

**Van Andrews: E-mail**

Hello,

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback this way. We are new to Parker, and didn't quite feel up to participating live on online meeting.

We live at 5419 Westfield Drive in King's Crossing neighborhood. We moved from Plano in 2019. Both of us grew up in these areas (Jaclyn in Wylie, and myself in Richardson).

We both agree new facilities are needed, but the plans presented in the past are too much, too soon. A priority should be placed on permanent housing of the police. The city hall can wait. But, our most major concern is the lack of planning for the whole city...

Having grown up in the surrounding areas, we have seen examples of great city planning and poor city planning. The North Dallas suburbs have exploded in growth since the 1970's, and this continues; areas like Parker, Lucas and Fairview are some of the last areas that offer acreage lots with excellent schools, that are close to highways and the rest of the metropolitan Dallas area.

The city of Parker needs a modern, long range plan that can be executed to accommodate the growth demand, while preserving home and property valuations and potential for appreciation, and maintaining the "country feel" of the community. In order to do that, the plan needs to include:

1. Appropriate zoning of land for retail, restaurants, and businesses. The city needs a larger tax base than it has now, and it can only be got by attracting retail, restaurants, and businesses to the city.
2. Repair and maintenance of infrastructure. The roads are terrible. The drainage is terrible (Muddy Creek, for example). The city needs to figure out how to work with adjoining cities and the county on infrastructure items. Lewis Lane in Parker is a prime example of a terrible road.
3. Finally, city buildings. Police building first. Others second.

I don't believe for a second that we won't need to raise additional revenue to accomplish these things. This is why #1 above needs to be looked at, planned and executed.

Parker must advance and grow into the 21st century. It doesn't have to lose its "country charm", but it will have to proactively plan and implement these plans in order to deal with the growth going on now. Towns like Richardson, Plano and Frisco figured it out when they went through their growth phases. Garland, Wylie / St Paul, and others did not. I'd like to see Parker be more like and even better than Lucas... we can do this!

Van and Jaclyn

Sent from my iPad=

Iris Arias: E-mail

Shirley,

Thank you so much for rising to the challenge to help our city. I hope this will move along to the best end.

To come to a wrap on points I want to finish or add on to I will start with the

Police Dept

I gather my information from Ed, council member & Lee, mayor. All other members are new to me, but I will try to connect with a few others. I don't have a problem asking questions or getting answers. I don't know why others say the city officials are not transparent.

So, I will inquire as to the former building used & how it serves a purpose today. I believe it is a metal portable unit which also housed a garage for auto & machinery maintenance. How accurate I am on that assumption, I will soon learn.

What is the weakness(es) of the present facility, we should all understand. And what any new plans would entail for fortifying the dept to bring to code compliance, we all need to know. I understand there is a pending "inspection" which may incur a stiff fine. What do we all need to know concerning compliance to current code requirements?

I have a problem with digressing to a former housing unit rather than going forward to new ground. I will ask to learn why.

Record Storage

Having worked in an acquisition setting of a research library for ARCO in Plano and just before computers/printers were installed in every station, paper trail was an absolute must. As technology moved into the library, it was believed that paper trail would disappear. It did not; various aspects of acquisition could run for a long time to close an acquisition. Plus, so much was needed to support budget expense & projection. This was a very different setting.

The city's archival setting is not completely known to me outside the collection of utility revenue, the compilation of council meetings. There is the collection of municipal court records & more which I don't know. There is a requirement at municipal levels that all records must be physically accessible at all times.

But what about storage needs....temp control, acid free paper, acid free ink, acid free pens, acid free filing boxes & how would media supplies help in reducing storage space need? How far back is the archiving required by municipal government standards?

Tunnel Vision Be Gone

The idea was heard of "ridiculous to require a lactation room". That depends on that we, the present residents, will be the only ones living in this city. We will eventually move, die, and new families will be moving in. Planning, now, is that new residents will come in to take their place here and make a life; ten or 15 years from now there will be new young families starting their lives. We were at that age also and the town isn't going to die. Parker is over 100 years old. Besides, I understand this topic is a code enforced issue. Does it get challenged? with whose time & money?

