom it may concern:

The Bastrop City Council met on Tuesday, February 9, 2016 and approved a request from the Bastrop Homecoming Committee, Inc. for the sale of beer and wine, from May 13, 2016 through May 14, 2016 from 5:00 PM to 12:00 AM each day at Mayfest Park located at 25 American Legion Drive, Bastrop, Texas.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at 512-332-8800.

Sincerely,

Michael H. Talbot
City Manager

cc: T. Chavez

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: February 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: February 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **RESOLVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL CREATE A PROCESS FOR FORMING A DESTINATION MARKETING CORPORATION AND OPERATING DURING THE PERIOD LEADING UP TO SUCH A CREATION, FOLLOWING THE OUTLINE INCLUDED ON PAGE ?????? OF THE COUNCIL PACKET.**

2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes ☒ X ☐ No ☐

4. Policy Implication: This report is required by State law under the CCP 2.135

5. Budgeted: ☐ Yes ☐ No **N/A**

Bid Amount:

Budgeted Amount:

Under Budget:

Over Budget:

Amount Remaining:

6. Alternate Option/Costs:

7. Routing: **NAME/TITLE** **INITIAL** **DATE** **CONCURRENCE**

- a)
- b)
- c)

8. Staff Recommendation:

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None

11. Motion Requested:

SUGGESTIONS BY MAYOR KESSELUS

DURING THE PERIOD BEFORE CREATION OF A DMO

- A. The council will continue to vote use of HOT funds, except for whatever goes into the revised and extended BMC contract and the amount set aside for selling use of the Bastrop Convention Center.
- B. During the period in which the council develops a DMO, the council will decide what to do about the traditional process of making small grants out of a \$300,000 set-aside – continuing it as in the past, altering it, or discontinuing it.
 - 1. Possibilities
 - a. Deciding on an amount similar to past years
 - b. Designating targets and uses for applications
 - c. Using the same process for determining specific amounts as was done last year
 - d. Asking one representative of each applying organization to attend a workshop meeting at which those representatives will decide the amounts
 - e. Other

CREATING A DESTINATION MARKETING ORGANIZATION

- A. Decide whether to work as the council or set up an advisory committee to study various aspects
- B. Work with available and other resources:
 - 1. Follow the process outlined in the report presented representatives of the Texas Travel Industry Association
 - 2. Examine the related section of the last report from the Vision Task Force
 - 3. Review the related advice from Hardee and Associates report regarding our convention center
 - 4. Benchmark with other similarly situated cities that have DMOs.
- C. Gather input from the public/stakeholders
 - 1. Hearings, workshops, forums
- D. Consider leadership formats
 - 1. Overall
 - a. A non-profit organization
 - b. A city department

- c. A separate entity, similar to the Bastrop Economic Development Corporation
 - d. Other
- 2. Management
 - a. A city employee
 - b. A third party management firm
 - c. Executive Director of an organization similar to BEDC
 - d. Other
- 3. Reporting relationship
 - a. To the city manager
 - b. To the city council
 - c. To a board, similar to BEDC
 - d. Other
- 4. A Board / Group of citizens to focus on the DMO - Possible types
 - a. Advisory Committee (similar to the Library Board)
 - b. Commission (similar to P and Z)
 - c. A semi-independent board, like BEDC
 - d. The City Council itself
 - e. Other

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: Feb. 3, 2016

MEETING DATE: Feb. 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Consideration, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding Approval to Award a Construction Contract to Facilities Rehabilitation, Inc. for the SH 71/95 Water Line Replacement Project.**

2. Party Making Request: **Wesley Brandon, City Engineer**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

Consideration, discussion, and possible action on awarding a construction contract to Facilities the lowest responsible bidder for the replacement of an existing 12" water line crossing near the intersection of SH 71 and SH 95.

4. Policy Implication:

5. Budgeted: X Yes No N/A
Bid Amount: \$91,390 Budgeted Amount: \$100,000
Under Budget: Over Budget:
Amount Remaining:

6. Alternate Option/Costs:

7. Routing: NAME/TITLE INITIAL DATE CONCURRENCE

a) _____
b) _____
c) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: **Staff recommends awarding the contract to Facilities Rehabilitation, Inc. They are the lowest responsible bidder and have satisfactorily performed similar work for the City.**

