

CITY OF DEER PARK
710 EAST SAN AUGUSTINE STREET
DEER PARK, TEXAS 77536

CC 77-173
CDC 1-180

Minutes

of

A JOINT WORKSHOP MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DEER PARK, TEXAS, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HELD AT CITY HALL 710 EAST SAN AUGUSTINE STREET, DEER PARK, TEXAS ON SEPTEMBER 24, 2018 BEGINNING AT 5:30 P.M., WITH THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS PRESENT:

JERRY MOUTON	MAYOR
SHERRY GARRISON	COUNCILWOMAN
THANE HARRISON	COUNCILMAN
TOMMY GINN	COUNCILMAN
BILL PATTERSON	COUNCILMAN
RON MARTIN	COUNCILMAN
RAE A. SINOR	COUNCILWOMAN

MEMBERS OF DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PRESENT:

T. J. HAIGHT	PRESIDENT
GEORGETTE FORD	VICE PRESIDENT
SUE MAUK	SECRETARY
DOUG BURGESS	MEMBER
JEFF LAWThER	MEMBER

MEMBERS OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION PRESENT:

GEORGETTE FORD	CHAIRMAN
JO KIEFER	VICE CHAIRMAN
SHERRY REDWINE	MEMBER
ERIC RIPLEY	MEMBER

OTHER CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

JAMES STOKES	CITY MANAGER
GARY JACKSON	ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
SHANNON BENNETT	CITY SECRETARY
CHARLIE SANDBERG	PARKS & RECREATION DIRECTOR

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – Mayor Mouton opened the meeting on behalf of the City Council, President T. J. Haight opened on behalf of the Deer Park Community Development Corporation and Vice Chairman, Jo Kiefer, opened on behalf of the Parks and Recreation Commission at 5:30 p.m.
2. THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION WILL DISCUSS ISSUES RELATING TO THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY CENTER – Steven Springs of Brinkley, Sargent, Wiginton Architects began the meeting with a review of the past presentation of the site assessment that was done. Some of the key site observations were of the drainage, shared parking and the multiple entrances. The square footage was incorrect for the gymnasium and has been corrected to show it to be 12,000 square feet. The proposition of the Type B Sales Tax project for the renovation and expansion of the Community Center and Gym does include an indoor pool, but will need to be discussed to clarify a definite design. The scope and scale of the existing building does present some challenges from a physical standpoint and also from a program function standpoint. The next step is to discuss a decision to whether to renovate or reconstruct.

Parks and Recreation Director, Charlie Sandberg gave an overview of the prior discussion of the expansion of the Community Center, there some ideas of the gym and pool. The total investment budget in 2012, was estimated to be 2.1 to 3 million dollars.

Mr. Sandberg commented, “We wanted that to be a real good starting point so you can see the transition from that point to where we are leading to.”

Assistant City Manager, Gary Jackson commented, “That is a good point Charlie made. There was no definition to what that was going to entail, there was no programming that went into that number. That was the overall citywide Parks Master Plan that was the project expansion of the Community Center. That plan didn’t give much detail.”

Mr. Springs continued the discussion with the framed benchmark information of estimated construction costs based on 2018 dollars. These numbers are not the total budget costs. It is only a basic range cost. The purpose of the numbers is meant to provide information to help guide and direct the project. The two options presented are renovation or new construction. Renovation for a 36,300 square foot building with an additional component of possible entrances, to include some room for abatement costs due to the age of the building, estimates between the low range of 8.2 million to a high range of 9.7 million. The second option is to construct a new building. New construction of a building with the same square footage, estimates to be of similar construction cost. What may drive the decision from this point forward, may not necessarily be capital cost. It could be other issues of usage and the long term vision of the project.

Mr. Springs discussed with the pool and gave different scenarios of the usage for the pool. The options included a therapy pool, enclosed lap pool or enclosing the existing pool. Mr. Springs commented, "There is a wide range of what an indoor pool could be, and we wanted to give you all a frame look at what you can and cannot do with a pool. There is a needs assessment process that would need to be followed that would lend a lot more detail for this project."

Mayor Mouton commented, "If we are committing in doing this, it seems like the most important thing to me, is finding the firm that we would need to hire to start the conceptual engineering designs, whether it be a renovation or new construction. I felt it was best to try to have this secondary meeting to come to some kind of agreement of which direction we want to go from here."

Councilwoman Sinor asked, "I am shocked at the numbers. How did we get so far off when we started assigning numbers from the beginning? Is there 6 million dollars to complete all the renovations and the pool?"

Parks and Recreation Director, Charlie Sandberg responded, "Yes. The pool is additional."

