

LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED - SPECIAL
RETREAT WORKSHOP SESSION

FEBRUARY 2, 3 AND 4, 2006

WORTHINGTON HOTEL
200 MAIN STREET
TREATY OAK ROOM
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2006

Present:

Gene Carey, Mayor

Council Members:

Greg Tierney, Mayor Pro Tem
Tim Blair, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem
Mike Nowels
Dean Ueckert
Rudy Durham

City Staff:

Claude King, City Manager
Donna Barron, Assistant City Manager
Steve Bacchus, Assistant City Manager
Julie Heinze, City Secretary
Ronald J. Neiman, City Attorney

With a quorum of the Council Members present, the called – special retreat workshop session of the Lewisville City Council was called to order by Mayor Carey at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 2, 2006. Other City staff in attendance was Budget and Research Manager Gina Thompson, Jason Kirkland, Budget Analyst, Assistant City Attorney Liz Plaster, and Communications Manager James Kunke.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2006

2005 Retreat Recap

City Manager King recapped the 2005 Council Retreat Direction and reviewed the current status of each of the following items:

- Off-Year Citizen Survey
- Police Department Manpower
- Police Department Crime Scene Investigators
- Police Department Manpower
- Police Department Jail Remodeling
- Fire Department Ambulance Billing Clerk
- Police Department 12 Hour Shifts
- 4th Ambulance
- Additional Staffing Station 4 and 6
- Station “7” (Westside)
- Old Town Parking
- Old Town Plaza
- Temple Property
- Residential Historical Preservation
- Conservation District
- Expand Old Town District
- Proactive Zoning in Old Town
- North Old Town Bonds
- Streetscape Extension
- Convention Center
- Eastside
- Westside Development
- Garbage Options
- Compensation Plan
- Strategic Plan

Strategic Planning Concept Review

City Manager King reviewed his PowerPoint Presentation regarding Strategic Planning Overview with the City Council.

City Manager King advised on Saturday the City Council and staff would be reviewing the City Council goals. City Manager King also advised that he would like to have a follow-up meeting in a month or two to review these goals.

Current Issues: Review and Discussion

City Manager King reviewed the nine priorities and their respective unresolved issues as follows:

Priority: Provide a well developed infrastructure, meet demand for community service

- Replacement of Animal Shelter
- Additional Funding for Corridor beautification Program/I35 enhancements
- Additional funding for replacement of aging water/sewer lines

- Additional funding for street/sidewalk/alley rehabs to offset age/cost increases
- Storm water program and associated costs
 - Additional funding for annual program?
 - Lakepointe/Waters Ridge lake/channel assumption/costs/funding source
 - Drainage Utility?
- Water re-use and infrastructure funding required
- Need for a facilities equipment/system replacement funding program for major system replacements/refurbishments
- Underground utility (phone, cable, power) program with customer surcharge
- Technology funding for system replacements:
 - Network switches (\$280,000)
 - Public Safety Radio System (see “Safe/Secure”) (\$1.75M)
 - Server OP Syst replacement (\$50,000)
- Water System (Carrollton Project) Expansion funding (\$7M)
- Sewer System funding (East Lewisville meter station, lift station, force main (\$6.9M)
- Garbage Service options (1x week residential)
- Phase 2, 3, of G.O. bond Schedule (funding for jail, etc.)
- Water supply to DCFWSD (Castle Hills)
- Drilling Ordinance

In regard to the I35 enhancements, Councilman Ueckert requested that City staff look into if any of the billboards are affected by this project can they be relocated to another property. He also requested City staff to find out if the State has restrictions on billboards along 35.

Councilman Ueckert requested a list of priorities of what areas City staff feels water line replacement are needed along with a list of streets that may also need to be replaced.