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None

11. Motion Requested: **Awarding the contract to Facilities Rehabilitation, Inc.**

BID TABULATION
CITY OF BASTROP
SH 71/95 WATER LINE REPLACEMENT
Bid Date: 1-22-2016


Item No.	Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Price	Total Cost	Unit Price	Total Cost	Unit Price	Total Cost	Unit Price	Total Cost	Unit Price	Total Cost	Unit Price	Total Cost	Unit Price	Total Cost
FACILITIES REHABILITATION INC.																	
CASTO LOPEZ CONCRETE LLC																	
WHITESTONE CIVIL CONSTRUCTION, LLC																	
SCHULTZ & SONS CONSTRUCTION																	
BORETEX LLC																	
UNDERGROUND WATER SOLUTIONS																	
JKB CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC																	
BASE BID																	
1	ENCASEMENT PIPE, 30" STEEL (JACK OR BORE), INCL. CLUSTERED CASING SPACERS	LF	140	\$ 400.00	\$ 56,000.00	\$ 366.00	\$ 51,240.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 70,000.00	\$ 620.00	\$ 86,800.00	\$ 510.00	\$ 71,400.00	\$ 594.00	\$ 83,160.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 98,000.00
2	ENCASEMENT PIPE, 30" STEEL (OPEN CUT)	LF	10	\$ 180.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 352.00	\$ 3,520.00	\$ 390.00	\$ 3,900.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 458.00	\$ 4,580.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 2,600.00
3	12" Ø PVC, ANVIA C900 DR-14 (ALL DEPTHS) INCL. FITTINGS, JOINT RESTRAINTS, AND TESTING	LF	235	\$ 93.00	\$ 21,855.00	\$ 128.00	\$ 30,080.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 35,250.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 18,800.00	\$ 105.00	\$ 24,675.00	\$ 113.00	\$ 26,555.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 39,950.00
4	CONNECT TO EXISTING 12" WATERLINE	EA	4	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 1,012.00	\$ 4,048.00	\$ 3,400.00	\$ 13,600.00	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 9,200.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 4,650.00	\$ 18,600.00	\$ 4,600.00	\$ 18,400.00
5	12" CUT, PLUG, AND ABANDON EXISTING WATERLINE	EA	2	\$ 400.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 968.00	\$ 1,936.00	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 650.00	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 2,300.00	\$ 4,600.00
6	EXCAVATION SAFETY SYSTEMS	LF	235	\$ 1.00	\$ 235.00	\$ 9.65	\$ 2,267.75	\$ 3.00	\$ 705.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 1,175.00	\$ 40.50	\$ 9,517.50	\$ 20.00	\$ 4,700.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 1,410.00
7	BARRICADES, SIGNS AND TRAFFIC CONTROL.	LS	1	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 3,292.00	\$ 3,292.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,400.00	\$ 6,400.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 16,000.00
8	3" Ø GRAY SCH 40 PIPE	LF	140	\$ 30.00	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 6.51	\$ 911.40	\$ 3.00	\$ 420.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 7,700.00
TOTAL BASE BID					\$ 91,390.00		\$ 97,295.15		\$ 127,575.00		\$ 131,175.00		\$ 132,272.50		\$ 154,515.00		\$ 188,660.00

TOTAL AMOUNT BID \$ 91,390.00 \$ 97,295.15 \$ 127,575.00 \$ 131,175.00 \$ 132,272.50 \$ 154,515.00 \$ 188,660.00
 ([lowest])



GENERAL PROJECT NOTES


1. The purpose of this work is to relocate existing water line facilities in order to resolve a conflict with TxDOT Project CSJ 0265-05-067.
2. Profile stationing, elevations, and design elements shown follow cross-section at SH 71 Baseline Station 1067+10.
3. All fittings shall be mechanically restrained.
4. All work shall be done in accordance with City of Bastrop standards and specifications, unless otherwise directed by engineer.
5. All water line installation and testing shall be done in accordance with applicable City of Bastrop and TCEQ standards.
6. Contractor shall reference sheet nos. 513 and 513 of TxDOT Project CSJ 0265-05-067 construction plans for existing utility locations not shown on the plans.
7. Existing utility information shown on the plans is shown in an approximate manner. Contractor shall verify depths and locations of all existing utilities prior to beginning work. Any discrepancies and/or conflicts shall be promptly brought to the attention of the Engineer.
8. Any damage to existing utilities, pavement, curbing, sidewalks, and/or vegetation not included as part of the work shall be repaired to the satisfaction of the Engineer at no additional cost to Owner. Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating the marking and/or locating the existing utilities by calling Texas 811 prior to starting work.
9. Contractor shall give Owner a minimum of 48 hours notice prior to beginning each phase of construction.
10. All work inside and/or related to TxDOT property shall be coordinated in advance with TxDOT.
11. Contractor shall attend a pre-construction conference between himself, Owner, Engineer, and all other affected stakeholders prior to beginning work.
12. Contractor shall make every effort to provide and maintain access to adjacent driveways at all times. If driveways must be blocked, Contractor shall be responsible for notifying and coordinating the timing with the adjacent property owner at least eight (8) hours prior to the blockage. Contractor shall also inform the property owner of the estimated blockage time, which in no case shall exceed six (6) hours.
13. If required, a traffic control plan shall be prepared and submitted to Owner by a Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Texas for review and approval. The plan shall be coordinated with TxDOT, as well as the local police department, EMS provider, and fire department.
14. All traffic control shall be provided in accordance with Texas MUTCD and TxDOT standards.
15. Prior to the pre-construction conference, Contractor shall submit a construction schedule to the Owner for review and approval. The schedule shall outline the proposed construction sequence and anticipated completion date of each component of the work.
16. Disposal of material deemed unsuitable for re-use by the Engineer shall be disposed of outside the Bastrop city limits at no additional cost to Owner.



