CITY OF DEER PARK

CC 79-107 CDC 1-219

710 EAST SAN AUGUSTINE STREET

DEER PARK, TEXAS 77536

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 NOVEMBER 11, 2019 BEGINNING AT 6:00 P.M., WITH THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS PRESENT:

| JERRY MOUTON | MAYOR |
|-----------------|--------------|
| SHERRY GARRISON | COUNCILWOMAN |
| TJ HAIGHT | COUNCILMAN |
| TOMMY GINN | COUNCILMAN |
| BILL PATTERSON | COUNCILMAN |
| RON MARTIN | COUNCILMAN |
| RAE A. SINOR | COUNCILWOMAN |

MEMBERS OF DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PRESENT:

GEORGETTE FORD LAURA HICKS JEFF LAWTHER DOUG BURGESS FAYLENE DEFRANCIS PRESIDENT VICE PRESIDENT MEMBER MEMBER MEMBER

MEMBERS OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION PRESENT:

GEORGETTE FORD JO KIEFER SHERRY REDWINE CHAIRMAN VICE CHAIRMAN MEMBER

OTHER CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

JAMES STOKES GARY JACKSON SHANNON BENNETT CHARLIE SANDBERG CITY MANAGER ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER CITY SECRETARY PARKS & RECREATION DIRECTOR Page 2, Minutes, Joint MeetingCC 79-108City Council, Deer Park Community Development Corporation andCDC 1-218Parks & Recreation Commission November 11, 2019CDC 1-218

- 1. <u>MEETING CALLED TO ORDER</u> Mayor Mouton opened the meeting on behalf of the City Council, President Georgette Ford 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 5:45 p.m.
- 2. <u>COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE</u> No comments received.
- THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY 3. DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION WILL DISCUSS POTENTIAL CONCEPTUAL OPTIONS FOR A POSSIBLE NEW COMMUNITY CENTER GYMNASIUM AND INDOOR POOL, INCLUDING POSSIBLE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATING COSTS, AND COST RECOVERY OPTIONS - Parks and Recreation Director Charlie Sandberg gave a brief history recap of the discussions at the previous meetings pertaining to the Community Center and the decision to go with the "campus" option, on the "North" side, the current space allocations, and advised Council of one main focal point, being the size of the gym. The North Option includes building a new smaller community center proposed at 12,000 square feet as the first phase which will potentially be for the administrative offices and the second phase would be a new building that would absorb Earl Dunn Gym with an indoor track and pool within the new construction of the building with a total of 46,000 square feet. The estimated construction schedule for the North Option will run approximately two years to complete. Mr. Sandberg advised Council that Steven Springs put together a list of projected cost comparisons, including a 6% escalation cost. Operational assumptions to include projected full-time staffing levels, new proposed positions, gymnasium and indoor pool usages assumptions, projected operational expenditures and cost recovery with amenity and membership comparisons were also discussed. (Exhibit A1-A6)

Steven Springs of Brinkley, Sargent, Wiginton Architects advised Council of the comparison between the projects and the "all in" costs of 31 million dollars and 34 million dollars and highlighted what each option at those costs entailed. Mr. Springs also gave comparisons between a 10,000 square foot double gym and a 15,000 square foot double gym. The option with a projected cost of 31 million dollars included a single story building with a 10,000 square foot gym and a full size court, but does not include an indoor track. The 34 million dollar option includes 42,000 square feet that does house an indoor track. Both options do not include an outdoor pool. An additional option with a projected cost of 37.7 million dollars includes a 15,000 square foot gym, two full size courts and an indoor track. The outdoor pool projected costs for renovations and replacement of the bathhouse is proposed at an additional \$2,570,000.

Councilman Haight joined the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

All of the options include the same Community Center building next door to City Hall. Mr. Springs emphasized the next steps would encompass determining a preferred option, reconciling final parking requirements and to develop a final concept.

Page 3, Minutes, Joint Meeting City Council, Deer Park Community Development Corporation and Parks & Recreation Commission November 11, 2019

