



Community Forum / January 5, 2021

Meeting Documentation

**Dr. Shirley D. Garrett, CSP
Facilitator / Consultant**

Background

Per the request of the City Council, Mayor Lee Pettle contacted Shirley Garrett, Professional Speaker, to facilitate a community-wide meeting (Community Forum) on January 5, 2021.

- The purpose of the forum was to gain community input regarding the recent bond proposition for a new city complex.
 - The proposition failed to gain majority vote.
 - The City Council wanted to know why the bond proposition failed and to learn more about the issues influencing the vote and the concerns of the citizens of Parker.
- The meeting was held at Parker City Hall and participants were able to attend in person or virtually through the “GoToMeeting” platform. Virtual participants used the internet or telephone to connect.
- Speakers identified themselves and their property address.
- Speakers were encouraged to submit their concerns and recommendations though e-mail after the meeting.

Outcomes

A total of 23 citizens spoke at the meeting on January 5, 2021:

- 15 of those who spoke attended the meeting in-person.
- 8 of those who spoke presented virtually.

A total of 20 citizens submitted e-mails after the meeting.

- 7 e-mails were from citizens who spoke (in-person or virtually) at the meeting.

The meeting was recorded on the *GoToMeeting* APP. The recording is available by contacting City Hall.

A transcription of the comments was downloaded from the meeting. A transcript is available by contacting City Hall.

E-mails were received until noon on January 6, 2021. A copy of the content of each e-mail is available by contacting City Hall.

The written summation reflects the messages received during the meeting on January 5th (in-person and virtually) and the e-mails submitted by residents. Every effort was made to:

- Avoid duplicating a comment made by the same person at the meeting (in-person or virtually) and their comment made by e-mail.
- Accurately capture the verbal and written comments.

Meeting Procedure

- **The agenda was posted at the beginning of the meeting:**
 - **Welcome – Mayor Lee Pettle**
 - **Brief introduction of Dr. Shirley Garrett**
 - **Overview of ground rules – Shirley Garrett**
 - **Community input – Property owners spoke / facilitated by Shirley Garrett**
 - **Closing – Shirley Garrett**
- **Ground rules established.**
 - **Each citizen will be given 3 minutes to speak publicly – virtually and in-person.**
 - **Each speaker will share their name and property address.**
 - **Each speaker will speak on their own behalf.**
 - **Speak to the issues with no personal attacks, accusations, or blame.**
 - **Avoid generalizations.**
 - **Audience will listen to others with respect, without comment, interruption, or disruption.**
- **Process to speak was established.**
- **Thought prompts were shared.**
- **E-mail address shared for further comments.**

SPEAKERS

Number	Name	In-person	Virtual	Time Mark on Audio/Video Recording
1	Randy Kercho	X		17:51
2	Jim Reed		X	22:17
3	Don Reynolds	X		24:45
4	Bobby Mathew		X	27:57
5	Cleburne Raney	X		29:55
6	Cal Arnold	X		32:07
7	Scott Livesay		X	33:35
8	Richard Williams	X		36:18
9	Michael Booth		X	38:48
10	Tom McDuff	X		42:04
11	Joe Cordina	X		44:30
12	Skip Cave		X	55:04
13	Bethany Ulteig	X		58:20
14	Jeff Harrison		X	1:00
15	Ling Shurtz	X		1:04
16	Jeff Hardage	X		1:05
17	Edwin Smith	X		1:08
18	Jamie Turrentine	X		1:10
19	Iris Arias	X		1:13
20	Landry Veal	X		1:16
21	Gregor Ulteig		X	1:19
22	Elvis Nelson		X	1:22
23	Marcus Aries	X		1:27

Note:

- A copy of the video/audio portion of the meeting is available upon request. Available by contacting: Parker City Hall

- A transcript of the meeting is available in a word document. It is about 124 pages long and does not accurately portray complete dialogue. It is suggested you also watch the video for an accurate rendition of the meeting.

