

MINUTES

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

JANUARY 21, 2020

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum

The Parker City Council met in a regular meeting on the above date at Parker City Hall, 5700 E. Parker Road, Parker, Texas, 75002.

Mayor Lee Pettle called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. Councilmembers Diana M. Abraham (departed at 9:02 p.m.), Cindy Meyer, Ed Standridge and Patrick Taylor (arrived at 7:40 p.m.) were present. Councilmember Edwin Smith was absent.

Staff Present: City Administrator Luke Olson, Asst. City Administrator/City Secretary Patti Scott Grey, Finance/H.R. Manager Grant Savage, City Attorney Brandon Shelby (arrived at 7:40 p.m.), Public Works Director Gary Machado, City Engineer Craig M. Kerkhoff, P.E., C.F.M., Fire Chief Mike Sheff, and Police Chief Richard Brooks

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AMERICAN PLEDGE: Michael Slaughter led the pledge.

TEXAS PLEDGE: Ling Shurtz led the pledge.

Mayor Pettle moved to “Items of Community Interest” next and reviewed the following items:

ITEMS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST

- PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION (P&R) – WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2020, 6 PM
(Tentative 2020 Calendar)
- HOME RULE CHARTER COMMISSION (HRCC) –TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2020, 7:00 PM
(Tentative 2020 Calendar)
- REMINDER - March 3, 2020 – Primary Election

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Feb 16	Feb 17 <i>President's Day</i>	Feb 18 Early Voting 8am–5pm	Feb 19 Early Voting 8am–5pm	Feb 20 Early Voting 8am–5pm	Feb 21 Early Voting 8am–5pm	Feb 22 Early Voting 7am–7pm
Feb 23 Early Voting 1pm–6pm	Feb 24 Early Voting 7am–7pm	Feb 25 Early Voting 7am–7pm	Feb 26 Early Voting 7am–7pm	Feb 27 Early Voting 7am–7pm	Feb 28 Early Voting 7am–7pm	Feb 29

- REMINDER – May 2, 2020 – General Election (EV and ED Info)

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Apr 19	Apr 20 Early Voting 8am to 5pm	Apr 21 Early Voting 8am to 5pm	Apr 22 Early Voting 8am to 5pm	Apr 23 Early Voting 8am to 7pm	Apr. 24 Early Voting 8am to 5pm	Apr. 25 Early Voting 8am to 5pm
Apr 26	Apr 27 Early Voting 7am to 7pm	Apr 28 Early Voting 7am to 7pm	Apr 29	Apr 30	May 1	May 2 Election Day 7am to 7pm

- PROJECTED 2020 TAX RATE PLANNING CALENDAR

PUBLIC COMMENTS The City Council invites any person with business before the Council to speak. No formal action may be taken on these items at this meeting. Please keep comments to 3 minutes.

Mayor Pettle asked if anyone wanted to make public comments on any other subject than the proposed municipal complex. Hearing none, she asked everyone to hold their public comments until the item on the proposed municipal complex, Item #7 on tonight's agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA Routine Council business. Consent Agenda is approved by a single majority vote. Items may be removed for open discussion by a request from a Councilmember or member of staff.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 17, 2019. [SCOTT GREY]
2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 30, 2019. [SCOTT GREY]
3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR JANUARY 7, 2020. [SCOTT GREY]
4. DEPARTMENT REPORTS – COURT, POLICE AND WEBSITE

MOTION: Councilmember Standridge moved to approve consent agenda items 1 through 4, as presented. Councilmember Abraham seconded with Councilmembers Abraham, Meyer, and Standridge voting for the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS

5. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND/OR ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION ON CANCELING/RESCHEDULING THE FEBRUARY 18, 2020 (DUE TO 3/3 PRIMARY EARLY VOTING) AND MARCH 3, 2020 (DUE TO 3/3 PRIMARY ELECTION DAY VOTING) REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS. [PETTLE]

There was discussion on whether Council wanted to cancel, relocate and/or reschedule City Council meetings, February 18, 2020 and/or March 3, 2020, due to March 3, 2020 Early and Election Day voting equipment in the City Council Chambers.

