



MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AUGUST 11, 2020

The Council meeting was open to the public. The City of Parker provided disposable face masks and hand sanitizer. Citizens were told, if they felt uncomfortable attending the meeting in person, they should send public comments to the City Secretary at PGrey@parkertexas.us and their comments would be read into the minutes.

CALL TO ORDER – Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum

The Parker City Council met in a special 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 7:00 p.m. Councilmembers Diana M. Abraham, Cindy Meyer, Edwin Smith, Ed Standridge and Patrick Taylor were present.

Staff Present: City Administrator Luke Olson, Asst. City Administrator/City Secretary Patti Scott Grey, Finance/H.R. Manager Grant Savage, City Attorney Brandon Shelby, Public Works Director City Engineer John Birkhoff, P.E., Fire Chief Mike Sheff, and Police Chief Richard Brooks

Architect Kent Spurgin, Spurgin & Associate Architects, 103 W Louisiana St, McKinney, Texas, and Hilltop Securities Marti Shew, Hilltop Securities Inc. 1201 Elm Street, Suite 3500, Dallas, TX 75270 were also present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AMERICAN PLEDGE: Will Shelby led the pledge.

TEXAS PLEDGE: Charlie Shelby led the pledge.

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.

Elvis Nelson, 5802 Corinth Chapel Road, said the proposed building is not what is needed: it is too large, costly and poorly designed. The building should be more flexible and there are too many meeting/conference spaces. The design was fashionable 40 years ago but having worked in corporate America for many, many years, times have changed to more multi- use, multi-purposed and flexible buildings to utilize resources more effectively. He also stated he has asked repeatedly for the needs assessment to document the requirements for each department and was told the staff did the assessment some time ago but has not received a copy. (See Exhibit 1 – Elvis Nelson’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)

Donald Reynolds, 6805 Cheswick Court, said he believes a new building is needed for administration and police, but the proposed facility is three times larger than it needs to be. Mr. Reynolds also asked why the “Annex” is a part of this project; it is too costly. He indicated the “Annex” should be removed. (See Exhibit 2 – Donald Reynolds’ email, dated August 10, 2020.)

Joe Cordina, 4302 Boulder Drive, reminded the Mayor, Council, City Staff and residents we have thought of ourselves as “Uniquely” Parker and asked if the proposed municipal complex is in keeping with our Parker theme. He indicated the City needed to move forward with a new building, just not this building. The building should be functional and state of the art inside, but the outside should be more Parker “uniquely” themed. Mr. Cordina also commented he understood a bond would be necessary, but \$9+ million was unacceptable and this would raise taxes and incur too much debt.

Ed Lynch, 5809 Middleton Drive, asked he Mayor, Council, and City Staff to consider this project as two separate buildings for two purposes; one for city business and one for community purposes. As different purposes the buildings should go as two different/separate bonds, one for City Hall and one for the Community Building (Annex). Mr. Lynch asked the City to follow state law, which requires buildings with separate purposes to be on different bonds.

The following residents’ emails were read into the record:

- Andy Redmond, 7275 Moss Ridge Road, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 3 – Andy Redmond’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Arvind Niranjana, 5203 Middleton Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 4 – Arvind Niranjana’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Sowmya Sudhindranath, Middleton Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 5 – Sowmya Sudhindranath’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Mark and Cindy Stachiw, 4404 Pecan Orchard Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 6 – Mark and Cindy Stachiw’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Cindy Stachiw, 4404 Pecan Orchard Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 7 – Cindy Stachiw’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)
- Linda Nelson, 5802 Corinth Chapel Road, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 8 – Linda Nelson’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Alan Meyer, 7278 Moss Ridge Road, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 9 – Alan Meyer’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Dan B. Jones, 4309 Boulder Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 10 – Dan B. Jones’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)

- Eddie and Charlotte France, 4303 Springhill Estates Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 11 – Eddie and Charlotte France’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Lay Wah Ooi, 6707 Overbrook Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 12 – Lay Wah Ooi’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)
- Cal and Joyce Arnold, 6904 Audubon Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 13 – Cal and Joyce Arnold’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)
- Jane and Henry Chappell, 5308 Creekside Court, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 14 – Jane and Henry Chappell’s email, dated August 11, 2020.)
- Z Marshall, 7003 Audubon Dr., expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 15 – Z Marshall’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)
- Alex and Marie Dinverno, 6902 Audubon Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 16 – Alex and Marie Dinverno’s email, dated August 8, 2020.)
- Cullen Tubb, 4204 Springhill Estates Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 17 – Cullen Tubb’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)
- Janet Gerwer, 7253 Moss Ridge Road, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 18 – Janet Gerwer’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)
- Pier and Glenn Burgess, 4104 Rolling Knolls Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 19 – Pier and Glenn Burgess’s email, dated August 9, 2020.)
- Lura and Cleburne Raney, 7000 Audubon Drive, expressed concern regarding the proposed bond issue/municipal complex. (See Exhibit 20 – Lura and Cleburne Raney’s email, dated August 10, 2020.)