E-mail Feedback

E-mailed concerns and recommendations were submitted by the following property owners.

1. Van Andrews
2. Iris Arias (spoke at meeting)
3. Brandon Azbell
4. Billy Barron
5. Roxanne Bogdan
6. Skip Cave (spoke at meeting)
7. Jeff Harrison (spoke at meeting)
8. Ray Hemmig
9. Dan Jones
10. Randy Kercho (spoke at meeting)
11. Scott Livesay (spoke at meeting)
12. Ed Lynch
13. Tom Macduff (spoke at meeting)
14. Greg Malissaratos
15. Z Marshall
16. Andy Redmond
17. Jim Reed (spoke at meeting)
18. Allison Sumrow
19. Sarah Toth
20. LeAnn Turrentine

NOTE: A copy of the e-mails is available by contacting Parker City Hall

Methodology

The process used to summarize the remarks is as follows:

- Transcript was downloaded and organized in a manageable format.
- Video was watched to determine the name of each speaker and for clarification of content.
 - The transcript always listed Luke Olson as the speaker when someone was speaking in the live meeting. To identify the actual speaker, it is necessary to watch the video or refer to the time mark on page 4.
 - The comments made by virtual presenters were accurately attributed since each virtual speaker signed in using their name.
 - The transcript was vague or an inaccurate interpretation in several places. Consultant watched each video and made adjusted to accurately reflect the spoken comments.
- Transcripts were analyzed for comments, concerns, questions, and recommendations.
- A process called “affinity diagraming” was incorporated to organize the comments into specific groupings.
- Comments were analyzed and compiled in an easy-to-read format with every intention to report the essence of the speaker’s remarks.
- As in any process like this, there is a margin of error. The consultant listened to all comments and read the transcripts. The transcript and video were compared and reviewed several times to assure clarity.
- Many statements could be listed in multiple categories. The sorting of statements is subject to opinion. The intent was to capture and organize the materials so that it would be of greatest value to the Mayor, City Council and citizens of Parker, Texas.
- Comments in parenthesis () were added by consultant for clarification.

Recommended Next Steps

Distribution of Report:

It is recommended that the report be distributed and utilized in the following method:

1. Consultant will send report to Brandon Shelby, City Attorney.
2. Mr. Shelby will distribute the report to the Mayor, City Council, and City Administrator.
3. Mayor and City Council will meet in a closed session to review the findings of the report. The Consultant will attend virtually.
4. The report will be distributed at a public City Council meeting and available on the city's website. The Consultant will attend this meeting virtually.

Public Meetings to Discuss Report:

1. After the community has a chance to review the documents, a second public meeting will be held.
 - a. The intent of this meeting is to give the community background information regarding questions that have been raised throughout the process of developing a facilities plan.
 - b. The Mayor, City Council and Staff will prepare remarks to clarify as many questions as possible that were posed in this report and issues that were raised during the past few months.
2. An interactive public meeting will be scheduled where citizens, Mayor, City Council, and Staff will give insights and feedback regarding the best way to move forward in facility improvements.

Summary of Comments and E-mails

Support of City Complex as presented in the bond referendum.

- We've already spent a great deal of money – don't start over.
- I'd like to understand options to move forward with current plan.
- I do think a new building is something we need.
- I strongly support we move forward quickly with a new Municipal Complex.
- I have been and will continue to be in favor of the new facility.
- We need to move forward with this recommendation.
- Don't overlook work and effort that has been done to date.
- Council and city residents work together and plan how to get finished fast (building project as proposed)