I seek an expansion on voices. The predominant voice is men and predominantly they were the voices I saw in print in the Uniquely Parker community page. I don't know if excerpts of the discussions on that page were passed on to you, but they were loaded with disrespectful & descriptive language. There was even a threat of suing the city if the bond had passed. This person said he had sued the city once & would do it again. I inquired and the question was researched with the city attorney. Yes, there was a suit, the plaintiff won & violated his agreement to silence. I know the name, but not to identify by sight. He was not a physical speaker or a virtual speaker. I just don't know if he was present at all. Is he a viable threat to the effort ..don't know, but wouldn't forget about the possibility. I wouldn't forget about him.

I am not a feminist but I think women should play a big role on space planning talk about the whys & why nots of the future & conserve as much of the original layout plans.

Again thank you for your desire to work with us!

Iris Arias

Brandon Azbell: E-mail

Dr. Garrett,

As a follow up to the Parker Council session on 01.05.2021, I would highly suggest subsequent information and communications to the community on the topic of the community complex should specifically highlight requirements imposed by Collin County, the state of Texas and US Federal requirements on public facilities. These would clearly be non-negotiable items which need to be clarified accordingly. All other items included in subsequent proposals, plans, etc. should indicate those based on needs of village staff, police and others.

There appears to be common support for an updated, renovated, or new facility to address the needs of the village. There is certainly debate on some aspects of the facility, but I am hopeful agreement on critical items can be addressed and within reasonable costs to the citizens.

Thank you.

Brandon Azbell

5403 Westfield Drive, Parker, TX 75002

Billy Barron: E-Mail

My concerns are:

1. Make sure to build a facility that is large enough to cover future needs. Do the project one and do it right.
2. The city is in bad need of a place to hold meetings, events, etc. Most other cities have such a place.
3. We absolutely need to not reuse the existing structures. They are well past their useful lifetime.
4. By delaying the project, the result is that Parker is going to get a worse facility at a higher cost.
5. Some people are proposing cubicles and open offices. That thinking is so 10 to 30 years ago. The industry is moving away from both because they are upfront cost effective but then in the long run, all the savings are destroyed by reduced efficiency.

My questions are:

1. Is there a way to combine the city hall chambers and the event room into a single room to reduce the size/cost? T
2. Given #1, we still have the issue of where to hold voting to not interfere. Can it be moved to a secure hallway or a conference room?

My suggestions are:

1. Explain the legal requirements so citizens know why many positions need a private office.
2. Do not have a citizen committee for the building. I see no way this will ever form a consensus. If you are going to ignore this suggestion, please stick to only people who have had very moderate views (e.g. Scott Livesay).

Billy Barron

6707 Overbrook

Roxanne Bogdan: E-mail

I'd like to thank the council for continually seeking community involvement and opinions regarding the new city hall building. You have been very open, transparent, and inclusive in your planning and I appreciate that. While yes I would like to be fiscally responsible in building this building, I also would like this to be a building that is:

- energy efficient
- built with nice finishes
- look professional
- be equipped with everything our staff needs or will need now & in the future
- has meeting lots of rooms for our residents and community groups to use
- our PD has a secure building
- our PD has a space for each officer to have a desk and space to perform their work, store their
Work material and items they need
- all department heads have reasonably sized offices, nothing excessive

I would like this to be a nice city hall. We cant build something that we will have to come back in a few years and expand. This is our one chance to build it right. We can have the country charm Parker holds shown in this building without it being and looking "cheap".

I understand that it costs money to have the things I'd like to see in our city hall and I trust this council and mayor to have our best interest in what they vote on in this building. Please vote to keep the country charm of Parker, keep it fiscally responsible and keep professional and nice. We all should be proud of our city hall.