MOTION: Councilmember Abraham moved to cancel both the February 18th and March 3 City Council meetings, due to the March 3, 2020 Primary Early Voting and Election Day voting equipment in Council Chambers. Council further stated if the need arose Council would meet in another location after being duly posted. Councilmember Meyer seconded with Abraham, Meyer, and Standridge voting for the motion. Motion carried 3-0.

6. CONSIDERATION AND/OR ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION ON KINGSBRIDGE PHASE II FINAL PLAT. [BIRKHOFF/MACHADO]

Developer Randy McCuistion, P.E., Vice President – Construction of The Cambridge Companies 8750 N. Central Expressway, Ste. 1735, reviewed the project.

City Administrator Olson said City Engineer Craig M. Kerkhoff, P.E., C.F.M. was present for questions and City Engineer John Birkhoff, P.E.'s letter, dated January 10, 2020, indicated all "previous items of work to complete the project have been satisfactory completed" and they "offer no further comments."

Councilmember Meyer inquired about drainage issues.

Public Works Director Machado and Developer McCuistion indicated drainage would be carried east and away. The drainage issues have been addressed and there should be no negative impact on Moss Ridge Subdivision.

On January 16, 2020, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the Kingsbridge Phase II Final Plat 5-0.

MOTION: Councilmember Standridge moved to approve Kingsbridge Phase II Final Plat as presented. Councilmember Abraham seconded with Councilmembers Abraham, Meyer, and Standridge voting for the motion. Motion carried 3-0. (See Exhibit 1 – Kingsbridge Phase II Final Plat, dated January 20, 2020.)

7. DISCUSSION AND OR ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION ON PROPOSED MUNICIPAL COMPLEX. [PETTLE]

Ling Shurtz, 4004 Dublin Road, stated she was in support of the proposed municipal complex and had questions regarding bond repayments. Mayor Pettle said Finance/HR Manager Savage would be able to answer questions and/or Bond Counsel would review information in an upcoming council meeting for the bond election.

Billy Barron, 6707 Overbrook Drive, said he is in favor of the proposed municipal complex and thought the complex would be good for the City. Mr. Barron suggested Council review funding needs and consider increasing the city's sales tax to provide funding for the project.

Cleburne Raney, 7000 Audubon Drive, said he supported the project and thanked everyone involved. Mr. Raney said our current Police Department facility does not meet basic safety and security standards and is unattractive, while the current City Hall needs many ongoing repairs and has space/storage and structural issues. A new Municipal Complex is essential. He said while he is not in favor of increasing the tax rate, he believes it is necessary to support a bond to pay for the municipal complex. Finally, Mr. Raney encouraged residents to support the proposed municipal complex.

Terry Lynch, 5809 Middleton Drive, did not support the proposed municipal complex in its current size, stating it does not "focus on the needs and includes a lot of wants." (See Exhibit 2 – Terry Lynch's handout, dated January 21, 2020.)

Mayor Pettle read Andy Redmond's email into the record. Mr. Redmond, 7275 Moss Ridge Road, expressed his concerns, regarding of Item # 7, proposed municipal complex, urging City Council to "vote NO regarding the proposed City of Parker Municipal Complex." (See Exhibit 3 – Andy Redmond's email, dated January 21, 2020.)

Mayor Pettle read Z Marshall's email into the record. Mr. Marshall, 7003 Audubon Drive, expressed his support, regarding Item # 7, proposed municipal complex, stating he is "very much in favor of moving forward with the new proposed Municipal Complex. This will be a ONE time legacy project that will handle all of our current needs and should handle our future needs for our great City." (See Exhibit 4 – Z Marshall's email, dated January 20, 2020.)

Councilmember Meyer said the comments from the Town Hall meeting should be processed and considered before the proposed municipal complex plans are completed. City Council agreed. Ms. Meyer said she is concerned with the width of the hallways; lack of open office space, which, if a more open spaced concept is used, could be less expensive and easier to adjust to future needs; the bump outs in the rear and front of the building, should be incorporated into the overall plan for a more rectangular building shape and cost savings; and too many offices in the Police Department.

Councilmember Abraham inquired whether grouping employees with similar jobs in open spaces would be a cost savings or if this is even possible, as some jobs may have confidentiality requirements.

Councilmember Meyer said she also supports Ms. Lynch's plan of splitting up the project, so Parker residents vote on each portion, the City Hall, the community building, and the pavilion/playground. Mayor Pettle and Mayor Pro Tem Standridge opposed the idea of splitting up the proposed municipal complex on the ballot, as they said the project was presented to everyone as a municipal complex, a campus, and not as separate pieces. Further, it was priced as one (1) complex, making it difficult to split the costs. There is some cost savings in sharing construction, labor and material cost and having three (3) separate bonds would be confusing. Attorney Shelby said it would be difficult to get clear, easily understandable language for the ballot and bond counsel may object.

Architect Kent Spurgin, Spurgin & Associate Architects, 103 W Louisiana St, McKinney, Texas, addressed concerns, stating he did not believe \$700 per square foot is accurate (in response to Andy Redmond's email – Exhibit 3); it was more like \$583 per square foot depending on what is included and \$250 to \$350 per square foot without site development, furnishings, Information Technology (IT), Audio Visual (AV), security systems, but he would have to get a detailed list of inclusions/exclusions to determine accurately. Mr. Spurgin stated the hallways are five (5) feet wide to comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations as he demonstrated the width it would take for a person in a wheelchair to pass in the hallway, two (2) people shoulder-to-shoulder to pass comfortably, and or a door to swing open for wheelchair or person passing in the hallway. He stated there may be some cost savings using cubicles versus offices with doors, but noted there would need to be enough structure to span the area; interior walls are movable as long as they are not load bearing; and to acquire the type of cubicles needed for proper sound buffer for confidentiality of certain positions and the proper furnishings for those cubicles. Ultimately, these options might provide some savings, but at what cost. Mr. Spurgin said he would work with Council to review options and any revisions accordingly.

Councilmember Meyer inquired as to whether revisions could still be made after tonight's vote to move forward with the project. Attorney Shelby indicated the revisions and changes could be made until the project is completed, the building was built.

City Administrator Olson noted if City Staff moved into the new facility tomorrow, it would be 75% full. There needs to be enough room to have some growth.

Mayor Pettle and City Administrator Olson said the City would seek grants and creative ways to fund the project such as "selling name pavers" among other things. Mr. Olson also indicated he believes, with his experience of building municipal facilities while employed with other cities, the project should be built as one (1) municipal complex, not in pieces/sections, and it would be beneficial to use a Construction Manager a Risk (CMAR). Mr. Olson asked Mr. Spurgin to elaborate. Mr. Spurgin clarified, stating a CMAR would be hired by the City to oversee the bidding processes for labor, materials, contracts, construction, and/or any other items with the project. The CMAR would be authorized to negotiate for, not always the lowest, but best, most efficient costs/solutions for materials, labor and so forth for the

project. The CMAR is charged with cost saving solutions and those cost savings are returned to the City.

MOTION: Councilmember Standridge moved to authorize and direct City Staff to move forward with the bond election for the proposed Municipal Complex. Councilmember Taylor seconded with Councilmembers Abraham, Meyer, Standridge, and Taylor voting for the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

ROUTINE ITEMS

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

UPDATE(S):

- HOME RULE CHARTER COMMISSION (HRCC) [PETTLE]

Mayor Pettle reported the Home Rule Charter Commission (HRCC) has continued its discussion on forms of government and the duties of the mayor and manager, using HRCC Vice Chair Kercho's Excel spreadsheet. The Mayor noted the next HRCC meeting will be held February 11, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall and those meetings are open to the public.

- DRAINAGE COMMITTEE [MEYER]

Mayor Pettle said the Drainage Committee update will be on the next agenda to give Councilmember Meyer additional time to prepare, due to working on the proposed municipal complex project.

- EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS [ABRAHAM]

Mayor Pettle said the Emergency Communications update will be on the next agenda to give Councilmember Abraham additional time to prepare, due to working on the proposed municipal complex project.

- PUMP STATION [OLSON/MACHADO]

City Administrator Olson said all the paperwork for the second pump station has been submitted to North Texas Municipal Water District (NTMWD) for approval. The City must have final approval before moving forward with the project.

- ACCEPTANCE OF CITY OF PARKER VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT DONATION(S) FOR THE RECORD [PETTLE]

- Paul & Nancy Vermeer - Check #6022 - \$500.00

Mayor Pettle and City Council accepted Paul and Nancy Vermeer's donation in the amount of \$500 for the Parker Volunteer Fire Department and thanked them for their generous donation.

Mayor Pettle asked if there were any items to be added to the future agenda. Hearing none, she encouraged everyone to email her any requests. She noted the next regularly scheduled meeting would be Tuesday, February 4, 2020.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

- Pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 551, Texas Government Code, Vernon's Texas Codes Annotated the City Council may hold a closed meeting.

9. RECESS TO CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AUTHORITY CONTAINED IN:

- a. Government Code Section 551.074 Personnel—To deliberate the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal of a public officer or employee.

- b. Government Code Section 551.071(1)—Consultation with City Attorney concerning Pending or Contemplated Litigation.
- c. Government Code Section 551.071(2) – Consultation with Attorney on a matter in which the duty of the attorney to the governmental body under the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of Texas Clearly conflicts with this chapter (Open Meetings Act).

Mayor Lee Pettle recessed the regular meeting to Executive Session at 8:31 p.m.

Councilmember Abraham departed at 9:02 p.m.

10. RECONVENE REGULAR MEETING.

Mayor Lee Pettle reconvened the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

11. ANY APPROPRIATE DELIBERATION AND/OR ACTION ON ANY OF THE EXECUTIVE SESSION SUBJECTS LISTED ABOVE.

No action was taken.

12. ADJOURN

Mayor Lee Pettle adjourned the meeting at 9:12 p.m.



ATTESTED:



Patti Scott Grey, City Secretary

APPROVED:



Mayor Lee Pettle

Approved on the 4th day
of February, 2020.

**FINAL PLAT
KINGSBRIDGE PHASE II**

ABSTRACT NO. 394
CITY OF PARKER, COLLIN COUNTY, TEXAS

Kimley-Horn
Oklahoma Drive, Suite 105

Celine, TX 75069		Scale 1" = 100'	Drawn by SEP	Checked by KHA	Date 1/20/2020	Project No. 062324242	Sheet No. 1 OF 2
FIRM # 10194603				Tel. No. (468) 801-2220			
OWNER: Estate At Creekside Park I, LLC 8750 N. Central Expressway Suite 1735 Dallas, Texas 75231 Phone: 214-581-2556 Contact: Jim Melino							

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. Copyright © 2018

OWNERS' DEDICATION

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF COLLIN §

WHEREAS ESTATES AT CREEKSIDE PARKER I, LLC, is the rightful owner of a tract of land situated in the L.M. Marshall Survey, Abstract No. 594, City of Parker, Collin County, Texas and being the same title as that tract of land conveyed to Estates at Creekside Parker I, LLC, according to the document filed in Instrument Number 201811060001380200, Office Public Records Collin County, Texas and being further described as follows:

Beginning at a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "BUR" found in the east line of Moss Ridge Estates, an addition to the City of Parker according to the plat filed in record in Cabinet D, Slide 156, Plat Records Collin County, Texas, said iron rod being the southwest corner of lot 8, block 2, of the extending Plat for Kingsbridge, Phase I an addition to the City of Parker, Collin County, Texas according to the plat filed in record in Cabinet 2015, Slide 461, Plat Records Collin County, Texas.

THENCE with the south line of said Phase I the following eleven (11) courses and distances:

North 89°23'05" East, a distance of 190.4 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" found at the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the left having a central angle of 67°20'35", a radius of 60.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of South 55°02'13" East, 55' 54" feet;

With said curve to the left, an arc distance of 58.88 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

North 86°13'40" East, a distance of 153.82 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

South 07°23'52" East, a distance of 13.07 feet to a 28' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

North 89°35'02" East, a distance of 60.00 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

North 07°23'52" West, a distance of 14.61 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

South 08°13'40" East, a distance of 153.22 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

North 08°13'40" East, a distance of 385.00 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "BUR" found for a corner;

South 14°46'20" East, a distance of 1260.00 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "BUR" found for a corner;

South 14°46'20" East, a distance of 185.00 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "BUR" found for a corner;

North 88°13'40" East, a distance of 231.41 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "BUR" found for corner in the west line of Jeffrey Drive;

THENCE with the west line of said Jeffrey Drive the following seven (7) courses and distances:

South 19°03'45" West, a distance of 349.42 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner at the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the left having a central angle of 45°39", a radius of 356.20 feet, a chord bearing and distance of North 78°13'41" West, 46°46'46" West;

With said curve to the left, an arc distance of 48.50 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner;

South 12°16'07" West, a distance of 60.06 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner at the beginning of a non-tangent curve to the right having a central angle of 73°48", a radius of 295.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of South 76°45'42" East, 39.17° West;

With said curve to the right, an arc distance of 1139.20 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner at the beginning of a tangent curve to the left having a central angle of 33°20'51", a radius of 590.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of South 22°18' West, 247.95 feet;

With said curve to the left, an arc distance of 251.52 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner at the beginning of a reverse curve to the right having a central angle of 10°33'48", a radius of 295.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of South 8°50'0" East, 56.18 feet;

With said curve to the right, an arc distance of 60.06 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for a corner in the northeast line of Creekside Estates, Phase VIII, according to the plat filed of record in Cabinet 2016, Slide 288, Plat Records Collin County, Texas, said iron rod being the most southerly southwest corner of the above mentioned Phase I;

THENCE South 88°13'35" West, with said north line, a distance of 152.62 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for the northwest corner of said Phase VIII;

THENCE South 14°49'05" East, with a west line of said Phase VIII, a distance of 205.07 feet to a 112' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "CBG SURVEYING" found for a corner at an angle in said west line, said iron rod being common with the most westerly northeast corner of Creekside Estates Phase VI, an addition to the City of Parker according to the plat filed of record in Cabinet 2013, Slide 406, Plat Records Collin County, Texas;

THENCE South 88°00'57" West, with a north line of said Phase VI, a distance of 450.00 feet to a 58' iron rod with plastic cap stamped "KHA" set for the northeast corner of McCauley Creek Estates, Phase II, an addition to the City of Parker according to the plat filed of record in Volume 2012, Page 87, Plat Record Collin County, Texas and being common with the southwest corner of the above mentioned Moss Ridge Estates and the northwest corner of said Phase VI;

THENCE North 07°24'13" West, with the east line of said Moss Ridge Estates, a distance of 1495.73 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING and containing 44.435 acres of land, more or less.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS.

That I, Sean Patton, do hereby certify that I prepared this plat and the field notes made a part thereof from an actual and accurate survey of the land and that the corner instruments shown thereon were properly placed under my personal supervision, in accordance with the subdivision regulations of the City of Parker, Texas.



Sean Patton,
Registered Professional Land Surveyor No. 5680
Kiley and Associates, Inc.
400 North Olafson Dr., Ste. 105
Collin, Texas 75019
Phone: 468-501-2200

Given under my hand and seal this _____ day of _____ 2020.

Notary Public, State of Texas

Notary Public, State of Texas

That, TESTATES AT CREEKSIDE PARKER I, LLC, do hereby adopt this plat designating the herein described property as KINGSBRIDGE PHASE I, an addition to the City of Parker, Collin County, Texas, and does hereby reserve the pavement strips shown on this plat for the mutual use and accommodations of all public utilities desiring to use same. Any public utility shall have the right to remove and keep removed all or part of any building, fence, trees, shrubs or other growths or improvements in any way endangering or interfering with the construction, maintenance, or efficiency of its respective system on any such easement strips, and any public utility shall, at all times, have the right of ingress and egress to and from and upon the said easement strips for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, inspection, patrolling, maintaining and/or keeping in repair all or part of its respective system without the necessity at any time procuring permission or anyone.

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared James J. Melito, President of LLC Manager, Inc., a Texas corporation, as Manager of Estates at Creekside Parker I, LLC, a Texas limited liability company, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same to the purpose and consideration therein expressed, in the capacity thereintended.

APPROVED AND ACCEPTED
City Administrator, Luke Olson
City of Parker, Texas

Given under my hand and seal of office this _____ day of _____ 2020.

Public Works Director, Gary Machado
City of Parker, Texas

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF DALLAS §

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared James J. Melito, President of LLC Manager, Inc., a Texas corporation, as Manager of Estates at Creekside Parker I, LLC, a Texas limited liability company, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she executed the same to the purpose and consideration therein expressed, in the capacity thereintended.

APPROVED AND ACCEPTED
City Administrator, Luke Olson
City of Parker, Texas

Given under my hand and seal of office this _____ day of _____ 2020.

Notary Public, State of Texas

My Commission Expires: _____

FINAL PLAT
KINGSBRIDGE PHASE II

44.435 ACRES

28 RESIDENTIAL LOTS

L.M. MARSHALL SURVEY,
ABSTRACT NO. 594
CITY OF PARKER, COLLIN COUNTY, TEXAS

Kimley»Horn
400 N. Olafson Drive, Suite 105
Collin, TX 75028
FIRM # 10194533
Tel. No. (469) 501-2200
Project No. 062224212
Sheet No. 2 Of 2

Scale	Drawn By	Checked By	Date
N/A	SEP	KHA	1/20/2020

OWNER:
Estates At Creekside Parker I, LLC
8790 N. Central Expressway
Suite 125
Dallas, Texas 75231
Phone: 214-491-2556
Contract: Jim Helton
APPLICANT:
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
400 N. Olafson Drive, Suite 105
Dallas, Texas 75231
Phone: 972-335-5500
Contract: Todd Hanley, P.E.

Terry Lynch ~ 5809 Middleton Dr.

Addressing Proposed Municipal Complex

This proposed “municipal complex” doesn’t focus on the needs and includes a lot of wants. The result will be more costs than it should to be paid by residents today and in the future.

I would like to address each of the three main areas of the proposed Complex and then offer my suggestions.

The municipal building proposed, while less than previously proposed is still more than three (3) times the size of the existing space (20,812 Proposed vs. 6,688 Existing (4,000 administration + 2,688 police)). This plan dedicates a lot of space to administrative and police personnel that we do not have now and may never have. It also reflects offices for majority of personnel.

The purpose of the 3,397 square foot community center is unclear?

It has been suggested that this building could be used for elections, but couldn’t the elections be done in the lobby of the new municipal building?

Additionally, couldn’t the 90 guest council chamber be used for things such as promotion ceremonies, town halls and other forums?

If there are other defined purposes, has there been a cost benefit analysis for this?

I love parks but as Parker residents we enjoy large lots. With that we have a place to get fresh air and exercise along with a place to invite friends and neighbors to join us as we wish. Should we force our residents to pay for a park facility that they may not use?

My suggestion is to pare down the proposal to include only NEEDS:

- Eliminate the community center and park expansion from the current proposal.
- Lessen the size of the proposed municipal building - decrease the number of personnel anticipated and utilize open spaces with cubicles - Businesses have used this approach for a long time. It takes up less space and is a more efficient and cost effective way of building for now and the future.

- Direct the city to create an initiative to solicit (No Strings Attached) Grants and Donations to build the envisioned “Park” space. In it, consider selling “naming” rights to fund the facility? The residents will still end up paying for the ongoing maintenance of the expanded park, but if done correctly the additions can be done with low maintenance and low cost in mind.

If the council decides to move forward with the full complex, I suggest the vote be split into the three main aspects so that residents can make the final decision on cost they are willing to endure and what pieces the actual project will include.

From: Andy Redmond [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 4:04 PM
To: Patti Grey <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]
Subject: Citizen Input, 1/21/2020 Council Meeting

Hello Ms. Patti:

Could you share this with Mayor Pettle and Council, as I will be unable to attend the meeting tonite.
>>

Hello Mayor Pettle and Council:

I'm Andy Redmond of 7275 Moss Ridge Rd.

I would urge each of you to vote NO regarding the proposed City of Parker Municipal Complex.

- The revised proposal works out to \$700 per sq. ft. (information sheet: 1/15/2020)
- Contrast the City of Murphy's complex: (per my email with Mr. Mike Castro, City of Murphy—City Manager)

2003 Construction at \$15, 512, 800 (included—City Hall at 17, 115 sq. ft; Fire Dept. @21,200 sq. ft.; Police Department @ 22,800 sq. ft. and Public Works @ 8,225= 69, 340 sq. ft.)

Costs per sq. ft. = \$223.72.

City of Murphy employee count (2019): 123 employees.

- Building costs have escalated in 17 years, but good commercial construction is still available for \$250 to \$275 per sq. ft.
- Perhaps consider an interview of Murphy residents, many I know yet complain about the this 2003 bond/expenditure. Likewise consider previous Parker "town hall meetings" and council meetings; which similarly reflect low citizen/voter support of such a complex or expenditure.
- The difference between Murphy (17,000+ residents at 2010 census) and Parker (perhaps 3,500 in 2010) is stark.

Unless future generations make changes to Parker's zoning, lot size etc. Need for Murphy-like infrastructure will never be necessary, nor is it desired!

I would urge each of you to assess our current facilities and certainly maintain and/or repair them to make it an affordable solution for many years to come.

Thanks for your time and consideration!

Regards,
Andy Redmond

-----Original Message-----

From: Z Marshall <zmarshall@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 11:32 AM
To: Patti Grey <PGrey@parkertexas.us>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: New Municipal Complex

Patti

Please include this in the Public Comments for the 1-21-2020 meeting. Also, please email to all Council today.

Thank you.

To Mayor & City Council:

I am very much in favor of moving forward with the new proposed Municipal Complex.

This will be a ONE time legacy project that will handle all of our current needs and should handle our future needs for our great City.

I do not feel we should do this in phases. I think it is important to remember that this is one of the few projects that will benefit All of the Citizens of Parker and not just for one neighborhood area or special needs for a particular project.

No one likes to have their taxes raised, but that is the basis for any taxing entity function. Citizens pay for services provided by those taxing authorities. Even with a 5 cent increase, our tax rate will still be relatively low compared to other cities in Collin County.

With our current growth, our future needs, and very aged and dated facilities, we need new facilities for our staff and excellent Police Department.

Our residents have also wanted a community center and green space options for our families to enjoy.

It is mandatory that we bring our Police Station up to required standards for their facilities. This is similar to what we did 12 years ago with our Fire Department. They had outgrown their facilities with old inefficient space and we did what needed to be done.

We just have to do this for our Police Department.

We are much better as a City, to

continue to have our Police Department housed in temporary space, that does not meet required public safety building standards. We did this as a temporary solution for a permanent problem of old facilities that flooded when it rained. It is now time to fix this.

Similarly with our staff currently housed in space that is very inefficient, technology challenged, outdated space, to combined our needs into one structure makes it a win win for all. Again, this complex will benefit All Citizens and staff.

Jane & I have decided to stay in Parker and are in the process of building out our new home.

We love our City and plan to be here for as long as we can. Our son & his family also live here.

We pay the same taxes as everyone else and expect superior services in return.

As your past Mayor & City Council Member for over 10 years, I know how difficult it is to make tough decisions. I have confidence you will make the right decision for all of us.

Thank you for your service to our great City.

Z Marshall

Sent from Z iPhone
214-762-8001