Proposed City Complex: Questions / Concerns

- Not willing to write a blank check.
- Too much – too soon
- We have a desire to have a permanent police facility as part of a new reasonably sized Adaptable Administration Facility, but first priority is a significant commitment by the city to address infrastructure issues that affect entire community.
- Would like to understand what our options are to move forward.
- Looking for a consolidation of needs and reduction of cost.
- Why do we need a new facility? We need expansion. This building should be easy to expand and add on to.
- Been messing around for 18 years. Would like to see (facility) as originally proposed. It was supposed to connect or part of fire-station.
- Are we really meeting our needs or trying to satisfy a bunch of wants and desires, and needs – certain goals of certain people?
- Do we need it? (lactation room and hallways wide enough for 2 wheelchairs)
- I've lived here 15 years and have seen this (council room) filled one time.
- What about the space out back used for storage?
- We need new police department and municipal complex but concerned around cost and design. Not as transparent as needed.
- Would like to see more clarity on the cost component.
- How much square footage do we need?
- What is our need in 10, 20 yrs.?
- Asked for changes (floor plan) have not changed at all.
- Building/s appearance pretty fancy
- What needs / requirements were presented to architect?
- Did architect have council oversight?
- Building should be designed to meet the actual needs of the City, not the wants and desires of a small segment.
- I think the building is too large and too costly.
- Explain legal requirements so citizens know why so many positions need private office.

Tax and Cost: Comments and Concerns

- I know this can be done without tax increase.
- We don't wish to have a tax increase.
- How will we pay for this (in favor)?
- Explain how complex will be paid for in detail to community (publish).
- How does bond really work?
- Need firm bids on entire project (fixtures, demolition, etc.).
- Ask architect to identify why the cost is high and how it can be lowered.
- To suggest there will be no new taxes is dishonest.
- Educate citizens on how a GO (Government Issued) bond works.
- We (my wife and I) have no inclination of paying higher taxes.
- My biggest concern is property taxes.
- \$9.5 million bond with interest will run \$10.5 million with interest. \$400 / sq foot.
- A written explanation of how the bond would work to all citizens.
- We do need reasonable expectations on the size and the amount (cost).
- Tax burden needs to be low here.
- City needs a larger tax base – appropriate zoning of land for retail, restaurants, and businesses.
- What will it (municipal complex) cost the average citizen?
- Commercial buildings (example – doors) costs more than residential.
- What are the outside costs? Concrete parking lot, lighting – electrical and water access costs?
- What will monthly utility costs be?
- Cost was fiscally irresponsible with poorly designed building.
- Our property taxes are going to be very, very high. Here's why:
 - \$9.5 million original cost (\$13.5 million including the expected interest of \$4 million)
 - 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!)
 - \$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!
 - \$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!

Proposed Administration Building (City Hall): Recommendations and Concerns

- (Concerned about) size of facility – Council chambers and Executive Session chamber.
- (I have) Questions regarding government regulations.
- Multiple conference rooms seem excessive.
- Foyer seems like a grand hall – voting could take place in other areas.
- Too many fixed walls and Fixed offices for people in the field not necessary.
- City Hall can wait.
- Space should be expandable, allowing buildout when needed rather than over build now.
- Common spaces should be centralized.
- Make sure this building will cover us for at least the next 10 years.
- You can put a roof over the building and not finish it out right now (could be used for storage).
- Centralize the common rooms.
- Do we need it (lactation room and hallways wide enough for 2 wheelchairs)?
- Cubicles and open offices are thinking of 20-30 years ago. They are cost effective up front and savings destroyed due to reduced efficiency.
- Is there a way to combine city hall chambers / event room into single room?
- Do not reuse existing structure.
- Appears to be common support for an updated, renovated, or new facility.

Police Facility: Recommendations and Concerns

- What do we need right now?
- Is there a pending inspection that concerns compliance and current code requirements?
- Concerned about police department structure facing a fine.
- Police building does not meet Public Safety building standards – never intended to be permanent solution.
- We need something for our police.
- Police building ought to be a separate building and we go forward with it right away.
- A priority should be placed on permanent housing of the police.
- Police building first. Others second.
- I'm hoping our police are going to be in a safe, secure place, that we're all, at least comfortable with, if not proud of it,
- Please get public safety concerns in front of building a new complex.
- It's shameful that our police officer's office out of a portable building that is in disrepair.