Priority: Controlling Costs

- New cost-sharing agreements with Flower Mound for “second” radio system and for annual “cost of service” (HV, FM, LD, Coppell, Denton County)
- Rising cost of health plans (plan modifications)
- Comp plan: regional competition impacts (cost) on fire/police, using merit only for General Government plans
- Controlling growth in personnel (+associated workload problems)
- Managed competition/privatization/interlocal purchasing: how aggressive?
- Hybrid vehicle funding/COG model “clean fleet guidelines”

Priority: Respond to changes in socio-economic demographics and impacts on community image and community involvement

- Sign Ordinance changes
- Kiosk signs replacing weekend directional and allowing off-site advertising
- “Branding” Lewisville: What are we and how are we different
- Spanish communication/program
- Level of social service agency funding (GF)
- 2020 Plan (Nowels) Time for consultant managed re-visit?
- Police Department Communications with Hispanic community
- Better marketing of Lewisville (funding)
- Web Portal concept (funding)
- Extended Stay “hotels” (legislation, Police Department activity)

Councilman Nowels recommended utilizing both current City of Lewisville cable stations and making them mirror images of each other with one in all English and one all Spanish. Discussion was held regarding the growing Hispanic population in the City of Lewisville and the need to serve these residents. Consensus of the City Council was that there was a need to look into better communicating with the Hispanic population in the City of Lewisville.

Priority: Financial Stability

- Reductions in over 65/disabled exemption levels
- Potential for sales tax “drain” (internet, competition to west, aging centers, reduced purchasing power)
- Property tax base, revenue caps or reductions, property tax over-dependence
- Use of SIB loan refund, GF/UF reserves
- Reducing UF Debt
- GASB 45 (retiree health funding)
- RFP for financial advisor?
- Revenue Bond Rating (Moody’s): Reduce debt, build reserves, increase rates
- Future reduction in “host fee” revenues
- 4B project costs
- Balance between project and operating costs in 4B (more operating = less projects)
- Future decreases in CDBG?
- Future decreases in H/M tax? (I35 impacts)

Priority: Provide cultural and recreational opportunities for residents and visitors

- Location/need for East Side Rec Center (\$800K bonds sold)

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 5

- Use of church site: OT Arts Activity Center? Rec Center? Neither?
Funding/Sources?
- Athletic Fields Master Plan (consultant study)
 - Types of fields/funding/phasing needed at RR St Park \$21-\$22M not including:
 - Valley Ridge Blvd (Main to Corporate) \$2.5M?
 - Railroad St (121 to Bennett) \$3.0M?
 - Trinity Trail System (Durham)
 - Types of fields/funding needed at East Hill Park
 - Types, locations, funding priorities/sources needed for tourism: festivals, lake, OT, canals/arboretum, fields/stands, etc.
- Racetrack impacts/participation (Valley Ridge: SH121 to Main...\$4.0M?)
- Possible need for additional library staffing after expansion
- VB Long Range Plan (+ use of H/M tax)
- OT Plaza: scope/funding
- Regional Sports Authority concept with Denton
- VB visitor center location/scope (exhibits? Arts? Own vs. lease?)
- Usability/use of Vista Ridge Amphitheatre/parking
- Reduced participation in Rec/Athletic Programs
- Future of Athletic Leagues/contracts
- Memorial Park Rec Center expansion: need?
- July 4th event: new location, date, funding source, simultaneous event with HV?

Priority: Provide a community where citizens/visitors are safe and secure

- Perception and reality of neighborhood instability
- Code enforcement effort/results (funding)
- Shrinking “available time” in Patrol
- Lack of citizen participation in crime prevention
- Jail population/capacity/expansion timeline (\$3.1 + M)
- Jail staffing increase (funding)
- Radio System replacement/interoperability (funding - \$1.75M)
- Crime scene investigation specialist
- Day laborers
- East Lewisville Fire Station nee/location/funding
- “Truck Company” station need/location/funding
- WEB based PD information (funding)
- Neighborhood Enhancement Team Program: funding sustainability?
- Youth gang activity

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 6

With no further discussion, Mayor Carey adjourned the Called – Special Council Retreat Workshop Session at 10:14 p.m.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2006

With a quorum of the Council Members present, the called – special retreat workshop session of the Lewisville City Council was called back to order by Mayor Carey at 9:06 a.m. on Friday, February 3, 2006. Other City staff in attendance was Budget and Research Manager Gina Thompson, Jason Kirkland, Budget Analyst, Assistant City Attorney Liz Plaster, and Communications Manager James Kunke.