Thank you,

Roxanne Bogdan

6701 Overbrook Dr.

Skip Cave: E-mail

Proposed City of Parker Municipal Complex Development Plan

01/04/2021

1. Plan Goals
 - a. Develop effective & efficient plan for new Parker Municipal Complex
 - b. Achieve plan agreement from majority of Parker taxpayers, so bond issue will pass
 - c. Provide full transparency with Parker citizens for all aspects of plan development
 - i. Design
 - ii. Costs & property tax increases
 - iii. Functionality & amenities
 - d. All issues resolved with citizen input & collaboration
 - i. Responses required for all issues raised by citizens
 - ii. Contentious issues resolved by online poll of Parker taxpayers
2. City Council creates the Parker Muni Complex Advisory Committee (PMCAC)
 - a. Council asks Parker citizens for volunteers to the PMCAC
 - b. PMCAC starts coordination with City Council on municipal complex design
 - c. PMCAC presentations become a regular agenda item at Council meetings
 - d. PMCAC presentations to Council can be longer than 3 minutes.
3. PMCAC coordinates with City Council to develop a comparable study
 - a. Perform a population growth study for Parker - 10-20 years growth projection
 - b. Municipal facilities in Texas cities of similar size & tax base are analyzed & compared
 - c. Engage NCTCOG assistance in analyzing comparable cities
 - i. Departments, headcount, & facilities
 1. Mayor, council & staff.
 2. City government departments
 3. Fire
 4. Police
 5. Meeting/conference rooms
 6. Amenities, common areas
 7. Unique features
 8. Architects used
4. Develop Requirements Document
 - a. Set up collaborative requirements document online
 - i. All Parker citizen comments on the document are allowed & encouraged
 - ii. Cost estimates & comparisons encouraged
 - iii. All comments, responses, & discussions on the doc are permanently recorded
 - iv. All comments & responses are viewable by the public
 - v. All issues posted by citizens in the document must have responses from the city.
 - b. Finalize the requirements doc after all requirements are accepted & agreed to by council & citizens
5. Select architect for preliminary studies
 - a. Select architect with municipal complex design experience
 - b. All designs must follow requirements doc
 - c. Architects to develop 2-3 preliminary plan options
 - d. The proposed plan options are posted online for citizens to view.
6. Select final design choice by online poll of citizens & Council.
7. Commission architect to develop plan selected by citizens & Council
8. Architect finalizes plan & presents to Council & citizens
 - a. Plan posted online for citizen comments and minor mods
9. Council & citizens approve final plan
10. Final plan sent out for construction bids, and final build-out estimates
11. Best bid selected
12. Property tax changes computed (CPA) and published.
13. Muni Bond election set using selected bid
14. Bond election held
15. Funds approved & construction started.

Jeff Harrison: E-mail

As a follow up to my comments at the meeting at City Hall last night, I wanted to provide the following thoughts:

My wife and I are long time members of the fine City of Parker - 21 years now! We have raised our 3 daughters here and are proud to call Parker our home. Like most of our friends in Parker, we moved here for the large lots, low taxes and unique country feel! We love our Parker Police and know that they need a new facility! However, they certainly do not need the ridiculous, expensive, inefficient monstrosity recently proposed by the City! Most all of our friends and neighbors feel the same as us on this issue and voted NO on Prop A!

As a board certified commercial real estate attorney (practicing for 33 years) I represent clients that build all types of commercial buildings in Texas and throughout the United States. I can honestly say that the recently proposed facility was one of the most fiscally irresponsible, poorly designed buildings I have ever seen. No reputable commercial lender would ever finance this building! Let's look at some of the disturbing facts:

1. \$9.5 million original cost (actually \$13.5 million including the expected interest of \$4 million)
2. 24,172 square feet of space (approximately 1,000 square feet of space for each of the 25 full time employees - amazing and totally unnecessary!)
3. \$393.00 per square foot build cost (based on original \$9.5 million cost); \$558.50 per square foot build cost (including the estimated interest of \$4 million) - at this cost we should be getting the Taj Mahal!!! Average construction cost for a commercial building should be closer \$200 per square foot!
4. \$8,437.50 is the cost per family in Parker for the proposed buildings (based upon the total \$13.5 million cost/1,600 homes in Parker). That is utterly ridiculous and fiscally irresponsible!