Community Room / Center: Recommendations and Concerns

- Do not feel needed. If needed add flex space attached to city hall (separate HVAC)
- Not needed, nor appropriate for a city of our size
- What about use of new facility for Women's Club? How can they use the facility?
- Consolidate with the gallery for better use.
- Community Center should be eliminated.
- If City Council still wants a separate facility Community Room, put it on the ballot separate from the city hall facility bond.

Infrastructure: Recommendations and Concerns

- Roads are terrible.
- Drainage is terrible (Muddy Creek).
- City needs to work with adjoining cities and county on infrastructure items.
- Lewis Lane is a terrible road.
- Roads and drainage issues are bad and only going to get worse.
- (We have an) aging infrastructure that is crumbling and not supporting the city.
- Need to see more commitment by the city to address infrastructure issues (roads and drainage).
- I do want the city council to fix our roads before we build a new city complex...specifically Dublin Road. The current condition of Dublin Road is a public safety hazard and a public embarrassment.
- If a bond election is needed to maintain and rebuild our crumbling roads, then get it.

Communication Between City Leadership and Property Owners: Recommendations and Concerns

- Transparency (is needed) in every single thing that happens on project.
- Problem is communication: need to keep citizen input continuing throughout the process.
- City must provide way to for requirements and plans to be communicated to citizens at an early stage.
- Must be a method for citizens to provide input.
- Citizens should have access to city input and responses and able to comment.
- Every input merits a response: accept, deny, or modify with justifications.
- City experts need to be identified by name and expertise.
- Explain how complex will be paid for in detail to community (publish).
- Periodic updates with Q & A sessions.
- Listen to and work with the residents of Parker.
- Communication, transparency, and collaboration by all parties needed to get to the end of the means.
- Top issues: Lack of transparency.
- Transparency is lacking.
- Communication is a key factor.
- Provide as much published information by the City Council with as much detail as possible.
- What information is true or what is coming from the city?
- Information to community should highlight requirements imposed by Collin County, State of Texas, and US Federal requirements on public facilities.

Citizens Committee / Engagement: Recommendations and Concerns

- If we had interactive meetings, we could argue the points all the way through.
- I think it's great to have a citizen's committee, but I'm really worried we will get bogged down.
- We should have a citizen council and Mayor and City Council should be involved.
- Community committee is a good idea.
- Mayor and Council are elected to take care of and lead on important projects. This is an important project.
- It is important to do it (plan for future) with citizen input.
- City advisory committee is so darn important.
- Unelected person should not lead the project or chair (community) committee.
- We need to increase citizen engagement.
- 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 don't see how you can say that council and the mayor and city staff can't come (to Citizen Committee), especially if they are citizens.
- Create the citizen's committee to tackle the facilities issue and the committee should have at least one of the council members that were intimately involved in the prior discussions.
- Do not have a citizens committee. No way to form consensus.

Facility and Operations: Comments and Recommendations

- Digital storage of records – analysis / options needed.
- The proposed plans and budget information were removed from website.
- What is the purpose of the metal building? (My) assumption used for auto and machinery maintenance.
- What (are) the storage needs/requirements of paper trail (of official documents)?
- Unsure about ability to go out for bid on project before GO bond financing.
- Work-from-home concept causes businesses to rid themselves of office space.
- Building a public commercial building is totally different than a regular commercial building and residential.
- A lot cheaper to build a roof and expand underneath (later).
- We will see Millennials who will be working from home, offering sales tax opportunities.
- We can take some of our money without having a bond issue, expand current facilities, fix current infrastructure (roads, drainage).
- Use fire department buildings for things like voting.
- Look at pre-fab or modular building.
- Environmental Social Governance (ESG) mandate for companies going forward.
- Virtual working from home (will impact what is needed).

Long-Term Plan: Comments and Recommendations

- Need a long-term plan to identify facility needs, funding and streets and drainage and other city-wide infrastructure.
- (We need to be) doing a facility build out.
- We need fact-based decision making.
- (Need to determine) what is truly needed and what is wanted?
- Identify priorities -- first, second, third level.
- A professional needs assessment is tantamount to moving forward.
- How appealing (are) our decisions to new possible residents.
- What is staffing projection?
- We need to be doing a facility build out.
- Present a professionally driven needs study to the residents including:
 - Future population projections
 - Expected level of Police activities
 - Needs for record and evidence storage
 - Need for vehicle storage and maintenance
 - Needed space for interview and subsequent legal activity
 - Sleep and community rooms
 - Expected level of Fire Department activities for larger population
 - Scope of service to include wind, rain, fire, and chemical events
 - Required extra training
- Would like to see estimated build out of citizen and our estimated staff.
- Considerable work needs to be done to research requirements/needs & develop cost-effective solutions for new Parker Municipal City Complex.
- Likely too much for work (needs assessment and future planning) for city council or staff.
- A city plan to address facility, funding, streets, drainage, and other infrastructure issues.
- Wants vs needs analysis (needed).
- Create a detailed set of design specifications to include needs and requirements for the near term, 10 years, and 30 years.
- Carefully review existing floorplan to identify areas of cost saving.
- Proactively plan and implement plans to deal with growth.
- Confer with architect on changes they have identified.
- Can the building be updated (current building)?

Long-Term Plan: Comments and Recommendations (continued)

- Major concern – lack of planning for whole city.
- Plan for virtual communication.
- Plan now for 10-15 years from now.
- Specific person or group coordinate collaboration with city. Required tasks would be:
 - Parker’s projected population growth over the next 20-30 years.
 - Project staff sizes, facilities & budgets.
 - Find architect with municipality expertise for comparable cities.
 - Keep citizens up-to-date with plan.
 - Citizens issues communicated to city and resolution communicated to citizens.
- Needs study could identify pertinent and coming code requirements.
- A lot of time and money invested already. Does not mean we should accept the results if they aren’t appropriate.
- Needs assessment is the most important next step by organization that has experience with municipal buildings and municipal facilities needs analysis.
- Build for today and the future.
- We need a forward-looking leadership result (in a future plan).
- Looking at producing a facility that meets our needs, not only for the immediate but for the future as well.
- Needs analysis needs to be comprehensive.
- Forward looking technology for new City Administration building:
 - Easier and more effective virtual and in-person inter-action with city services.
 - A portion of energy needs met by GREEN inputs --wind/solar.
 - Building structure and rooms that can have multi-purpose uses.
- 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 / looks 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.
 - Secure (Police Department).
 - Large enough for Police Officers to perform and store their work.
 - Sized so department heads have reasonably sized offices, nothing excessive.
 - Large enough for future needs.

Additional comments

- I want to compliment the city for setting this up.
- Maybe we just want to spend a whole bunch of money so we can put a name on the side of the building or something.
- You can come over here (City Hall) at 2:00 in the afternoon and there is nobody in the lobby.
- A ton of California folks coming our way.
- Market it right and you get what you want.
- I encourage all of you to volunteer to be a part of it (Citizen Advisory Committee).
- What really shocked me is where our police are. I really thought it was a storage unit.
- It's going to cost bedroom home (?) \$8537 / home to have that building.
- Retired people don't have money. Just cannot live (with increased property taxes).
- My property taxes have increased 300% since (I think the year was 1998).
- We really love our police.
- We (the citizens) have the skill and ability to make this (new facility) happen.
- When we all get together, we come up with some really good ideas.
- If you have too many chiefs, you muddle it down.
- Need an expansion on voice -- predominant voice is men (in meetings).
- Concerned about disrespectful language, threats, and suing the city.
- Women's Club may be fine organization. Should not influence the size or design of the facility.
- I have been appalled at some of the hateful behavior I have seen from Parker citizens in regard 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.
- Delaying the project will get worse facility at higher cost.