Current Issues (cont'd)

City Manager King began reviewing the remaining priorities and their respective unresolved issues as follows:

Priority: Respond to changes in economic base and aging or substandard/residential/retail/commercial properties

- SF Rental Inspection Program
- OT parking/funding/locations/TIF Bonds
- Res/Retail use of Temple Church block
- OT retail survivability/new incentive program/redevelopment opportunities
- Westside retail survivability/incentives/redevelopment (mixed use)
- OT population density (TH vs. MF)
- East Side junkyards
- SW LV incentives/infrastructure
- Transit related re-development (land banking, funding, incentives)
- Funding source for ED (4A/B Sales Tax)
- 35E ROW/construction impact
- Expanding MF inspection program to hotel/motels
- Specific targets for redevelopment/associated barriers, incentives, funding
- Expanded OT master plan

City Manager King handed out and reviewed the results of the survey that the City Council had recently completed. Discussion was held regarding the results. Councilman Durham stated that he was not in favor of imposing any additional regulations. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Blair expressed concern that the building code was different years ago and he wanted to ensure that the building codes would comply with what was in effect at the time those homes were built. City Manager King advised that would be how the inspections would be handled.

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 7

City Manager King explained that the program was generally looking for bad violations that would be a violation at any time.

Discussion was held regarding lease contracts and occupancy control. City Attorney Ron Neiman advised that he did not feel the City could impose that people enter into a particular agreement with respect to private property. City Manager King questioned if the City Council wanted staff to look into this topic. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Blair stated he would like to find out for sure if the City could at least recommend a contract that is enforceable by law. City Attorney Neiman advised that an oral lease is enforceable by law.

Discussion was held regarding an ordinance that limited the occupancy level. Assistant City Attorney Liz Plaster advised that there was a Fire Code that did address occupancy level.

Discussion was held regarding expanding the Multi-Family inspection program to hotel/motels. Councilman Durham advised he was opposed to this. Councilman Ueckert advised he felt it would go well with the current program.

Priority: Meet transportation and transit demands

- Funding for Windhaven/Corporate Drive
- Valley Ridge Blvd. through park area (+ Valley Ridge south of 121? See cultural/rec)
- I35E Schematic/ROW
- Use of “Near Neighbor” funding
- Regional connector & local route service (DCTA)
- P & R locations
- Train Station locations
- Use of ELAP funds (Garden Ridge, Fox, Corporate?)

Councilman Ueckert questioned if the City would be required to pay for utility relocations? City Manager King stated that initially that had been the case; however, the City had been told it is now included in the project.

Councilman Nowels explained the current situation regarding Collin County and Frisco. City Manager King advised of a meeting next Thursday to discuss this issue.

Priority: Maintain stable high

- Increase and strengthen bilingual service delivery
- Improve recruitment/selection systems
- Improve employee recognition/reward system
- Maintain compensation/benefit packet that is competitive with survey cities

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

- Develop and invest in ongoing training and education programs
- Improve internal employee communications and information flow within and between departments

City Manager King questioned if there were any other issues the City Council would like to add to the list.

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for a break at 10:20 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 10:33 a.m.

Railroad Street Park

City Manager King reviewed the proposed phasing that had been done by Dunkin Sims Stoffels, Inc. Bob Stoffels was present to respond to any questions posed by the City Council. City Manager King advised handed out new cost estimates and an aerial photograph of the area that showed the proposed phasing.