To suggest that there will be no new taxes is also dishonest! Even for a moment assuming that they are correct - which I don't - without the additional debt, taxes would presumably go down and allow the City to address other serious infrastructure needs! The only way for the City to pay for such poorly designed buildings is by taxing its residents.

I encourage the City to listen to and work with the residents of Parker on this matter. If so, we can certainly redesign the needed facilities and come up with a fiscally responsible plan that everyone in Parker will be proud of!

PS. While the Parker Women's Club may be a fine organization, it is seriously disturbing to me that some City Council members and residents seem to believe that the Club's ability to use the City building should somehow influence the size or design of the facility. Such considerations are simply inappropriate. The building should be designed to meet the actual needs of the City not the wants and desires of a very small segment of the residents of the City.

Jeffrey W. Harrison, Esq.

Shareholder

Board Certified in Commercial Real Estate Law

Ray Hemmig: E-Mail

My name is: Ray Hemmig, and I have resided at 3405 Bluffs Ln, Parker, TX 75002 for 22 years.

Please get public safety concerns in front of building a new complex.

I do not object to building a modest new structure for Police and Administration functions.

However, I do want the city council to fix our roads before we build a new city complex...specifically Dublin Road!

If a bond election is needed to maintain and rebuild our crumbling roads, then get to it.

The current condition of Dublin Road is a public safety hazard, and a public embarrassment!

Thank you,

Ray Hemmig

Dan Jones: E-Mail

Dan B. Jones, 4309 Boulder Dr.

The proposal for the new City Hall complex is a complicated issue that has apparently been under consideration for a long time. I have been a resident of Parker for 20 years, but was just made aware of the project just prior to the bond election. Several items come to mind:

1. Transparency:

- a. The City Council has obviously done a great deal of work on the project, even going to the expense of architectural drawings (floor plan, not construction plans).
 - i. What were the needs and requirements provided to the architect to which the design was based?
 - ii. If the Council had made that data available to the citizens of Parker, a huge concern would be allayed.
 - iii. If no requirements were provided, why is the Council surprised that the citizens are concerned about the existing design?
 - iv. If no requirements were provided, did the Council allow the architect to design whatever they pleased without oversight?
- b. The city web site no longer has the proposed plans and budget information posted.
 - i. While this could be a technical malfunction, those that no longer trust the integrity of the City Council will see this as another case of hiding information they do not want the public to see, review and analyze.
- c. Due to the above, the City Council is being vilified instead of praised for their work. If they have done their due diligence, then share the information.

2. Size of facility:

- a. 25k square feet seems excessive for our small town. The plans show a very large portion dedicated to the City Council chambers and Executive Session chambers. While cities such as Dallas have these types of facilities, how can that extravagance be justified for our small town?
- b. Many seemingly wasteful items are likely requirements due to government regulations (number of parking spaces, accessibility, corridor widths, etc.).
 - i. If the Council had itemized and provided a list of these requirements with the plans, the citizens would better understand some of the design constraints.
- c. Multiple conference rooms and the City Council Executive session chambers seem quite excessive for our small town.
 - i. Allocating multiple shared spaces instead of dedicated spaces would alleviate the current space constraint while reducing new construction requirements.
- d. The foyer seems to be more of a grand hall than an area to direct personnel from place to place.
 - i. The space, being two story, will be expensive to heat/cool and would serve little purpose.
 - ii. Using the space for voting, while sounding good, is a twice per year activity that could be accommodated in other locations (i.e. shared conference room space)
- e. The "Party Room" being a separate structure from City Hall presents many concerns:
 - i. Not often used and very expensive per square foot. I personally do NOT think this space is needed for the City of Parker, but, IF the needs and requirements so justify then:
 - 1. Being a separate structure requires additional exterior walls, one of the most expensive parts of a building.