SCALE: 1" = 2,000'
2,000'
4,000'



NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
0	12/28/15	ORIGINAL ISSUE
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		



LOCATION MAP & NOTES
WATER LINE RELOCATION
STATE HIGHWAY 71
at STATE HIGHWAY 96
DATE: DECEMBER 2015
SCALE: AS SHOWN
SHEET 1 OF 2

City of Bastrop

Agenda Information Sheet:



City Council Meeting Date: January 26, 2016

Project Description:

Consideration, Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding Approval to Award a Construction Contract for the SH 71/95 Water Line Replacement Project.

Item Summary:

Owner: City of Bastrop
Engineer: Wesley Brandon, P.E., City Engineer
Location: SH 71, just west of its intersection with SH 95.
Utilities: City of Bastrop water, sewer, and electric

Background:

The project consists of replacing portions of an existing 12" water line crossing in order to resolve a conflict between its current location and the proposed improvements related to the upcoming TxDOT SH 95 Overpass Project. The project was designed in-house and advertised for bids twice in the Bastrop Advertiser. The bid opening was held Friday, January 22nd at City Hall.

Basis of Support:

Staff received the following 7 bids at the time of bid opening:

Company	Total Amount Bid	Company	Total Amount Bid
FACILITIES REHABILITATION INC.	\$ 91,390.00	BORETEX LLC	\$ 132,272.50
CASTO LOPEZ CONCRETE LLC	\$ 97,295.15	UNDERGROUND WATER SOLUTIONS	\$ 154,515.00
WHITESTONE CIVIL CONSTRUCTION, LLC	\$ 127,575.00	JKB CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC	\$ 188,660.00
SCHULTZ & SONS CONSTRUCTION	\$ 131,175.00		

After reviewing all submitted bids, Facilities Rehabilitation, Inc. was the lowest responsible bidder.

Special Considerations: None.

Comments: None.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends awarding the construction contract to Facilities Rehabilitation, Inc. They have recently performed similar work for the City, and staff is confident they will complete this project to the City's satisfaction.

Attachments:

Project Bid Tabulation, Project Location Map

City Contact:

Wesley Brandon, P.E., City Engineer
Planning and Development Department

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: FEB 2, 2016

MEETING DATE: FEB 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE FIRST READING OF A PROPOSED ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BASTROP TEXAS, AMENDING THE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXISTING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS; APPROPRIATING THE VARIOUS AMOUNTS HEREIN; REPEALING ALL PRIOR ORDINANCES AND ACTIONS IN CONFLICT HERewith; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

2. Party Making Request: **Tracy Waldron, Chief Financial Officer**

3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No

4. Policy Implication:

These budget amendments increase the budget appropriations for Fiscal Year 2016. See attached memo.

5. Budgeted: Yes No N/A

Bid Amount: _____

Under Budget: _____

Budgeted Amount: _____

Over Budget: _____

Amount Remaining: _____

6. Alternate Option/Costs: _____

7. Routing:	NAME/TITLE	INITIAL	DATE	CONCURRENCE
-------------	------------	---------	------	-------------

a) _____

b) _____

8. Staff Recommendation: **Staff recommends approval of the Budget Amendments**

9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None

10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None

11. Motion Taken: _____

**FY 2016
BUDGET AMENDMENTS
GENERAL FUND**

Fund Balance (unaudited) as of 9-30-15	4,139,117
FY 2016 Budgeted Revenues	10,252,797
FY 2016 Budgeted Appropriations	(11,966,627)
2/2016 Budget Amendments (net)	(3,720)
Ending Fund Balance	<u>2,425,287</u>