Bob Stoffels then reviewed where each of the six phases would be located and what they would be comprised of and their respective cost as follows:

	ITEM	ORIGINAL ESTIMATE	REVISED ESTIMATE
Phase I	Skate Park & Dog Park	\$2,538,260	\$2,068,435
Phase II	Temporary Football Facilities	\$3,515,900	\$3,527,400
Phase II – Part II	Park Maintenance Building Compound		\$400,000
Phase III	Northern Soccer Complex	\$4,236,125	\$4,035,500
Phase IV	Football Complex & Southern Soccer Complex	\$4,794,125	\$4,149,500
Phase V	Softball Complex	\$3,780,250	\$3,696,250
Phase VI	Baseball Field	<u>\$1,533,625</u>	<u>\$1,162,625</u>
	Total Athletic Complex Cost	\$20,398,285	\$19,036,710

Mr. Stoffels explained that another element associated with development of this project is the Trinity Trail. Mr. Stoffels showed where that trail would be located and how it flowed.

City Manager King reminded the City Council that these are preliminary costs.

Discussion was held regarding using the facility once a phase was completed. Councilman Ueckert questioned if the walking trails would be constructed of asphalt or concrete. Mr. Stoffels stated that they would prefer concrete as the cost is cheaper. Mr. Stoffels advised that there would be paved access to all bleachers per ADA requirements.

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Councilman Ueckert questioned why the football field was in the first phase. City Manager King advised that staff had wanted to relocate football facilities from Lake Park to allow more room there for baseball and eliminate the dual use of the field. Councilman Nowels questioned if it was possible to put in the lights in Phase 2 and then when the field is converted to its permanent use then that is when the lighting goes in for a huge cost savings, or at least a deferment. Parks and Leisure Services Director Fred Herring advised that could be done; however, if you prolong it the cost will probably go up. Discussion was held regarding providing permanent lighting that can be flipped for other areas of the park.

City Manager King stated that a regional sports authority might be interested in this field and bring in a big time baseball tournament that these facilities could possible work well for; however, it would depend on the amenities that are included and surrounding the park. City Manager King also stated and a PSA could be done to determine a long range master plan for the fields that could possibly incorporate East Hill Park that could shape the direction that the City goes in the future. City Manager King also pointed out that there could be a possible economic development impact.

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Blair questioned if the trail system needed to be 10 feet. Mr. Herring advised that in order to get a State grant, the width needs to be a minimum of ten feet; however, they do recommend 12.

Capital Project Funding

City Manager King reviewed a PowerPoint presentation regarding Capital Project Funding as follows:

Parks Funding Issues

<u>Comments</u>		<u>Budget</u>	<u>Need</u>
	RR St. Park	\$8.022M (4B)	\$20-22M
	“VB” Athletics	--	Unknown
	OT Plaza	1.000M (4B)	1-3M
	Arboretum/VR Canals	--	Unknown
	OT Rec Center Land	.800M (4B)	Unknown
	Ot Rec Center	4.160M (2012 4B)	5.0M

Parks Funding Issues (cont'd)

Comments		Budget	Need
	RR St. Park	\$8.022M (4B)	\$20-22M
	“VB” Athletics	--	Unknown
	OT Plaza	1.000M (4B)	1-3M
	Arboretum/VR Canals	--	Unknown
	OT Rec Center Land	.800M (4B)	Unknown
	Ot Rec Center	4.160M (2012 4B)	5.0M
	Mem Park Gym	2.275M (2013 4B)	3.0M
	OT “Activity” Center	--	3.7 – 7.9M
	East Hill Park	--	20M
	Trinity Trail	.507 (G.O.)	.507M

Roads Funding Issues

Comments		Budget	Need
Developer Match	Windhaven (Trinity-Josey)	--	1.5M (City)
COG Grant?	Corporate (Waters Ridge)	3.0M (G.O. future)	1.8M
After Sinacola	RR Street	--	3.0M
COG Grant?	Corporate (Josey Bypass)	--	14.52M (No ROW incl.)
ED Development	Valley Ridge (121-Park)	--	3.0M
	Serendipity	2.749M	4.806M
	West Lake Park II	4.442M	4.442M
	Richland St.	1.190M	1.190M
	Valley Ridge (through park)	--	2.50M
	Vista Ridge Mall Drive	1.765M (G.O. future)	2.0M
Owners & Denton County?	Sprinks	3.5M (G.O. future)	4.162M No ROW (Majestic Est.)
Owners & Denton county?	Valley Parkway (3040-121)	3.5M (G.O. future)	4.573M No ROW (Majestic Est.)