Councilman Harrison asked, "A new or renovated Community Center is a little over 9 and 10 million dollars not including the pool? If you add the pool to that, are we looking at 15 to 16 million dollars total?"

Mr. Sandberg responded, "That is correct."

Mayor Mouton asked, "Was there any conversation when we were discussing Type B Projects, of renovating or replacing the Community Center?"

Councilwoman Sinor responded, "Not replacing. It was all renovation, but I do not think anyone knew how bad of shape the building was in."

Councilwoman Garrison asked, "What can we legally do in dealing with the Type B Project? Wouldn't we have to set priorities?"

Mayor Mouton commented, "Based on the bond ballot, we have some minor precedent on how the allocation of the 6 million dollars that was originally funded to City Hall was able to be used."

Assistant City Manager, Gary Jackson commented, "First, the ballot did not speak of a dollar amount. It defined the projects. For this project, renovations and expansion of the Community Center and Gym to include an indoor pool were the parameters given to this project. The Council passed a resolution which put in a dollar amount. You have to look at

the dollar amounts in combination with the ballot amounts. There was in effect, a contract with the voters. In speaking with the same Bond Counsel we had for the new City Hall, even though the City Hall was not a Type B Project, there were bond funds that were left and the majority of that money was City fund balance that we built. We went to the Bond Counsel and let them know there was mold, asbestos and other issues and that it was not feasible to go through all that and practically rebuild the existing footprint and spend almost as much as you are spending on the new building right next door. That was the purpose of that bond issue to move next door and build a new one in lieu of the expansion of the existing one. That question was posed to the Bond Counsel. Mr. Frels felt as long as we stayed within the Dow Park footprint, doing the same similar type thing of not expanding the building because in effect, you are still spending as much when you look at the cost comparison. The pool is still an important factor, and was advertised as included in the contract with the voters.”

Councilman Ginn commented, “I know that pool was a major selling point of the election. I think there will be a lot of unhappy voters if we put that on the back burner.”

Councilwoman Garrison commented, “It doesn’t say what kind of indoor pool. I think some people got their heads wrapped around some kind of a really big indoor pool like they have in La Porte. There was never any promise of that. I don’t see how anyone can possibly believe we can spend 15 million dollars to build a new building with a pool. My concern is what happens to the 6 million dollars if we don’t. I know we can use the 6 million dollars to rebuild or renovate, but anything else that we go over, will have to come out of our reserve.”

Mayor Mouton commented, “We have borrowing capacity of going up to 50 plus million based on the last presentation from our Bond Counsel. We have the space to allocate and cover the expense without effecting the tax rate. There is a feasible way to do it without effecting short or long term scenarios with our rating or borrowing capacity. I am not advocating that we have to do that.”

Councilwoman Sinor commented, “I agree with you Mayor. We are just talking about hypothetical numbers. We have to get to a point where we start talking about real numbers.”

Mayor Mouton commented, “I struggled in the concept in the last meeting of putting a committee together. We have to objectively move forward in hiring somebody to define scopes to enable us to define a budget. Then we can work this whole idea of what is in front of us. In some context, I think the 6 million dollars needs to be preserved to the extent of what was on that ballot. Anything over and beyond that, I think, we should look at different ways the City can propose a secondary Type B ballot proposition. Any way you look at it, the City is in great financial shape to approach this without putting us in any dire straits. If everyone is in some aspect of agreement, we just need to consider putting out a request for proposal and try to find a firm. Then we can start working with a conceptual scope which will then define cost at that point.”

Councilman Patterson commented, "I am concerned about the numbers and how we got here. We do have an opportunity to set the future course in Deer Park in the area of Parks and Recreation. I hope we do not lose sight of that and get caught up. I want us to remember we are leaving a footprint for the future."

Councilman Harrison asked, "If we were to build a new Community Center, what would happen to the existing facility?"

Mr. Springs responded, "We didn't try to define that yet at this point. It depends on the scope. We can't answer your question directly because there are many options."

Councilman Harrison asked, "Did any of the numbers you presented include demolishing the existing Community Center?"

Mr. Springs responded, "Yes, in Option 2."

Councilman Harrison asked, "Did those numbers include parking and lighting for the new Community Center?"

Mr. Springs responded, "Yes. It was all in from a brick and mortar standpoint. It would not have included soft costs."

Councilman Harrison asked, "Is there any part of the existing Community Center where we could keep the structure, the sides and roof and also put a pool in?"

Mr. Springs responded, "No, not really. The only thing that would be feasible would be the gym. That is the only healthy structure. The existing building is full of structural and internal problems. It wouldn't be feasible to put a pool inside the existing structure."