Dan Jones (E-mail, Continued)

2. Having a flex space ATTACHED to City Hall would be more appropriate since it could be used for many things.
 - a. Voting
 - b. Conference rooms
 - c. Meeting/Party room for rent
 - d. Training room
 3. Separate HVAC for the space mitigates any concerns on recurring costs while not in use.
3. Cost:
- a. The project cost is touted as not causing a tax rate increase. While this is not technically a lie, it is only true in the light of the closing of current debt obligations that would be put towards this bond. This would, however, require additional funds to pay for the multiple needed infrastructure improvements that the City of Parker needs. The building WILL cost tax dollars and the Parker residents WILL pay for it via property taxes.
 - b. The bond was put to vote WITHOUT getting a firm bid on the entire project. The fixtures, demolition, etc. was NOT included in the estimate and a “filler” number was used (not certain demolition was included at all).
 - i. BEFORE borrowing a fixed amount of money, it is incumbent on the City Council to get bids on ALL items that the project would cover to ensure that cost overruns do not occur.
 - ii. This city has a history of obtaining bond money, paying interest on that money, and not completing projects for years. While schedules do slip and government permits take time, it is NOT acceptable to not take those timeframes into consideration...this is basic project management.
 - c. The overall price per square foot should have caused the City Council to ask highly detailed questions and task the architect to identify why the cost is high and how costs could be lowered.
 - i. IF the Council did ask those questions, why not put that information out to the citizens?
 - ii. Again, transparency is HIGHLY lacking.

In closing, I would like to state that I am totally in favor of a City Hall complex to include the Police Station, but I am not willing to write a blank check. I see limited benefit of a “Citizen Committee” since the opinions of the committee will be equal to the number of participants times 2. I believe the better alternative is for the City Council to do their job:

1. Create a clear and DETAILED set of design specifications to include needs and requirements for the near term, 10 years and 30 years.
2. Carefully review the EXISTING floorplan to identify areas of cost saving (shared spaces, flex spaces, etc.).
3. Confer with architect on changes they have identified
4. Obtain bids for ALL areas of the project:
 - a. Building
 - b. Flatwork (parking and driveway)
 - c. Demolition
 - d. Utility extensions (gas, water, sewer, communications) \Fixtures (desks, tables, chairs, lights)

4. Dan Jones (E-mail, Continued)

- a. Electronics (computers, monitors, TVs, security cameras)
 - b. Etc.
2. Provide ALL the information to the public and explain how and why the decisions were made. Going into Executive Session and coming out with a single number and pushing it to a vote is NOT the way to gain citizen confidence.

Randy Kercho: E-mail Comments

Thank you for leading the public meeting last night. I spoke last night but wanted to add two things;

- 1) Realized I did not state my name - I was the first speaker (Randy Kercho)
- 2) I recommended that the city create the citizen's committee to tackle the facilities issue and stated the committee should have at least one of the council members that were intimately involved in the prior discussions so that the committee had that information at hand during its meetings. I would like to add that one of the requirements of the individuals selected to the committee should be that they have the commitment and time in their schedule to meet multiple times during the month.

Thanks

Scott Livesay: E Mail

My name is Scott Livesay. I live at 7305 Moss Ridge Road. I have the following comments for the discussion about a municipal facility for the City of Parker.

I believe the first bond failure was because of the exorbitant price by the engineering architect. The second bond failure appears be associated with designing more than was necessary. If we agree that the current facility, along with housing the City Police in temporary structures, needs to be addressed and remedied, focusing the discussion around accommodating that should be the task, without adding nice to haves into the equation. I would suggest the new facility have space to allow for occurrences such as elections, without taking over the City Council Room, perhaps a conference/meeting room within the facility layout. But that should not require a separate facility.

It would definitely help the process if the engineering architect provided a lower level of detail behind what becomes the calculated cost per square foot for a facility. Within the building construction business, there are usually two figures discussed. The first is a cost per square foot for the building exterior, without interior buildout. That is nominally \$100 per square foot, given the land is already owned. The interior buildout is nominally \$100-\$150 per square foot depending on the details of the interior appointments. Those costs need to be visible to the city and the residents, and which would aid in the understanding of the bond dollars requested. Whomever is bidding the project knows these costs and can provide them with the cost estimates.