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS

1. CONSIDERATION AND/OR ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION ON ORDINANCE NO. 792, CALLING A BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY ON NOVEMBER 3, 2020 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9.5 MILLION. [OLSON/SAVAGE/SHELBY/BOND COUNSEL/FINANCIAL ADVISOR]

City Administrator Olson noted the City presented price points, during the presentation on August 4, 2020 and all documents, including questions from residents with responses are on the City’s website. The proposed facility has decreased in size from the original 30, 000 square feet, decreased from \$14 million to \$9.5 million for bond; and the tax rate will not increase due to this proposal.

Mayor Pro Tem Standridge: said Council has been working on this project for three (3) years; invited citizens to get involved; looked at current space usage; and looked at the lack of privacy in the Police Department. The Police Department's current temporary building does not meet police standards and is rented. Mr. Standridge encouraged residents to take a tour of the current facilities, if they think the City Staff has plenty of space. He also noted the City is not building a house, it is building a government structure that must meet legal requirements, including space, bathrooms, lactation room and American with Disability requirements.

Councilmember Meyer said she has been going back and forth over this for years. The City does not have adequate staff space now. When the current City Hall was built, it was said to be way too large, but we grew into it and now it is inadequate. City Administrator Olson and Finance/HR Manager Savage have done an excellent job on getting this project costs down so there will be no increase in the tax rate. She said she has mixed feelings on the Annex, stating she does not believe it is critical currently. The Annex is a good size, but the kitchen is too large, and the layout needs to be modified; it is still poorly designed, in her opinion. Finally, Councilmember Meyer said she still feels the City Administration Building and Annex should be separated on the ballot.

Mayor Pettie: remarked this is a proposal. The buildings and their design may be changed until they are completely built. Ms. Pettie said the project is a work in progress and if approved, changes will occur with input from residents, council, staff, builders and others, to save money and improve things. Mayor Pettie reiterated this proposal will not increase the tax rate.

Councilmember Smith said this is a wonderful opportunity. He noted the original grand plan was greatly reduced through citizens' input and suggestions.

MOTION: Councilmember Smith moved to approve Ordinance No. 792, calling a Bond Election in the City on November 3, 2020 in the amount of \$9.5 Million. Councilmember Taylor seconded with Councilmembers Abraham, Smith, Standridge, and Taylor voting for the motion and Councilmember Meyer voting against, as follows:

For: Mayor Prop Tem Standridge, Councilmembers Diana M. Abraham Edwin Smith; and Patrick Taylor

Against: Councilmember Cindy Meyer

Present and not voting: Mayor Lee Pettie

Absent: Not Applicable

Motion carried 4-1.

ROUTINE ITEMS

2. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mayor Pettie asked if there were any items to be added to the future agenda.

Mayor Pro Tem Standridge added a Transportation Update; Mayor Pettie added updates on Lewis Lane, Noise Committee, and Pump Station; and Councilmember Smith added a Comprehensive Plan update. Hearing no additional requests, Mayor Pettie encouraged everyone to email her any additional requests. She noted the next regularly scheduled meeting would be Tuesday, August 18, 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.

3. 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 Pettie recessed the regular meeting to Executive Session at 8:01 p.m.

4. RECONVENE REGULAR MEETING.

Mayor Lee Pettie reconvened the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

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

No action was taken.

6. ADJOURN

Mayor Lee Pettie adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.



ATTESTED:


Patti Scott Grey, City Secretary

APPROVED:


Mayor Lee Pettie

Approved on the 18th day
of August, 2020.

Patti Grey

From: Elvis Nelson <ejnel@live.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 10:28 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: City Council Meeting Aug 11
Attachments: Proposed New Parker Building Flyer.docx

Please accept my comments regarding the new building proposal and have them read into the record at the meeting.