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

County Funding \$5M	Valley Ridge (Mill-Kealy)	--	3.5M
County (same) Funding \$5M	Valley Ridge (Kealy-College)	--	5.0M
	Westwood Estates 1	7.465 (future G.O.)	7.465M
	Westwood Estates 2	5.820 (future G.O.)	5.820M

Miscellaneous Funding Issues

<u>Comments</u>		<u>Budget</u>	<u>Need</u>
	Radio System	--	\$1.75M
	Doc Imaging/ Network /OS	--	.6M
2 possible sites	FD "Truck" Station	--	3-4M
	Animal Shelter	--	1.5M
	Jail	3.115 (G.O. future)	3.115M
	PS Training Facility	1.34 (G.O. future)	1.34M

Old Town Parking

<u>Comments</u>		<u>Budget</u>	<u>Need</u>
	Property Acquisition	--	\$1M?
	Improvements	.3M ('06) TIF	105M?

Economic Development

<u>Comments</u>		<u>Budget</u>	<u>Need</u>
	Land Banking/Transit Related Development	--	??
	Retail Incentives	--	?
	Westside Incentives	--	?

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

4B Plan
 Railroad Street Phase 1, 2
 (Name ?)

4B uses	RR Park Ph 1 (dog, skate, infra)	\$2.538M
	Sinacola Earthwork	.600M
	Internal Road (from Ph. 3)	.370M
	RR Park Ph. 2	3.516M
	Trinity Trail	.507M
	TOTAL	\$7.531M

4B Plan
 RR St. Phase 1,2 (cont'd)

4B Sources	05-06 budgets (fields)	\$.982M
	4B Bond (Skate Park)	1.035M
	06 Budget (Dog Park)	.505M
	4B Fund Bal (moved from 06-07 budget)	5.500M
	4B Bond Interest	.440M
G.O. Source	Trinity Trail	.507M
	TOTAL	\$8.969M

4B Plan
 RR St. Phase 1, 2 (cont'd)

Other Sources	Valley Ridge (121 to Park
	RR St. (121 to Bennett)

G. O. Bond Status

	<u>Authority</u>	<u>Issued</u>	<u>Authority Balance</u>
1998 Election			
Drainage	3.130	2.180	.950
Public Safety	3.000	2.570	.430
2003 Election			
Streets	64.270	11.650	52.620
Jail	3.115	0	3.115
PS Trng	1.340	0	1.340

G. O. Bond Status (cont'd)

	<u>Original Plan</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>Plan Balance</u>
Use of Funds				
Misc. St. (ED)	1.120	1.120		
N OT	2.000	1.200	.430	.800
Serendipity	4.716	1.375	1.410*	1.931
W Lake Pk II	5.566	.965	3.465*	1.136
Bal/V Ridge	1.923	2.200	--	(.277)
	\$15.325	\$6.860	\$4.875*	\$3.590

*\$4.875M was generated on the '05 sale of \$4.790 par value bonds due to bonds selling at premium. The \$4.790 is used for calculating remaining authority.

G.O. Bond CIP

*Estimated three year capacity (FY 07-09) is \$23.95M (2% av growth) to \$26.17M (3% an growth) keeping rate stable at .13572

Program Recap: Early Projects

- Valley Ridge (GR toWCL) Under construction, funded
- Westlake Park II In design, funded
- Serendipity In design, funded partially
- North OT Richland St. in design (\$3.245M in remaining unsold “authority)
- Miscellaneous St. \$1.12M used for OT TH project. \$4.675M in remaining “authority” (\$.880 in original plus \$3.795 shifted from Valley II – see below