Councilman Harrison commented, "You could put a pool in the gym at the Community Center in that one building."

Mr. Springs responded, "It is technically feasible. In my intuition, you would spend that much to make that work."

Councilman Harrison asked, "The number you gave to build a new facility, does that include a gym or keeping the existing gym?"

Mr. Springs responded, "Keeping the existing one. Conceptually, we were taking the 24,000 square foot footprint of the existing Community Center and just moving it to another place in the park."

Councilwoman Garrison asked, "Can you tell me again what is the square footage of just the Community Center?"

Mr. Springs responded, “24,000 square feet.”

Councilwoman Garrison asked, “We still do not know, at this point, if we will need 24,000 square feet?”

Mr. Springs responded, “Correct.”

Councilwoman Garrison commented, “If I remember correctly, from a presentation before, one of the gentlemen talked about how unstable the ground is and that he recommended not putting in an inground pool.”

Councilman Harrison asked, “The dilemma is, do we move the Community Center and keep the gym or totally renovate and possibly have to add on and not have a pool?”

Mayor Mouton commented, “The aspect of renovating that building is the same conceptual problems we had with City Hall, where you cannot shut that building down to renovate it and expect not to disrupt programming substantially of an extended amount of time. That is not an option. We can leave the building and maintain it as it is, or we can build a new one to replace it while we leave the existing building there.”

Mr. Springs commented, “We didn’t really have a way to put a cost to that disruption. You would have to temporarily house those programs in a different location or shut them down.”

Councilman Harrison asked, “In the Type B that was passed, it mentioned a pool. If we were to build a new community center in Deer Park and keep the gym and demolish everything around it, can we approach a pool at a later date? If we build a new community center, do we have to have a pool because of the way it is worded?”

Mayor Mouton commented, “We have so many directions we can go in. We can’t do everything with the 6 million dollars. Once we start defining the scopes, we will have multiple scopes of direction. The pool being one, the community center being another and based on what we do with the community center, the last scenario being the gym and how we can make all that work.”

Councilwoman Garrison asked, “Are you estimating the cost for a new Community Center with the drainage included?”

Mr. Springs responded, “Yes. We didn’t line item a whole list of things. We just used a square foot cost and provided that range for that very reason. I provided a low and a high range because we really don’t know what the site development costs are.”

Mayor Mouton asked, “In the general scope, is it safe to say yes, the drainage would have to be accommodated?”

Mr. Springs responded, "Correct. Unless there is something unusual going on that we don't know about, typical site development costs are included in the numbers."

Councilman Harrison commented, "I am in agreement with Councilman Patterson."

Councilwoman Garrison commented, "I agree too. I think this is our future. I think we should build something we are proud of, this is our future. We just have to bite the bullet and move forward."

Councilman Martin asked, "Is the next logical step putting RFP's out to get real numbers?"

Councilwoman Garrison asked, "Don't we need to know how many square feet we are really needing if we build a new community center?"

Mayor Mouton responded, "I would say the next step is to hire someone to design the perimeter, and to come up with what our needs are now and for the next 50 years with what is recommended from Staff."

Mr. Springs commented, "What you are talking about is what we call a needs assessment process. You have the opportunity of success because you can go into the project with your eyes open and having built consensus about what is going into the job and knowing the numbers are valid."

Mr. Sandberg commented, "What you see currently being programmed in the Community Center, I am not advocating for or against it. The current programs may not be there anymore. That may change in the future."

City Manager, Jay Stokes, commented, "In terms of hiring a firm, we are already under contract with Halff and we have Mr. Springs through that relationship with them. That step is already established."

Mr. Springs commented, "We have some money left in the existing contract, via Halff with the City."

Mayor Mouton asked, "Are you more on the engineering side or architectural side?"

Mr. Springs responded, "I am the architect. I would say that the money is still encumbered in Halff's contract that is, our money. It is not enough to cover a full needs assessment, but there is some money there to get started."

Mayor Mouton commented, "I am up for exploring and expanding perimeters moving forward with a defined scope. I would accept recommendations from you in regards to where we are."

Mr. Stokes commented, "I would like to keep working with Mr. Springs. It will save time from having to start all over."

Mayor Mouton asked, "I just want to make sure Council, the Community Development Corporation and the Parks and Recreation Commission is good with that moving forward?"

Mr. Jackson asked, "In looking at the prospective scope, are we looking at renovation?"

Mayor Mouton commented, "My personal opinion, based on the programming interruption, I do not think renovation is an option."