Proposed New Parker Building

I am Voting No

My wife and I have lived in Parker Village for 10 years and have loved it. Except for the high water bills, we have generally been happy with our Parker City government. Since we got here everybody agrees we are a small town and want small country town living and government. However the current push to build a new city hall is most upsetting. Many of concerned citizens have tried to offer suggestions all year to fix the current issues, but our officials have refuse to cooperate and make any needed changes.

First I must say I agree it is time for a new city structure as current facilities are at the end of their useful life. But the proposed design is not what is needed; it is too large, too costly, and poorly designed. The design was fashionable 40 years ago, but having worked in corporate America for many, many years, times have changed to more multi-use, multi-purpose, and flexibility to utilize resources more effectively.

What is wrong with this proposal? Here briefly are a few key points:

1. **Too much meeting space.** Of the total 24,172 sq ft, seven rooms totaling 5,865 sq ft or 24% is designated as conference or meeting rooms, infrequently used. Most businesses today have multi-purpose rooms that can be reserved. Rooms that are single purpose are inefficient. The separate community center room building has very little justification and costs more than one million dollars that can be avoided. Consolidating these seven into four rooms would save 2,000 sq ft or \$589,000.
2. **Lack of shared documentation.** We have asked for several months for a copy of the needs assessment or requirements for each department so could see the justification for the 24,172 sq ft buildings. We are repeatedly told the Parker staff completed this task themselves long ago. There are office areas for 20 staff members in the current design but an explanation of how that translates into a need for 24,172 sq ft is not available
3. **Poor design.** Great for the 1980s but fixed walls, large entrance and halls look nice and are inefficient. Fixed walls do not allow for future changes.
4. **Too many key components are not costed.** The staff stated these elements cannot be estimated but added \$655,000 as contingency which could easily be understated.
5. **Empty promise of no tax increase.** Spending \$9.5 million without an increase in property tax is hard to believe. Plus a more efficient design would cost much less. This is not a small town building.
6. **Lack of cooperation.** The communication exchanges this year have not been mutual. Parker citizens point out weaknesses and needed design adjustments and nothing changes. All that is provided are claims of how long information has been collected by Parker staff and how great the work already is. Large expenditures of this nature deserve more participation at each step of the development. Waiting until the floor plans are already set is not what participation means.

Elvis Nelson
5802 Corinth Chapel Road
einel@live.com
214-335-0571

From: [Donald Reynolds](#)
To: [Patti Grey](#)
Subject: Issues concerning proposed municipal complex
Date: Sunday, February 2, 2020 1:04:19 PM
Attachments: [city complex.docx](#)

Ms. Grey, Could you please read my attached letter to the City Council members during the meeting on Feb. 4. Thanks so much, Don Reynolds

Feb. 2, 2020

To: Parker City Council

From: Donald Reynolds
6805 Cheswick Ct.
Parker, TX 75002

Subject: Issues with proposed plan for new municipal complex

Dear Council members; I share your desire for a new municipal structure as the current building has not been well maintained and needs to be replaced. In addition, there needs to be a permanent office for the police department. Having said this, my review of the proposed complex has left me with serious concerns.

My primary concern is the “not to exceed” cost of \$14 million dollars. This suggests that not enough planning has gone into the project in order to get to a realistic cost. A municipal building meeting the needs and future needs of the City should not cost more than \$5 million dollars.

I feel that realistic requirements for the building should be defined as to space actually needed for staff and support needs. A smaller building should meet all the current and future requirements. In addition, I feel that there is no need for a complex including a community building and a park addition.

I am willing to support a bond issue for a new municipal building but not one that is a \$14 million dollar complex.

Sincerely, Donald Reynolds

Patti Grey

From: Andy Redmond <redmonde@tx.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 2:54 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: 8/11/20 Council Meeting--proposed municipal complex.

Hello Ms. Patti:

Trust all is well, I will likely be unable to attend, kindly enter this to be read.

Dear Mayor and Council:

I'm Andy Redmond of 7275 Moss Ridge Road.

I'm against the proposed municipal complex, I believe Parker voters will soundly defeat this bond request if moved to a ballot. I'm not opposed to a fiscally responsible needs based facility; however, that is not what has been proposed to Parker residents.

- Our mayor/council do not see the need to be transparent and waited until the last minute, rushing the proposal into a council meeting prior to a ballot deadline. Something so "critical" to our city's future has been mis-managed for several years now, perhaps from onset.
- Wants based assessments are present in previous and current proposals, even when many residents have consistently expressed these faults in design, construction size, etc.

A needs based assessment would show that we need perhaps a 6,000 to 8,000 sq. ft. facility * \$250 per square foot (approx.\$2,000,000). We could be aggressive with the site costs also, with a maximum of \$2,000,000.