- 4. <u>THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY</u> <u>DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND</u> <u>RECREATION COMMISSION WILL DISCUSS A CONCEPT AND ASSOCIATED</u> <u>COST FOR A SWIMMING POOL BATHHOUSE</u> – Item was detailed in prior discussion.
- 5. THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION WILL DISCUSS TYPE B FUNDING CAPACITY AND POTENTIAL FUTURE TYPE B PROJECT AUTHORIZATION – Assistant City Manager Gary Jackson gave an overview of the different scenarios for the cost analysis of the annual operating and maintenance that ranges between a 15 to 25 year certificate of obligation that includes amounts between \$250,000 to \$350,000. Mr. Jackson commented, "The maximum that you can generate with a 25 year note with \$350,000, O&M would be \$33,805,000. If you went with 25 years with \$250,000, the O&M would be \$36,165,000. There is an upwards of 5 million existing in the Fund Balance. As a reminder of how the first Type was put together, the proposition on the ballot did not tie to dollar amounts because the proposition cannot be written that way. What we did was go back and do a resolution and have Council pass it that tied each project to a cost for a total amount of \$20 million dollars. The combination of the proposition and the resolution that was passed formed a contract with the voters. The Bond Counsel says now, even though you generated, let's not confuse the 6 million dollars with voter authorization with 5 million dollars in Fund Balance that is left. The 5 million dollars is what we generated in cash more than what was projected in the revenue projections to begin with. Since we had a resolution that had specific amounts per project and specific total expenditures we can't spend that fund balance because we didn't contract with the voters to do that. If you had another Type B Election, and you put the total package together and you didn't have a cap or dollar amount then you could spend the 5 million dollars you have already authorized and you wouldn't be restricted by the previous because you would have new voter authorization. What could potentially be done is, with a new bond you can generate either 36 million dollars or \$33,800,000 for new debt but it could be written in such a way to authorize the existing 5 million. And let's not forget we have other projects that have had the expectations built up. We have the Girls' Softball project that has parking that was really intended to be as a more "phased" project. We still have a lot of parking area that needs to be added. The soccer complex and the softball complex have some unlit fields. You could potentially use the 5 million dollars to light the fields and add the parking to those two complexes. Let's not forget that Spencerview has the additional property that was donated that potentially was intended to have parking on it as well. 5 million may not be able to cover all three of those projects but it would take a big bite out of it. You would be able to potentially accomplish through an expanded Type B, without caps in dollar amounts. It is very unusual for a Type B to have capped dollar amounts, there isn't anything wrong with that but it makes it very restrictive. There is some language that Bond Counsel has written that could authorize the new project. For all intents and purposes, we have expanded language to look at. For 25 years you are going to basically tie up all of the money that would be generated for the Community Center, which is what the intent is, but you wouldn't have

| Page 4, Minutes, Joint Meeting | CC 79-110 |
|---|-----------|
| City Council, Deer Park Community Development Corporation and | CDC 1-220 |
| Parks & Recreation Commission November 11, 2019 | |

write it to say "build a community center. That would be allowed in the language."

City Manager James Stokes commented, "Keep in mind several things, John's numbers are always conservative. The sales tax projection that they are based upon is very conservative. The interest rates he projects we will get is very conservative. There is a good chance we will do better than this. I will submit to you that John has never given us anything that we haven't beaten the pants off of it. In all likelihood, there is no guarantee, but I'll ask my Finance Director Donna Todd, has John ever given us one of these that was correct? No, they are always conservative. You all get what I'm saying. What happens with the future, 25 years from now? Everything costs more, what also happens? We are going to get more sales tax because everything costs more because you'll pay a percentage of what things will cost in the future. What you see today, Deer Park doesn't have the same sales tax like what they had 25 years ago. It is not a guarantee but in all likelihood, things will go up. This is very conservative. Also, if you want to put in any general fund money on any part of this, we can do that. We can eat away at costs, if it is something that we want to do. If we want to pay a portion out of some of this, we can pay Mr. Springs with the general fund to take that 38 million dollars down to a lower number. There are things we can do, mechanisms that are perfectly legal, moral, ethical and sound principal fundamental things to do to make this work if that is what Council, Deer Park Community Development Corporation and the Parks and Recreation Commission want."

Mr. Jackson continued the discussion of the capital cost comparisons.

Mayor Mouton commented, "I'm not advocating anything other than this, we are building something that is going to be utilized for the next 50 years. If we short change it now, it is only going to cost more money in the future. As Mr. Stokes said, we are in a good financial position that some of this can definitely be worked through very easily in regards to how we move forward."

Mr. Jackson presented an example of possible ballot language for the Special Election in May 2020.

After a lengthy discussion, it was the consensus of the City Council, Deer Park Community Development Corporation and Parks and Recreation Commission to approve the ballot language for the Type B Special Election in May 2020.

6. <u>THE DEER PARK CITY COUNCIL, THE DEER PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> <u>CORPORATION AND THE DEER PARK PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION</u> <u>WILL DISCUSS THE NEXT STEPS FOR THE COMMUNITY CENTER PROJECT</u> – City Manager Jay Stokes advised Council that the next step would be to call an election, a mid January meeting to go over the operational plan to define expenditures and revenues along with a rendering of the plan. Page 5, Minutes, Joint Meeting City Council, Deer Park Community Development Corporation and Parks & Recreation Commission November 11, 2019

 <u>ADJOURN</u> – Mayor Mouton adjourned the workshop meeting on behalf of City Council, President Georgette Ford adjourned on behalf of the Deer Park Community Development Corporation and Vice Chairman Jo Kiefer adjourned on behalf of the Parks and Recreation Commission at 7:06 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Shannon Bennett, TRMC City Secretary Jerry Mouton, Mayor City of Deer Park

Georgette Ford, Vice President Deer Park Community Development Corporation

Jo Kiefer, Vice Chairman Parks and Recreation Commission