Mr. Stokes asked, "Now that we know that renovation is not an option, and that we will be creating something new, the question is, who is going to be involved in determining what we will be creating? We know we will be working with Mr. Springs, but do you want this to be Staff driven or do you want it to be a committee?"

Mayor Mouton responded, "I say multiple different committees and multiple different approaches. No matter where we go with this, it is going to end up right back here with Council and these two committees."

Mr. Stokes commented, "For the next few months, Staff will work with Mr. Springs to come up with conceptual ideas and bring them back to a called meeting."

Mr. Springs commented, "Typically when we are involved in a needs assessment like this, we usually are talking to a steering committee and then doing period reports to the larger bodies. I think a steering committee with 10-12 members. The questions I would have in order to formalize a proposal, is knowing how many public meetings we would have to have? Or is the committee structure provided so we do not have to have that many public meetings?"

Mr. Stokes asked, "This is what I see, a couple of basketball courts, some kind of therapy indoor pool, a walking track, a weight room with nice lockers. Is this something that we are looking at?"

Mr. Springs commented, "The component I didn't hear was the mention of the preschool."

Mr. Stokes commented, "To be clear, I do not see a preschool in the new building. This is becoming more clear, we will end up with a contract with Mr. Springs. Staff will work on all this and we can meet back in early 2019."

Mr. Springs commented, "I think the best interest is to come back at the first couple of milestones along in the process to make sure we are still between the digits that everybody wants to see. I would want our first big group meeting for a progress report before the holidays hit."

It is the consensus of the Council to streamline the process and to come back in future meetings for assessment reports and updates. If anything should come up, adjustments can be made as the conceptual ideas progress.

2. THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION WILL DISCUSS ISSUES RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO REVIEW OPTIONS FOR THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY CENTER – Discussion was covered with the previous item and will be determined in a future meeting to appoint a committee.
3. THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION WILL DISCUSS ADDITIONAL EXPENSES AND FUNDING FROM THE MAXWELL ADULT CENTER UNENCUMBERED BALANCE – Parks and Recreation Director, Charlie Sandberg, gave an overview of the Maxwell Adult Center renovations and the additional expenses. Mr. Sandberg explained how originally, some of the expenses were pulled out prior to construction of the project because of pricing. The expenses, now coming up, include structured cabling for internet and phone service, architectural services for project administration and additional days added due to issues related to the normal scope of work.

Assistant City Manager, Gary Jackson commented, “I believe Charlie only has numbers on the first item of structured cabling and that will be an item for you to vote on in an upcoming agenda. I believe what Mr. Sandberg wanted to preface you on the expenses, in addition to what is on the agenda, because of the extra time it has taken. There is an extended number of days that the contractor will have to be paid due to general conditions. The number looks like it will be limited down between \$11,000 to \$15,000. That is less than it could have been. The time for approving that will not be until the contract is completed because the number of days are unknown until then. Based on the current completion date, it looks like it will be in the \$15,000 range for the additional days. Mr. Springs’ contract was based on the number of days originally set in the contract. Since it took more days, he has provided more architectural services. There is enough money within the unencumbered funds for the structural cabling as well.”

4. THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION WILL CONSIDER AND TAKE ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL TO REQUEST FUNDING FROM THE MAXWELL ADULT CENTER UNENCUMBERED BUDGET – Parks and Recreation Director, Charlie Sandberg gave an overview of the fund amount it will take to cover project costs associated with structured cabling and network cabling for the internet and phone services. An estimate for the structured cabling is projected to be \$17,680.37.

Motion was made by Georgette Ford and seconded by Doug Burgess to recommend to City Council to request funding of \$17,680.37 from the Maxwell Adult Center unencumbered budget.

5. THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL WILL CONSIDER AND TAKE ACTION ON A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION TO AUTHORIZE FUNDING FROM THE MAXWELL ADULT CENTER UNENCUMBERED BUDGET – Motion was made by Councilwoman Garrison and seconded by Councilman Patterson to authorize funding from the Maxwell Adult Center unencumbered budget in the amount of \$17,680.37. Motion carried 7 to 0.
6. ADJOURN – Mayor Mouton adjourned the workshop meeting on behalf of City Council, President Haight adjourned on behalf of the Deer Park Community Development Corporation and Vice Chairman Kiefer adjourned on behalf of the Parks and Recreation Commission at 6:42 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Shannon Bennett, TRMC
City Secretary

Jerry Mouton, Mayor
City Deer Park City Council

T. J. Haight, President
Deer Park Community Development
Corporation

Jo Kiefer, Vice Chairman
Parks and Recreation Commission