- A proper needs assessment will reveal the "wants" proposed currently vs. our needs.

Examples: Excessive square footage remains both for city administration and also police. Needs assessment would dictate removal of --excessive conference rooms, a city attorney office (we have a contract city attorney who offices at his law firm), council meeting area less like our large surrounding cities and MORE like our current council meeting area-- only larger. Further, a small municipal court window will suffice for years to come. Other than traffic citations, do we have crime matters before the "court?" Have we ever held a jury trial, if not why, do we have a proposed jury deliberation room?

- The annex-- not sure why the City wants to compete with several property-tax paying businesses who offer rentals (i.e. Southfork, CrossCreek Ranch etc.). If we design a large multipurpose council room, it can double as an annex and city meeting room, if so required. Further several area churches may also allow private functions for those / those organizations who may need large meeting space vs. taxpayer's paying for a large room that is seldom used.
- Our most recent "proposed" council presentation assures us that the municipal building is "no tax increase" plan. We need to assure all voters know the sleigh of hand to fund any "i/o" deficiencies with the Maintenance/Operations (M&O) budget. M&O budgets increase each year at about 3 to 4 times the consumer price index. If the our mayor and council strongly believe this, they should

write some language into the bond that M&O shall pay..with no tax increase. That could mean a future of lean budgets, however, if this is building so critical, show fiscal restraint in other areas.

- Why haven't the cost analysis of furnishings, build out costs and/or projected increases—such as increased utility expenses for the proposed facility been presented?

In conclusion, we see a proposal fitting our neighbor, City of Murphy. Murphy unlike Parker has a diverse tax base—including multifamily, residential, retail and commercial tax bases. Murphy's population is approximately 4.5 times larger than Parker (21,000 vs. 4,800) and three times larger than potential Parker buildout* (Buildout estimate assumes we retain current zoning--Agricultural, ETJ and sub-divisions). Yet Mayor/Council want to spend for a comparable facility to the adjacent neighboring cities—which IS NOT desired, nor needed by Parker residents!

Thanks for hearing my input.

Andy Redmond
972.880.9845
redmonde@tx.rr.com

Patti Grey

From: Arvind Niranjana <aniranjana@manasconsulting.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Parker City/Community Hall - Please Read into Record

Patti,

I would like the following read into record during this evening's council meeting.

While I support the building/ renovation of the city hall to provide the city staff a better workplace, I question whether we can afford the extravagance of buildings that will cost approximately \$10 Million. There are several projects that should be prioritized higher such as:

1. **Fixing Roads** - there has been no effort made to fix Lewis lane and other side streets, that continue to be in a state of disrepair.
2. **Improving Walkability** - with increasing traffic in Parker and the surrounding cities, it has become difficult to walk anywhere without sidewalks
3. **Fixing Drainage** - several neighborhoods have terrible drainage issues due to the builders not accounting for the developer's grading when they complete their construction. This has led to standing water and issues with frogs, mosquitoes and other bugs. This is not only a health hazard but also a nuisance which requires homeowners such as myself to spend several hundred dollars each month to control

I would also like to understand how the debt will be serviced and impacts taxes this year and over the next 20 years when the bond will be in effect.

Given this, I do not support the existing proposal and believe we need more information to evaluate.

Thank you.
Arvind

--

Regards,

Arvind

Arvind Niranjana

Email: aniranjana@manasconsulting.com

Mobile: +1 (303) 475-5703

Office: +1 (972) 996-4707

825 Watter's Creek Blvd.,

Building M, Suite 250,

Allen, Texas 75013

Manas Consulting, Inc.

Project Execution Resources

Delivery Leadership | Technology Enablement | Strategy

www.manasconsulting.com

Patti Grey

From: Sowmya Sudhindranath <sowmyas12@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 1:55 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Resident comments on New proposed City building and community hall

Hi Patti,
Could you please ensure that the following comments are read and recorded in the city minutes.

I am a resident in Kings Crossing Phase 2 for the past 2.5 years. The reason we moved to Parker was for the big lots and having access to more open space. During this time, the condition of the roads has deteriorated drastically with no improvement in sight and so has the drainage in our community. Repeated complaints to the city have not solved this issue. We have heard responses that the city has no money and that they are short staffed. If this is the reality then why are we spending tax money on a new building and community hall. Should we not assess the needs of the city for staffing and then determine a long term plan? The condition of Lewis lane - which I have to take no matter what, is poor at best. It is scary to think that our teenagers will have to navigate this road as they begin to learn driving. I hope the city takes our opinion into consideration before this measure is introduced on the ballot.