	BUDGET	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION	ACCOUNT NUMBER
Matching Revenues to Expenditures:				
Human Resources	Neutral	700	Donations received for City Christmas Party	101-00-00-4509
Police	Neutral	341	Insurance Proceeds for Repair of Patrol Car	101-00-00-4537
Total Revenues		<u>1,041</u>		
Matching Expenditures to Revenues:				
Human Resources	Neutral	(700)	Donations received for City Christmas Party	101-06-00-5653
Police	Neutral	(341)	Maint of Vehicle-Patrol	101-09-22-5345
New Expenditures:				
IT	Increase	(3,720)	IT Furn expense (furniture for new staff)	101-07-00-5206
Total Expenditures		<u>(4,761)</u>		
Net Change		(3,720)		

**FY 2016
BUDGET AMENDMENTS
ARENA FUND**

Fund Balance (unaudited) as of 9-30-15	0
FY 2016 Budgeted Revenues	0
FY 2016 Budgeted Appropriations	0
02/2016 Budget Amendments (net)	<u>0</u>
Ending Fund Balance	<u><u>0</u></u>

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>ACCOUNT NUMBER</u>
	Neutral	93,000	Trans In-Hotel/Motel #501	506-00-00-4719
Matching Expenditures to Revenue:				
	Neutral	(2,500)	Small Tools, etc	506-82-00-5201
	Neutral	(3,000)	Ground Maintenance	506-82-00-5346
	Neutral	(2,000)	Utilities	506-82-00-5403
	Neutral	(4,000)	Professional Services (promoters)	506-82-00-5505
	Neutral	(2,500)	Equipment Rental	506-82-00-5655
	Neutral	(10,000)	Building Improvement	506-82-00-6000
	Neutral	(69,000)	Equipment	506-82-00-6010
	Total Expense	<u>(93,000)</u>		
	Net Change	0		

**Arena Fund Proposed Budget
FY2016**

Supplies & Materials	Small tools, air filters, ice machine repair, fill material paint etc....	\$ 2,500.00
Maintenance & Repairs	Additional fill material, paint, tables, chairs, audio equip. etc...	\$ 3,000.00
Occupancy	Utilities, water, sewer, & electric	\$2,000.00
Contractual Services	Rodeo promoters,	\$ 4,000.00
Other charges	Equipment rental, advertising	\$ 2,500.00
Capital Outlay		
Tractor	New Kubota for grounds maintenance	\$ 35,000.00
Warm up arena	Enclose the warm up arena with a mutton busting pen for future events	\$ 10,000.00
Water truck	Low mileage water truck to be used for arena	\$ 30,000
New Drag	Used to prep the arena grounds	4,000.00
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$93,000

ORDINANCE NO. 2016-04

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXISTING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS; APPROPRIATING THE VARIOUS AMOUNTS HEREIN; REPEALING ALL PRIOR ORDINANCES AND ACTIONS IN CONFLICT HERewith; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City Manager of the City of Bastrop has submitted to the Mayor and Council proposed amendment(s) to the budget of the revenues and/or expenditures/expenses of conducting the affairs of said city and providing a complete financial plan for Fiscal Year 2016; and,

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council have now provided for and conducted a public hearing on the budget as provided by law. Now, Therefore:

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BASTROP, BASTROP COUNTY, TEXAS:

That the proposed budget amendments for the Fiscal Year 2016, as submitted to the City Council by the City Manager and which budget amendments are attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is hereby adopted and approved as the amended budget of said city for Fiscal Year 2016; and

Ordinance and prior actions in conflict herewith are hereby repealed; and

This Ordinance shall be and remain in full force and effect from and after its final passage and publication in accordance with existing statutory requirements.

READ and APPROVED on First Reading on the 9 day of February, 2016.

READ and ADOPTED on Second Reading on the 23 day of February, 2016.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Ken Kesselus, Mayor

Ann Franklin, City Secretary

STANDARDIZED AGENDA RECOMMENDATION FORM

CITY COUNCIL

DATE SUBMITTED: Feb. 5, 2016

MEETING DATE: Feb. 9, 2016

1. Agenda Item: **Consideration, discussion and possible action regarding internal access between properties to driveways that connect to Hunters Crossing Boulevard shared between Toyota and Best Western located within the Hunters Crossing Subdivision.**
2. Party Making Request: **Mayor Ken Kesselus**
3. Nature of Request: (Brief Overview) Attachments: Yes X No
4. Policy Implication:

5. Budgeted: X Yes No N/A
 Bid Amount: \$91,390 Budgeted Amount: \$100,000
 Under Budget: Over Budget:
 Amount Remaining:
6. Alternate Option/Costs:

7. Routing:

<u>NAME/TITLE</u>	<u>INITIAL</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>CONCURRENCE</u>
a) _____	_____	_____	_____
b) _____	_____	_____	_____
c) _____	_____	_____	_____
8. Staff Recommendation:
9. Advisory Board: Approved Disapproved None
10. Manager's Recommendation: Approved Disapproved None
11. Motion Requested:

