

AGENDA
NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF
SHAVANO PARK, TEXAS

This notice is posted pursuant to the Texas Open Meetings Act. Notice hereby given that the City Council of the CoSP, Texas will conduct a Budget Workshop Special City Council Meeting on Wednesday, August 8, 2018 immediately following the Special Budget City Council meeting scheduled at 5:30 p.m. at 900 Saddletree Court, Shavano Park City Council Chambers for the purpose of considering the following agenda:

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND INVOCATION

3. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

The City Council welcomes “Citizens to be Heard.” If you wish to speak, you must follow these guidelines. **As a courtesy to your fellow citizens and out of respect to our fellow citizens, we request that if you wish to speak that you follow these guidelines.**

- A. Pursuant to Resolution No. 04-11 citizens are given three minutes (3:00) to speak during “Citizens to be Heard.”
- B. Only citizens may speak.
- C. Each citizen may only speak once, and no citizen may pass his/her time allotment to another person.
- D. Direct your comments to the entire Council, not to an individual member.
- E. Show the Council members the same respect and courtesy that you expect to be shown to you.

The Mayor will rule any disruptive behavior, including shouting or derogatory statements or comments, out of order. Continuation of this type of behavior could result in a request by the Mayor that the individual leave the meeting, and if refused, an order of removal. In compliance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, no member of City Council may deliberate on citizen comments. (Attorney General Opinion –JC 0169)

4. CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE §551.415(b), the Mayor and each City Council member may announce city events/community interests and request that items be placed on future City Council agendas. “Items of Community Interest” include:

- expressions of thanks, congratulations, or condolences;
- information regarding holiday schedules;
- an honorary or salutary recognition of a public official, public employee, or other citizen, except that a discussion regarding a change in status of a person’s public office or public employment is not honorary or salutary recognition for purposes of this subdivision;
- a reminder about an upcoming event organized or sponsored by the governing body;
- information regarding a social, ceremonial, or community event organized or sponsored by an entity other than the governing body that was attended or is scheduled

- to be attended by a member of the governing body or an official or employee of the municipality or county; and
- announcements involving an imminent threat to the public health and safety of people in the municipality or county that has arisen after posting of the agenda

5. AGENDA ITEMS

5.1. Presentation / discussion - Update on Drainage Improvements - City Manager

5.2. Presentation / discussion - Building Permit Fee Schedule review - City Manager

5.3. Discussion - FY 2018-19 Budget - City Manager

6. ADJOURNMENT

Executive Sessions Authorized: This agenda has been reviewed and approved by the City's legal counsel and the presence of any subject in any Executive Session portion of the agenda constitutes a written interpretation of TEX. GOV'T CODE CHAPTER 551 by legal counsel for the governmental body and constitutes an opinion by the attorney that the items discussed therein may be legally discussed in the closed portion of the meeting considering available opinions of a court of record and opinions of the Texas Attorney General known to the attorney. This provision has been added to this agenda with the intent to meet all elements necessary to satisfy TEX. GOV'T CODE §551.144(c) and the meeting is conducted by all participants in reliance on this opinion.

The facility is wheelchair accessible and accessible parking spaces are also available in the front and sides of the building. The entry ramp is located in the front of the building. Sign interpretative services for meetings must be made 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Call the City Secretary at 210-493-3478 x240 or TDD 1-800-735-2989.

CERTIFICATION:

I, the undersigned authority, do hereby certify that the above Notice of Meeting was posted at Shavano City Hall, 900 Saddletree Court, a place convenient and readily accessible to the general public at all times, and said Notice was posted on the 3rd day of August 2018 at 10:15 a.m.

Zina Tedford
City Secretary

CITY COUNCIL STAFF SUMMARY

Meeting Date: August 8, 2018

Agenda item: 5.1

Prepared by: Bill Hill

Reviewed by: Bill Hill

AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION: Presentation / discussion – Update on Drainage Improvements - City Manager Hill

X

Attachments for Reference: 1) 5.1a KFW Task Order 6

BACKGROUND / HISTORY: After a presentation by staff in February, at the March 26, 2018 City Council Meeting the Council approved Ordinance O-2018-001. This Budget Amendment authorized \$564,188 from capital reserves to drainage projects in the City. The approved projects and engineering costs were:

Presented to Council February 26, 2018	
Engineer Planning	
KFW Engineering Task Order 4	\$63,307.00
KFW Engineering Task Order 5	\$78,700.00
KFW Engineering Task Order 6	\$118,000.00
Phase 1 & 2 Engineering costs	\$260,007.00
Construction	
Drainage Area 1 – Wagon Trail Depression	\$10,000.00
Drainage Area 2 – Kinnan Way Berm	\$21,400.00
Drainage Area 5 – Bent Oak Clearing	\$15,000.00
Drainage Area 12 – Chimney Rock	\$143,610.00
Drainage Area 12 – Fawn Drive	\$114,171.00
Phase 1 Execution costs	\$304,181.00
Total Drainage Transfer	\$564,188.00

DISCUSSION: In the past five months staff and KFW have made significant progress. As of August 1, 2018 progress achievements include:

- Kinnan Way Berm constructed and drainage ditches cleaned out by Bitterblue (no cost to City)
- Wagon Trail depression pump plans submitted to CPS – awaiting CPS approval
- Surveying, hydrological studies and 40% plans completed for culverts on Bent Oak, Chimney Rock and Windmill – progress underway on 95% plans
- Natural drainage gulley running from Bent Oak to NW Military cleared of all brush and debris
- Significant communication with residents led to determination that culverts on Cliffside and Fawn were not necessary; close coordination with residents regarding other proposed culvert on Bent Oak, Windmill and Fawn

However, by the end of the budget year not all projects and engineering approved in the March Budget Amendment will be complete. These include KFW Engineering Task Order 6 (preliminary engineering and partial survey for the three largest projects concerning Turkey Creek, Elm Spring / Bikeway and Munitract / Ripple Creek areas) and the construction of the culvert on Chimney Rock.

It is anticipated that bidding for construction of culverts on Bent Oak, Windmill and Chimney Rock can begin in October 2018 timeframe. In addition to the unspent monies for work not complete yet, staff have achieved significant savings from original approved scope by dropping costs associated with Cliffside & Fawn culverts as well as rigorous oversight of expenses.

The table below shows the approved Council items, actual expenses, savings achieved and finally projected costs for work in August – September before close of fiscal year. Finally this table shows fiscal year 2017-18 unspent capital reserves from the portion allocated by Council.

Engineer Planning	FY18 Approved Costs	Actual Expenses (as of 8/2/18)	Savings	Projected Costs Rest of FY18
KFW Engineering Task Order 4*	\$ 60,307.00	\$ 11,135.21	\$ 24,764.79	\$ 24,407.00
KFW Engineering Task Order 5	\$ 78,700.00	\$ 23,934.13	\$ 25,265.87	\$ 29,500.00
KFW Engineering Task Order 6	\$ 118,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
*Extra \$3,000 saved after staff noticed error in Task Order 4 before signing	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -
Phase 1 & 2 Engineering costs	\$ 260,007.00	\$ 35,069.34		\$ 53,907.00
Construction				
Drainage Area 1 – Wagon Trail Depression	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00
Drainage Area 2 – Kinnan Way Berm	\$ 21,400.00	\$ -	\$ 21,400.00	\$ -
Drainage Area 5 – Bent Oak Clearing	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -
Drainage Area 12 – Chimney Rock	\$ 143,610.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Drainage Area 12 – Fawn Drive	\$ 114,171.00	\$ -	\$ 114,171.00	\$ -
Phase 1 Execution costs	\$ 304,181.00	\$ 10,000.00		\$ 10,000.00
Totals	\$ 564,188.00	\$ 55,069.34	\$ 193,601.66	\$ 63,907.00
			Total Expenses FY18	\$ 118,976.34
			FY 18 Unspent (Approved Costs - Total Expenses)	\$ 445,211.66

For fiscal year 2018-2019 staff propose the completion of the three culverts on Bent Oak, Windmill and Chimney Rock (and associated engineering work in Task Order 10) as well as completion of KFW Task Order 6. The total cost of these projects is \$729,500 but with the projected unspent monies from this budget year, only an additional \$284,288 would require being released from drainage reserves.

FY19 Drainage Projects		
Construction Projects + Services	Cost	
Chimney Rock culvert* (Task Order #10)	\$ 183,000.00	*Updated figure from FY 18
Windmill culvert (Task Order #10)	\$ 164,500.00	
Bent Oak culvert (Task Order #10)	\$ 230,500.00	
KFW Engineering Task Order 10	\$ 33,500.00	
Total	\$ 611,500.00	
FY19 Planning - Continuing Requirements		
KFW Engineering Task Order 6	\$ 118,000.00	
Total	\$ 118,000.00	
Total	\$ 729,500.00	
Additional Monies Required FY 19 (FY 19 Projects - FY 18 Unspent)	\$ 284,288.34	

Note: Previous Task order funded a LWC on Fawn that is not proceeding. New Task Order 10 funds the construction of LWC on Windmill and Bent Oak.

COURSES OF ACTION: N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT: \$729,500 for the FY2018-19 Budget (Approximately \$445,212 are funds budgeted in FY 2017-18 and not spent).

MOTION REQUESTED: None; Request consensus to budget \$729,500 for the FY2018-19 Budget as described.

August 1, 2018

City of Shavano Park
Attn: Bill Hill
City Manager
900 Saddletree Court
Shavano Park, Texas 78231

Re: Proposal for Task Order #6
Preliminary Engineering – Areas 3, 4, and 4.2 (the “Project”)

Mr. Hill;

We appreciate this opportunity to provide you with a proposal for Professional Civil Engineering and Surveying Services on the project. Our proposed scope of services for the above-mentioned project is outlined below (the “Scope of Services”):

The previously prepared Master Drainage Plan was conducted a very high level to identify areas of drainage concerns and potential solutions. The solutions presented at that time were not fully vetted out. Each area requires additional analysis to further vet the proposed solution, identify other alternatives and determine the most appropriate solution for each area. City Council has requested further analysis on three areas identified in the Master Drainage Plan as Area 3 – Turkey Creek, Area 4 – Elm Spring, and Area 4.2 Munitract/Ripple Creek.

For each of these areas KFW will perform limited field survey to gather additional information to supplement the LiDAR data that was previously used. This survey data will be used to refine the hydraulic models to provide a more accurate representation of how runoff will flow during a design storm event. Using this model as a base line we will analysis up to 3 proposed alternatives to alleviate flooding. With each alternative we will perform a route analysis to determine approximate impact to adjacent properties, easement needs, utility conflicts, and prepare Opinions of Probably Construction Cost (OPCC). Based upon our findings KFW will provide a recommendation for which alternative we believe is most viable for detailed design consideration.

The deliverable for each area will include exhibits identifying schematic route of each alternative, updated hydrology and hydraulic models, utility conflict matrix, OPCC, and recommendations.

EXCLUSIONS

This proposal is specifically limited to the Scope of Services, with any and all other services or matters being expressly excluded. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing sentence, and by way of example only, the following items are assumed to be done by others and/or excluded from this proposal:

- Environmental and Geotechnical Reports
- Pavement types and design
- Structural design, including retaining walls
- Landscape, Lighting, and Irrigation Plans
- Tree ordinance compliance
- Platting services
- Storm drain detention design
- Construction documents
- Preparation of As-Built Drawings
- Design of a fire sprinkler system, hydraulic calculations, or a fire flow test
- Submittal for a SAWS Utility Service Agreement
- FEMA submittals
- Construction staking services
- Construction phase services
- Design of public utility extensions and drainage improvements
- Fire flow tests and hydraulic calculations will be billed as a direct expense.
- Exact service entrances and sizes for domestic water, fire lines, sanitary sewer, gas, and electric services will be provided by the Architect or MEP Engineer.
- All agency review and impact fees are to be provided by the client.
- Additional services requested by the client will be compensated by a negotiated lump sum fee. Additional services shall include, but are not limited to, any revisions to plans to accommodate revisions after computations are complete.

Fee Summary:

Area 3 – Turkey Creek	\$67,000
Area 4 – Elm Spring	\$27,000
Area 4.2 – Munitract/Ripple Creek	<u>\$24,000</u>

Total Lump Sum Fee: **\$118,000**

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

The basis of compensation for the Scope of Services will be a lump sum fee invoiced monthly by percentage of completeness of each task. A fee of **\$118,000** is the cost of the Scope of Services. This budget does not include any other services or matters, including, without limitation, applicable tax or direct expenses for reprographics, travel, express mail, courier services, or any required sub-consultant services not covered under the Scope of Services. Direct expenses will be invoiced monthly with a 10% markup. Any and all other terms and conditions related to this proposal will be included in the Professional Services Agreement attached hereto and incorporated for all purposes herein.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this proposal and work with you on the Project. If this proposal meets with your approval, please sign and return an executed copy of the attached Professional Services Agreement.

Sincerely,
KFW Engineers



Christopher Otto, P.E., C.F.M
Director of Infrastructure Services

I hereby accept this proposal and authorize the execution of the scope of services presented herein under the terms of the current Professional Services Agreement between The City of Shavano park and KFW Engineers and all modification hereto.

TASK ORDER APPROVAL
Bill Hill, City Manager

DATE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF SUMMARY

Meeting Date: August 8, 2018

Agenda item: 5.2

Prepared by: Curtis Leeth

Reviewed by: Bill Hill

AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION: Presentation / discussion - Building Permit Fee Schedule review - City Manager



Attachments for Reference: 1)

BACKGROUND / HISTORY: At the June 25, 2018 City Council meeting, Council directed staff to review the current fees in comparison to other cities with consideration of a cap on existing residential structures on certain fees.

DISCUSSION:

ANALYSIS. City staff began their review of the fees by analyzing the difference between the Residential and Commercial valuation tables. The Fee schedule establishes the following:

Shavano Park		Shavano Park	
Residential		Commercial	
Valuation	Fee	Valuation	Fee
> \$2,000	\$50	> \$500	\$50
\$2,001 - \$5,000	\$100	\$500.01 - \$2,000	\$25 for first \$500 + \$3.00 for each \$1000
\$5,001—\$8,000	\$200	\$2,001 –\$25,000	\$70 for \$2,000 + \$14 for each \$1000
\$8,001—\$12,000	\$300		
\$12,001—\$18,000	\$400		
\$18,001—\$25,000	\$500		
\$25,001—\$50,000	\$750	\$25,001 – \$50,000	\$400 for \$25,000 + \$10 for each \$1000
\$50,001—\$100,000	\$1,000	\$50,001—\$100,000	\$650 for \$50,000 + \$7 for each \$1000
\$100,001—\$500,000	\$1,000 for first \$100,000 + \$5.60 for each \$1000	\$100,001—\$500,000	\$1000 for \$100,000 + \$5.60 for each \$1000
\$500,001—\$1M	\$3,250 for first \$500,000 + \$4.75 for each \$1000	\$500,001—\$1M	\$3,250 for \$500,000 + \$4.75 for each \$1000
\$1,000,001—\$2M	\$5,610 for first \$1M + \$3.65 for each \$1000	\$1,000,001 <	\$5,610 for \$1M + \$3.65 for each \$1000
\$2,000,001 and up	\$9,260 for first \$2M + \$3.65 for each \$1000		

The residential table uses a series of flat fees in smaller valuation brackets while the commercial fee schedule uses a progressive fee increase system based upon every \$1,000 in value within larger valuation brackets. Staff tested random permit values to see the impact of these two different valuation tables.

Testing - Shavano Commercial vs Residential					
Valuation	Commercial Fee	Residential Fee	Red = Residential paying more		
\$ 200.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	Blue = Commercial paying more		
\$ 600.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00			
\$ 2,500.00	\$ 87.00	\$ 100.00			
\$ 4,800.00	\$ 112.00	\$ 100.00			
\$ 7,200.00	\$ 154.00	\$ 200.00			
\$ 9,500.00	\$ 182.00	\$ 300.00			
\$ 11,800.00	\$ 210.00	\$ 300.00			
\$ 14,900.00	\$ 252.00	\$ 400.00			
\$ 20,200.00	\$ 336.00	\$ 500.00			
\$ 24,900.00	\$ 392.00	\$ 500.00			
\$ 27,300.00	\$ 420.00	\$ 750.00			
\$ 37,100.00	\$ 530.00	\$ 750.00			
\$ 49,200.00	\$ 650.00	\$ 750.00			
\$ 79,200.00	\$ 860.00	\$ 1,000.00			
\$ 89,300.00	\$ 930.00	\$ 1,000.00			
\$ 97,000.00	\$ 979.00	\$ 1,000.00			
\$100K - \$500K fees the same					
\$500K - \$1M fees the same			\$2M + bracket is no benefit to residents		
\$1M - \$2M fees the same					
\$ 2,340,800.00	\$ 10,504.65	\$ 10,504.65			
\$ 6,000,000.00	\$ 23,860.00	\$ 23,860.00			

The flat fee structure causes residential permit fees to be higher at almost all valuations. However, after \$100,000 the valuation scales are the same and staff determined the additional \$2M + bracket is of no benefit to residents.

Next staff compared the commercial valuation table to five other cities to determine if the commercial valuations were excessive or reasonable. The Cities of Helotes, Castle Hills and Leon Valley use the same valuation brackets, so comparison between Shavano and those cities was easily accomplished by comparing the valuation scales directly without testing of valuations. Staff created a simple “Higher or Lower” comparison for these cities.

Shavano vs Other Cities with same brackets			
Valuation	Helotes	Castle Hills	Leon Valley
> \$500	Lower	Higher	Higher
\$500.01 - \$2,000	Higher	Higher	Higher
\$2,001 – \$25,000	Higher	Higher	Lower
\$25,001 – \$50,000	Higher	Higher	Lower
\$50,001–\$100,000	Higher	Higher	Lower
\$100,001–\$500,000	Higher	Higher	Lower
\$500,001–\$1M	Higher	Higher	Lower
\$1,000,001 <	Higher	Higher	Lower
Green = Comparison City Fees Lower than Shavano			
Red = Comparison City Fees Higher than Shavano			

As you can see Helotes and Castle Hills fees are generally higher than Shavano's while Leon Valley is generally lower in fees than Shavano Park. The next step staff took was the test the City's commercial fees against the cities of Alamo Heights and Fair Oaks Ranch who used different valuation brackets and therefore required detailed testing of different valuations:

Testing - Shavano vs Other Cities with different brackets			
Valuation	Shavano Commercial	Alamo Heights	Fair Oaks Ranch
\$ 200.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 25.00
\$ 600.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 25.00
\$ 2,500.00	\$ 87.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 35.13
\$ 4,800.00	\$ 112.00	\$ 144.00	\$ 50.65
\$ 7,200.00	\$ 154.00	\$ 216.00	\$ 66.85
\$ 9,500.00	\$ 182.00	\$ 285.00	\$ 82.38
\$ 14,900.00	\$ 252.00	\$ 398.00	\$ 116.38
\$ 20,200.00	\$ 336.00	\$ 504.00	\$ 149.50
\$ 24,900.00	\$ 392.00	\$ 598.00	\$ 178.88
\$ 27,300.00	\$ 420.00	\$ 646.00	\$ 192.73
\$ 37,100.00	\$ 530.00	\$ 842.00	\$ 249.08
\$ 49,200.00	\$ 650.00	\$ 1,084.00	\$ 318.65
\$ 79,200.00	\$ 860.00	\$ 1,392.00	\$ 474.45
\$ 89,300.00	\$ 930.00	\$ 1,493.00	\$ 522.43
\$ 185,700.00	\$ 1,481.60	\$ 2,359.05	\$ 937.48
\$ 370,000.00	\$ 2,512.00	\$ 3,895.00	\$ 1,720.75
\$ 580,000.00	\$ 3,630.00	\$ 5,560.00	\$ 2,573.25
\$ 1,300,000.00	\$ 6,705.00	\$ 10,150.00	\$ 5,273.25
\$ 2,340,800.00	\$ 10,504.65	\$ 15,874.40	\$ 9,176.25
\$ 6,000,000.00	\$ 23,860.00	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 22,898.25
\$ 12,000,000.00	\$ 45,760.00	\$ 68,000.00	\$ 45,398.25
Green = Comparison City Fees Lower than Shavano			
Red = Comparison City Fees Higher than Shavano			

This final comparison shows that Alamo Heights permit fees are more expensive than Shavano while Leon Valley's fees are lower.

In summary three of the five tested cities have permit fees higher than Shavano, while two have lower permit fees.

OPTIONS: Staff provides two optional changes to the building permit fee schedule to lower costs for residents.

OPTION 1: Remove the residential fee valuation table in Fee Schedule and make commercial fee schedule the universal fee schedule. It will save residents money almost universally from staff testing; average savings for residents is 31% with this change.

Note that this change would only benefits residents with permit fees under \$100,000 in valuation. Staff analysis showed that beyond the \$100,000 bracket the two valuation tables were equivalent. Only 39 of 401 residential permits between August 1, 2017 – August 1, 2018 were above \$100,000 in value and of those 39 permits, 23 were new residential constructions. Staff project the vast majority of residents will benefit with this change.

OPTION 2: Add three specified fees for fence, driveway and patio / deck projects. Some of the proposed flat fee's justifications are included and a caveat of how residents would benefit. A flat fee has some disadvantages to a valuation scheme:

Permit	Cost	Staff Costs	Who Benefits?
Fence	\$100	plan review; minimal inspection	only if \$5k or more would residents benefit
Driveway	\$150	2 inspections - pre-pour & final	only if \$5k or more would residents benefit
Patio / Deck	\$150	2 inspections - pre-pour & final	only if \$5k or more would residents benefit

These specified permits are present in other cities as surveyed by staff and are all considered relatively small-scale residential projects with minimal complexity in plan review and inspection. In addition, the average valuation of fence, driveway and patio / deck projects permitted from August 1, 2017 – August 1, 2018 are above the threshold of benefiting. Staff predict majority of residents will see a benefit from these fees and projects a revenue loss for the City.

Staff did not analyze the implementation of a cap of fees for existing structures after seeing revenues reduction from three recommendations and dramatic lowering of fees for most residential permits.

COURSES OF ACTION: N/A

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Financial impact is as follows. Projections based upon permit data from August 1, 2017 – August 1, 2018.

- Staff project a **\$35,000 decrease in revenues** if the commercial building permit fee schedule is adopted as a universal permit fee schedule. Staff can show projection analysis if requested.

- Staff project a **\$6,300 decrease in revenues** if the three specified fees are adopted. Staff can show projection analysis if requested.

Total projected revenue decline: **\$41,300 decrease in revenues**

MOTION REQUESTED: N/A. Provide guidance to staff.