Regards,
Sowmya

303 885 3408

6
Patti Grey

From: Cindy Stachiw <castachiw@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 1:39 PM
To: Patti Grey; Mark Stachiw; Cindy Stachiw
Subject: Letter from Mark and Cindy Stachiw regarding the Proposed New City Hall
Attachments: City Council Letter.pdf

Please include the attached letter from Mark and Cindy Stachiw, 4404 Pecan Orchard Drive, in tonight's public comments regarding the proposed New City Hall.

Thank you,

Cindy and Mark Stachiw

972-849-9078

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:Letter

Date:Tue, 11 Aug 2020 13:36:06 -0500

From:Mark Stachiw <mastachiw@gmail.com>

To:Cindy Stachiw <castachiw@gmail.com>

--
Mark A. Stachiw, Esq.
P.O. Box 766
Allen, Texas 75013
Cell: (972) 632-6739

The information in this e-mail and attachments, if any, is confidential and may be subject to the attorney client, attorney work product or attorney-attorney privileges. This e-mail, the information contained herein and in any attachments is intended solely for the intended addressee. Access to this e-mail, the contents, or any attachments, by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action take on it, or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

August 11, 2020

Hon. Lee Pettie

Parker City Council Persons,

We are writing to oppose the construction of the proposed new City Hall, Police Station and Community Center. While the old City Hall and Police Station have probably outlived their usefulness and need to be enlarged and updated, that does not warrant the construction of the proposed new City Hall, Police Station and Community Center (combined 24,000 square feet – with a price tag of \$9.5 million). This is especially true when the cost to construct such a facility (on a per square foot basis) is almost twice what the current prices are to build other structures in Parker. It is my understanding that the going rate for houses in Parker is approximately \$120-\$150/square foot – and that is with multiple bathrooms, kitchens and other amenities. Costs to construct this project of \$250 and almost \$300/square foot – is completely out of line. We have to wonder what amenities and accrements are being included in such a project to make it cost more than double house construction. This goes even more with the Community Center at almost \$300/sq foot – which essentially should be just a large room – which should cost less than a house. In addition, a miscellaneous cost estimate of almost \$1 million (which would be about 12% of the total cost seems a bit much as well. What is this money being used for? Furniture? Systems? It seems out of line.

Further, we are not sure why Parker needs a community center. A number of years ago, the City purchased the Preserve based on assertions by a number of members of the community that we needed such a place in Parker for gathering and community events. I and other City Council members were opposed because in our mind it was not needed and would in fact not be used. Now 16 years later, the Preserve has had very infrequent usage and that is even with the construction of the gazebo. We are concerned that the community center will likewise be underutilized – which makes it a waste of tax payer money. In addition, it was my understanding that the use of City buildings were being denied to local community groups today out of a fear that if one group was allowed to use it (such as the Woman's Club) other disfavored groups (such as racist organizations) could similarly request to use it and the city could not deny their usage. I am not sure that the law has changed on this point – a public building made available to the public has to be available for one and all. I would urge the city attorney to speak to the current city council on this point to make it clear what responsibilities the city is undertaking to have such a facility open to the public. And, if it is not going to be available to the public, what use would it then be? We have very few community functions, so it is hard to imagine that we need a building to sit idle for months for the few functions we might have.

Moreover, look outside at the economic conditions of the North Texas as result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Many small business owners (a number of which are citizens of Parker) are struggling to hold on to their businesses and make ends meet. What signal are we sending to them by proposing an extravagant new building – far in excess of what our city needs – at this very time that they are struggling? Rather than finding ways to increase the borrowing by the city and increase the taxes on its citizenry to pay for it (or worse deny other services if the taxes cannot be increased), we urge the City Council to reconsider the costs and needs for the various pieces of this project and rather construct something more appropriate for our city.

Finally, this City Council has lost its way. Parker was founded on the principals of limited government and low tax rates. If we wanted all these amenities (such as Community Centers) we would have moved to Plano, Allen, Murphy or Frisco, Rather, we as citizens of Parker made the trade-off to have limited services (such a volunteer fire department), no libraries, no city pools, etc. This Community Center smacks of a creep towards what we all ran away from – high taxes and amenities used only by the few for a few. We urge the City Council to go back to the drawing board and propose a more modest City Hall and Police Station (and no Community Center) more in line with the traditional values of Parker.

Sincerely,



Mark and Cindy Stachiw
4404 Pecan Orchard Drive
Parker, TX 75002

From: [Cindy Stachiw](#)
To: [Patti Grey](#); [Mark Stachiw](#); [Cindy Stachiw](#)
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Municipal Complex to be read into the Public Record
Date: Monday, August 10, 2020 9:25:34 AM

Mayor and City Council Members - I, Cindy Stachiw, 4404 Pecan Orchard Drive, a resident for almost 25 years, am opposed to this extravagant request and wish to say on record that I DO NOT support this project at the price tage presented.

Thank you for placing these comments in the official records.

Cindy Stachiw

972-849-9078

8

From: [Linda Nelson](#)
To: [Patti Grey](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting: 8/11 - - Public Comments (Linda Nelson)
Date: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 11:16:26 AM

Hi Ms. Grey,

I may attend this evening's City Council meeting (8/11/20). Regardless of whether I attend or not, please ensure that my comments below are read and included in the official minutes (appendix) for tonight's meeting.

My name is Linda S. Nelson. I reside at 5802 Corinth Chapel Road in the Parker Village HOA.

Thank you for another opportunity to provide feedback for the new Municipal Complex. As previously reported at other City Forums, I have and continue to support the replacement of the current City Administrative facility and have provided feedback on improving the proposal.

However, an important and still unfulfilled request is for the City of Parker to provide a **single document mapping requirements** for a new Municipal Complex to what is actually being delivered. Disparate emails, Facebook postings, floor plans and FAQs does not eliminate the need for this type of standard project artifact used across all industries & entities. This document would provide transparency that what is being built maps to a confirmed requirement / need requested by the Citizens of Parker.

An good example of this would be to support the need to build out the Municipal Annex which would provide additional space. There should be requirements that support # of events, # of people, across # time periods. There should be rationale as to why this is cost effective to

build this space out rather than using space at one of the local venues. Based on this clearly articulated mapping, then the Citizens of Parker could determine whether this makes sense or not.

The same transparent mapping would also assist with the evaluation of all the other space and related costs that is being provided. And while it might seem the easier path to simply approve the current proposal as delivered in order to move on, I believe that this would be a mistake. I strongly encourage the City of Parker to fulfill this long-standing request. And in the absence of this information, then I would strongly encourage the Citizens of Parker to simply vote "NO" in November.

Cordially,

Linda Nelson
5802 Corinth Chapel Road
Parker, Texas 75002
214.563.6921

9

Patti Grey

From: Alan Meyer <afmeyer@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: August 11th Council Meeting - Individual Consideration Item #1 - Bond Election

Council Members,

I will not be attending tonight's Council meeting and as offered in the agenda posted on the city website, am sending the below to be read at the meeting on my behalf.

It is my understanding that the City council is asking to place a referendum on the election ballot to issue an ~ \$9.2M Bond for the purpose of constructing, improving and equipping a new municipal administration facility and annex facility and related parking facilities. While the cost seems a bit excessive, the real question should be "Is this really necessary?" It is also my understanding that the Police offices were moved out of the primary municipal building / courtroom facility into a separate structure within the last couple of years. Is that separate facility not able to satisfy their needs? Please indicate how the current facilities have been outgrown and what additional offices / facilities will be provide for this excessive cost? How many competing bids have been examined to keep the costs (if a new construction is deemed necessary) down?

I would expect a cost estimate like this for a much larger city like Allen or Plano as opposed to a small hamlet city like Parker, Tx. I have to question how the Council obtains construction bids. About 2-3 years ago, a bid was awarded to a company to fix the drainage issues in Moss Ridge Estates. My understanding is the City paid \$100K for that contract and it was not done very well and hasn't fully resolved the drainage issue. This is why I am also suspect that this excessive price tag was not properly shopped or competitively bid upon.

Per the proposition, it also seems that taxes would likely increase for the city residents to pay for the annual interest on the bond as well as the ultimate payoff of the bonds at maturity. This will be a significant potential amount added to the resident's tax obligation.

I urge the Council to seek alternatives to this Bond proposition and to pursue other (less costly) alternative construction options (if construction deemed necessary). Should this Bond Proposition be placed on the ballot (as is), I would be encouraging my fellow neighbors and Parker residents to vote NO on such a Bond Proposition.