I would suggest at a minimum when addressing the facility cost, we should know:

- The cost of removing the existing facility
- The cost of the driveways and parking concrete areas
- The cost of the foundation, including any groundwork required for soil needs
- The cost of the exterior walls and roofing
- The cost of interior buildout, with options for flooring, trim, wall covering, HVAC, Lan/Network cabling, etc. (separately identified)
- The costs of additional furnishings, if needed by the city
- Any reserve included above the costs, for covering unknowns.

The challenge for the City of Parker is to design the needed space within the facility for a lower cost that will be acceptable to the citizens of Parker. Living within the current tax structure is a good goal. But there are other needs within that tax structure to support the other long term needs of the City of Parker, most predominately being the road infrastructure and the water drainage issues that are underfunded. Long term planning needs to encompass those needs of the City as well as the facility need, and do so within the current tax constraints on the citizens of Parker.

Thank you for your time.

Regards:

Scott Livesay

7305 Moss Ridge Rd

Ed Lynch: E-mail Comments

I recommend the following actions:

- 1) Estimate Parker resident build out given current zoning to include residents by range of age and estimated total households through the 20 year period of a needed bond for a new facility. Disclose that in detail to the residents.
- 2) Publish the needs assessment or do a needs assessment for the 20 year period of the needed bond. Then disclose this to the residents and answer question of the residents about the needs assessment.
- 3) Publish staffing numbers by city department currently and estimated for the 20 year period of the needed bond.

Tom Macduff: E-mail

My name is Tom Macduff - 4313 Sycamore Lane. A resident of Parker Texas since June 1976.

I voted 'NO' on the recent bond election. My concerns about the proposed city admin building, and additional facilities for fire and police, extended across many different issues.

FIRST: The original basis for the REPLACEMENT of our existing structure.

Agreed that the current building is not capable of handling future needs for a larger community, both on a technology basis , a records storage basis, a community use basis, future Police needs, future Fire Department needs.

For those identified needs, and others, my expectations were for the City to present a 'professionally driven NEEDS study' to its residents. Such a study would have included the following:

- 1) - Future Population projections, broken down by likely ages, marital status, children per household, income levels, etc.
- 2) - Expected levels of 'POLICE' activities and needs for records and evidence storage; vehicle storage and maintenance; needed space for interviews and subsequent legal activity; sleep and community rooms, etc.
- 3) - Expected levels of Fire Department activities and needs for a larger population, a likely change in the Fire Departments scope of service to include wind, rain, fire, and chemical events that would require additional equipment and training.

Such a study would likely infer higher levels of added ANNUAL expenses that would be imposed on the City budget. HOW HIGH?

SECOND: The promotion of such a NEW CITY ADMIN building could be an opportunity to promote the forward looking nature of our CITY of PARKER, our leaders and residents.

With forward looking technology, this new building could include:

- 1) - Easier and more effective 'Virtual' AND 'In-Person' inter-action with city services.
- 2) - A portion of 'energy needs' met by GREEN inputs (wind/solar).
- 3) - A complex of building structures and rooms that 'Can have Multi-purposes/uses'.
- 4) - A design of the buildings that can be ALTERED on an as needed basis. The likely move to 'virtual work from home' business practices will likely influence our City administration's practices as well, and therefore our likely space needs would change.

THIRD: A professional NEEDS study could identify pertinent and coming CODE requirements that again promote the appeal of Parker's forward looking leadership.

NONE OF THESE THOUGHTS WERE PRESENTED TO RESIDENTS, ASKED TO CARRY ADDITIONAL DEBT, WITH AN UNKNOWN IMPACT ON CITY BUDGETS, etc.

Greg Malissaratos: E-mail Feedback

My wife and I were unable to attend the meeting.

We are senior citizens and have no inclination of paying higher taxes. We don't feel a new facility is needed.

With the current economy and climate a lot of businesses are allowing their work force to work from home and, are planning to rid themselves of office space in order to save money as the work from home concept is working. This is also true of county and state jobs.

Thanks

Greg

Z Marshall: E-Mail

Honorable Mayor & City Council.

I'm sorry I am out of town and unable to attend to the Community meeting.

As your former Mayor, Mayor Pro-Tem, City Council & P& Z member, I strongly support we move forward quickly with a new Municipal Complex for our great City.

Parker has the highest average home value of all cities in Collin County.

We must improve our City facilities now.

Its unfortunate that we have not done something sooner for the benefit of our Staff, Police, and Citizens.

Our current City Hall was built when we had a population of 950 residents over 30 years ago. With our population now five times that amount, and eventually growing to ten times that amount, our municipal 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.

I think it would be prudent to educate the Citizens on how a GO Bond works.

Also, this needs to be confirmed by legal, but I believe it is state law that we can not even go out for bid on a project using GO bond financing until the bonds may been placed. In other words, you must have the money in the City bank accounts before you can go out for bid on a project.

That sounds totally backwards on how you establish a real cost for a building project before you take it to the voters for approval, but it's the law. Take it up with your state legislators.

I know first hand how difficult your job can be and appreciate all you do for the citizens of Parker.

Thank you for your service.

Z Marshall
Mayor
City of Parker 2012-2018
4004 Sycamore Lane
Parker, TX 75002

Andy Redmond – E-mail Comments

Hello:

I think a community group should be appointed to gather and accept input about a possible new municipal building.

Trustfully you will advise the current council that their prior attempts should be abandoned as the voters rejected those ideas before and at the election (greater than 85% of registered voters participated in the election and the prop a was defeated by more than 60% of said voters).

We've been told publically by the current and past council members that our current building has mold, is unsafe and not feasible to repair/remodel or make addition too for future suitable space. This seems like a lawsuit waiting to happen should a citizen or city staff member fall ill from this "unsuitable" space. We should be examining for a cost savings on how to remodel/add on to the building for future suitability of city space for admin and police. It has also come to the communities attention that little if any current building maintenance budget was in place due to their certainty voters would embrace a new complex. This is poor stewardship of taxpayer funds not to carefully maintain our current infrastructure.

We've also been privately and publicly told by current and former council members that a 'Needs assessment was done'. It's obvious this was not accurately completed by competent / qualified individual(s) --it became a wants list not a needs list for various city departments.

What does the city's comprehensive plan reflect of total build out (city population) based on current zoning?

You should also advise mayor/ council to have no further "executive" sessions regarding this municipal project, complete transparency should be mandated.

Any future designs should have flexible space

If council desires a \$1mil community facility they should put such on a separate bond as the law / statute so requires.

Thanks!

Andy Redmond

7275 Moss Ridge Rd

Jim Reed: E-mail Comments

My name is Jim Reed and I reside at 4703 Boulder Drive in Parker and have been a resident since Jan 2000.

I have a few items that I would like to make a few comments on the building project.

- 1) I am fully on board with having a facility that meets the needs of our community. However, we need a “right sized” facility. We are a ~5500 person community and too much infrastructure is not needed. This all needs to be transparent so the taxpayer community of Parker is informed.
- 2) We are surrounded by communities that have a similar size to Parker. Let’s learn from them what has worked and use their experience in the decision making process. This could involve many factors. The size and scope of facility, timing, cost, bond process, community involvement, etc.
- 3) I would like to see a proposal with supporting bids for the plans that are proposed so we understand the vital details to complete the project and what it involves.
- 4) I feel strongly we could “repurpose” the existing facility to create a new space but not fully rebuild. We should get bids to expand and renovate the existing facility to meet our needs.

Allison Sumrow: E-mail Concerns

Thanks to the Council for this feedback vehicle. We have had several of these sessions, with consistent feedback that was not incorporated, so I do hope that this time, the majority voices will be heard.

To reiterate my previous public comments:

- 1) I am in support of upgraded facilities for the police and staff.
- 2) The facility should be reasonable for a city of our size, and in keeping with the needs of the City. The COST should be reasonable and the size should be reasonable. The defeated proposal was much to large and too expensive, with costs not consistent with costs found in the area.
- 3) A community center is not needed, nor appropriate for a city of our size.
- 4) Serious analysis should be applied to reconstructing/repurposing and expanding the current building.
- 5) A great deal of money has already been spent towards the facility effort, but that does not mean that we should accept those results, if they aren't appropriate. It's very disappointing that the money was spent, but we must put the time and money into the analysis and plans to get it right.
- 6) A needs assessment is the most important next step, done by an organization that has experience with municipal buildings and municipal facilities needs analyses.
- 7) The space should be expandable, allowing for buildout when needed, rather than over building now.
- 8) Common spaces should be centralized – break room, bathrooms, meeting rooms – rather than multiple, repetitive spaces.

Allison Sumrow

Sarah Toth: E-mail Comments

Dear Dr. Garrett,

I wasn't able to attend tonight's meeting, but wanted to say a few things if I may. I am all for being fiscally responsible and making smart decisions for the city. That said, it's shameful that our police officers office out of a portable building that is in disrepair. I agree there is no need for an over-the-top, luxurious City Hall and complex, but we need to have the space to accommodate the needs of the city staff to operate our facilities. We need to have a place for our citizens to gather to discuss important matters. If we think ahead and plan for (hopefully) growth and prosperity in the city, we can build a complex that can grow with us and stand the test of time.

I have been appalled at some of the hateful behavior I have seen from Parker citizens in regards to this building. There are citizens that feel if they scream the loudest and resort to name-calling and other bullying tactics, they will get their way. They need to be shown that this behavior is not ok and will not be tolerated.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Sarah Toth

LeAnn Turrentine; E-mail

After listening to comments at the city meeting for citizens' comments, I've come to the assumption that the majority is in favor of a new facility, especially for our wonderful police department. I have been, and will continue to be in favor of the new facility.

-I think that communication may be one of the key factors. And with the meeting on Tuesday, January 5, 2021, there was a start to include the entire community to voice concerns/suggestions. Although, keeping in mind, that we elected the city officials and put our trust in them that they would do the best by and for the city. I honestly don't know how a citizen's committee would specifically work, but I'm for that if that will entail everyone listening to all parameters. As well as, I would be interested in joining that committee. I do think that all citizens/employees should be invited/allowed to join any committee meeting that is held in regard to the facility. There needs to be transparency and communication by all parties involved and interested in the process.

-Size and cost is at the top of everyone's mind. A written explanation of how the bond would work to all citizens would be a start (I know that it was explained, but it seems to be confusion on that part), especially with regard to increasing taxes for households. There has been a lot of time and money already spent on the process of planning the building. I understand that an exact price can't be finalized until contracts are signed, but, we need to prepare for future costs of items. I hope all will keep in mind, that building a public commercial building, is totally different than a regular commercial building and residential. As someone, pointed out, if you put a residential front door on a commercial building, it is not going to last very long!

I hope that all will keep in mind, that not only do we need to build for today, but for the future. We don't want to go through this process again in 10-15 years when we meet our buildout! And, as someone stated, it's a lot cheaper to build a roof and expand underneath it, than to expand and add on at a later date. i.e. We are about to outgrow our wonderful fire station, if we have not already! I do not think the current facilities are in shape to renovate. We can't keep putting "band aids" on things, they will eventually "explode"! And then we have nothing!

-I think we all agree that we have a phenomenal police and fire department, as well as city staff. They deserve somewhere desirable to work. We must spend money to attract AND KEEP staff. Infrastructure was brought up several times-we have the staff and elected officials to handle these items, we need to keep them. A "revolving door" does no one any good. We will just have to keep starting over. I totally agree that infrastructure, maintenance and other concerns are at the top of lists, but we must provide for staff and officials if we expect them to be able to work to provide us the best possible city departments.

-I think we need communication, transparency and collaboration by all parties to get to the end of the means of which we all want to accomplish-NEW FACILITIES that we can all be proud for our city.