Sincerely,

Alan Meyer
7278 Moss Ridge Road
Moss Ridge Estates

Patti Grey

10

From: Dan Jones <djones449@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 7:32 AM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Municipal Complex to be read into the Public Record

Dan B. Jones
4309 Boulder Dr
Parker, Texas

I am in agreement that Parker is in need of a Police Station and that a new City Hall would ultimately be less expensive than upgrades, renovations and expansion. However, the cost estimate of \$240 per square foot for construction of the Municipal Complex is too high and valid construction estimates should be received PRIOR to funds being requested or allocated via a bond issue. Once money has been approved and allocated, costs NEVER go down.

As for the Community Room, I do not see a need for such a facility, but would reluctantly support if the cost estimates were around \$100 per square foot, not the proposed \$295 per square foot estimate.

I am certainly not in favor of the significant tax rate increase required to fund this proposal, assuming it passes as-is, which will only be exacerbated by the ever increasing property valuations. With so many unknowns and only estimates begin used for this proposal, I can foresee significant cost overruns.

Finally, should the project pass as-is and the unincluded costs exceed the current estimate, will this Council increase the tax rate retroactively like they did for our garbage fees?

Dan B Jones

11

Patti Grey

From: Eddie France <eddie.france4303@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 11:38 AM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: City of Parker Proposal \$9.5 million Municipal Complex

After taking an optimistic review of the City proposal for a new Municipal Complex, my wife and I understand the need to improve the current situation with adding square footage. We, also, understand your desire to grow with administrative staff and services. We both feel there has to be a way to build a less expensive structure designed for future growth, while allowing modest growth over the next 5 years.

At this point, my wife and I cannot support your proposal set before us on this day, August 11, 2020. However, we would support new facilities costing considerably less than is being presented.

We vote "NO" to this current proposal being placed on the November Ballot.

Respectfully submitted as residents of Parker for 20 years.

Eddie and Charlotte France
4303 Springhill Estates Drive
Parker, TX 75002-5784
eddie.france4303@gmail.com
214-497-5761 (Mobile)

Patti Grey

From: Lay Wah Ooi <laywah@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 11:33 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: New City Buildings

Dear City Council,

Please vote yes on placing the bond for the new city buildings on the November Election. We need to move the Police out of the portable buildings into a secure facility. The current City Hall is too small and in bad shape. Finally, we do need the City Hall Annex so that we have a public place to hold meetings/gatherings/events within the City of Parker.

Thanks for your hard work on planning this,

Lay Wah Ooi
6707 Overbrook Drive

Patti Grey

From: Cal <carnold46@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 1:11 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Municipal Complex to be read into the Public Record

Here is our input on the Proposed Municipal Complex:

We are in favor of the new Municipal Complex. The old building is worn out and can no longer meet our needs. We've long since gotten our money's worth out of it. And the housing of our police department in the temporary quarters is an embarrassment. You cannot go into the police department and have a private conversation, nor can they conduct interviews in private. We need to provide them comfortable, professional quarters. You cannot always save your way to success. Sometimes you have to invest ...and that time is now for the City of Parker. We feel the board has done the proper due diligence and right sized the proposed Municipal Complex.

We totally support the Proposed Municipal Complex and the bond issue to pay for it.

Cal and Joyce Arnold

6904 Audubon Drive
Parker

Patti Grey

From: Jane Chappell <jane.chappell3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 5:53 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Municipal Complex to be read into the Public Record

While I understand and support the need to expand the current facilities, almost 21,000 sq ft seems excessive given the size of our community. How many people do we plan to have based in this facility? From my understanding of staff size, this would be significant square feet per person. We would support a smaller building with an efficient layout (ie not a lot of common wasted space) with a path to grow vs this large facility at the onset. We do not support a Community Room/Annex at \$1M. Given a smaller facility, the land costs should go down substantially as well.

Our fundamental view is we should look to live within our budgets. At this time with the economy in such an uncertain time due to COVID-19, with higher unemployment rates, this isn't the time to increase property taxes for something we would like vs something we need. We realize this concept was started prior to COVID, but to continue down this path at this time is pretty tone deaf.

Jane and Henry Chappell

Patti Grey

From: Z Marshall <zmarshall@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 8:00 PM
To: Patti Grey
Cc: Luke Olson; B Shelby
Subject: Bond Ballot approval

Patti

Please pass on my comments to the City Council and place into the record at the August 11th City Council meeting.

Honorable Mayor & City Council.

As your former Mayor, Mayor Pro-Tem, City Council & P& Z member, I strongly support placing the \$9.5 million bond issue on the November 3rd ballot.

Parker has the highest average home value of all cities in Collin County. Combine that with one of the lowest City tax rates in the County, its unfortunate that we have not done something sooner for the benefit of our Staff, Police, and Citizens.

Our current building was built when we had a population of 950 residents over 30 years ago. With our population now five times that amount, our building is old, outdated, inefficient and needs to be replaced.

Our Police are stationed in a temporary building, that does not meet Public Safety building standards, and was never intended to be a permanent solution for our Police Station.

By maintaining our current City tax rate, after issuing this additional debt, it is a WIN WIN for everyone.

Although you do not need voter approval to move forward, I think it's a prudent decision to let the CITIZENS decide on this issue.

Thank you for your service to our great City. I know first hand how difficult your job can be and appreciate all you do for the citizens of Parker.

Z Marshall
Mayor
City of Parker 2012-2018

Patti Grey

From: Marie Dinverno <mdinverno@prestigeusa.net>
Sent: Saturday, August 8, 2020 2:13 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: New City Hall

August 8, 2020

Parker Texas City Council:

We are writing this letter in support of the proposal for the building of a New City Hall along with a Community Building. This project is a vital need for our community. Our current buildings do not meet the needs of our City and also are in need of extensive upgrades. These new buildings will make a statement about Parker's forward thinking and planning for Parker's future. Parker is a growing community and also a very desirable area for people to relocate and make Parker their home. The current buildings do not reflect a positive image for Parker. A community building would also allow residents a place to gather and enhance community spirit. The building would give us a place to gather . The building may be utilized ranging from simple events to large scale events.

We have lived in Parker for the past eleven years and fully support the building of our New City Hall and Community Building.

Also would like to thank the City Council for their work and dedication to presenting this exciting project for our city.

Alex and Marie Dinverno

Patti Grey

From: Cullen Tubb <C_tubb@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 2:02 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Municipal Complex to be read into the Public Record

Good Afternoon,

I am against incurring additional debt.

Cullen Tubb

4204 Springhill Estates Dr.
Parker, Texasw 75002
Phone: 214.361.7929

Patti Grey

From: Janet Gerwer <jgerwer13@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 12:03 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Municipal Complex to be read into the Public Record

Are we trying to keep up with some mysterious "Jones".

I would like our community to maintain the quaint country atmosphere it so proudly displays.

Janet Gerwer

19

Patti Grey

From: Pier Burgess <pburgess@burgess-inc.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 9, 2020 6:41 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Future Community Center

Pattie, and City Counsel,

We would like to voice our support for the building of a City of Parker Community Center along with the City Hall.

The purpose of a center like the one proposed, is to foster and build positive relationships with city representatives, first responders and the citizens of Parker. This center would foster a positive relationship and partnership with the police department and fire department and our elected officials. All ages, the youth and seniors, would have a place to volunteer, develop friendships and do community services that support our city. City events, club meetings, educational activities and concerts can all be hosted there. Art exhibits, festivals and even graduations can be hosted at the community center and on the surrounding lawn. Such great potential to support our community and add a potential revenue source for the city is exciting. It is truly the compliment to the much needed city hall. The long term benefits are limitless.

Please support our request for a building where we can support you our City, and grow a community spirit that is uniquely Parker.

Thank you for your consideration,

Pier and Glenn Burgess

--

Pier Burgess, Founder/VP Finance/Special Projects

Burgess Construction Consultants, Inc.

[1255 W 15th St., Ste. 900](#)

[Plano, TX 75075](#)

m. 214-850-1170

Connect: [Web](#) / [Blog](#) / [LinkedIn](#)

A Legacy of Quality for Over 30 Years

Third-Party Inspections and Energy Services

Patti Grey

From: Cleburne Raney <the.raneys@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 3:13 PM
To: Patti Grey
Subject: Municipal building

We are writing in support of the proposed new Municipal Building and Community Building for the City of Parker. The City has been lucky to have been able to get the number of years it has out of our present City Hall, and it is time to invest in the future. The City is in need of a larger building providing employees more work space, space for growth, storage and an updated police headquarters. We are also in support of the City investing in a Community Building for our residents. At the present time the residents of Parker do not have a facility near us that is reasonably price for families to use for a meeting place, group to use to have gatherings or any other type of meetings.

The Parker City Council and Parker employees have done an admirable job in the past few years to try and meet our residents request about the best methods to fund this project, and we feel you are now on the right path. We thank all of you for your diligent efforts.

We request that the Council vote to approve to have the bond election for the new facilities placed on the November ballot.

Lura and Cleburne Raney