Program Recap: Middle Projects

- Westwood Estates I/II \$13.285M original budget authority for “wood” streets west of Valley Parkway. Multiple inquiries about timing. Part of PD Neighborhood Enhancement Program area
- Jail \$3.115M. Council direction from '05 retreat to move up to '06 sale if possible

Program Recap: Late or Deferred Projects

- Vista Ridge Mall Dr. (\$1.865M). High priority and benefit/cost but current COG Arterial Streets application
- I35 Bridges (\$6.90M). No longer needed due to state commitment to fully fund 35E
- Fox Avenue (\$3.795M). High Priority but current DCTA ELAP application

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

- Valley II (\$3.795M). Shifted to Miscellaneous Streets category after extensive waterline/street rehabs in 2003.
- Public Safety Training Center Addition (\$1.34M). Always prioritized at end of program, assuming other priorities higher.
- Southwest LV (\$7.0M). Sprinks and Valley Parkway. Agreement with Denton County to fund 3 or 4 legs pending (as well as property owner agreements). Also Sprinks is a GOC Arterial Streets application.
- East OT (\$5.463M). “Triangle” between Main, Railroad, 121 and Mill/Kealy. Ash/Birch/Sycamore, Kealy (Purnell-Whately), Thomas, Hembry (S. of McKenzie), Mesquite done through street rehab. Scope of project undefined, possibly subject to future redevelopment plans.
- South OT (\$1M). Various streets between Main, Mill, Purnell, Edna. Underfunded for scope if using concrete/storm drainage/OT ROW standards. Possibly subject to future redevelopment plans.
- Corporate (\$3M). East of I35 in Waters Ridge to Railroad St. Current application for COG Arterial Street Program. Possible ELAP project (after Fox).

Miscellaneous Streets

Original remaining authority	\$.880M
+from Valley II	3.795M
+from I35	6.000M
+from Fox	<u>3.795M</u>
	\$14.470M

+VR Mall Drive?	1.865M
+Valley/Sprinks?	7.000M
+Corporate	<u>3.000M</u>
	\$11.865M

\$26.335M?

G.F. Balance

Undesignated Reserves	\$12.370M
SIB Return	<u>3.890M</u>
	\$16.260M

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Advances From General Fund

- The GF can provide funds for G.O. Bond projects and then be reimbursed from a future bond sale.
 - Reimbursement resolution must be passed by Council prior to expenditures.
 - Reimbursement must occur within 18 months of putting facility into operation.
 - Expenditures made within three years prior to date of issuance are eligible

Recommended '06 G.O. Bond Sale

- Capacity is \$4.920 -\$6.015M (2% av – 3% av growth). Assumes stable tax rate.

High Priority Projects

- Serendipity
- Jail
- Valley Ridge to Park
- Railroad Street
- Windhaven
- Corporate (Waters Ridge)
- Westwood Estates 1, 2

Bond Sale Scenarios

2006 (4.90-6.015M)	Serendipity	\$2.057M		
	Misc Sts. (Valley Ridge)	<u>3.000M</u>		
		\$5.057M	Say	\$5.060M GO
	Jail			3.115M GF
	Windhaven			1.500M GF

2007 (10.045-11.315M)	Westwood Est. 1	\$ 7.465M		
	Jail	<u>3.115M</u>	(Reimb)	
		\$10.580M		\$10.580M GO
	Railroad St.			\$ 3.000M GF

2008 (7.525-7.395M)	Westwood Est. 2	\$5.820M		
	Misc. Streets	<u>1.500M</u>	(Reimb)	
		\$7.320M		\$7.320GO

2009	Misc. St.	3.000M	(Reimb)	
		etc.		

Other Possible Projects

Valley III Subdivison	\$8.3M
Bennet Lane	4.3M
College Street (RR-Valley Ridge)	1.75M

Castle Hills Water Supply Option

Assistant City Manager Steve Bacchus referenced the memo contained in the City Council backup material and explained the situation surrounding the contract. Mr. Bacchus then began his PowerPoint Presentation regarding the Castle Hills – Denton County Fresh Water Supply District Water Options as follows:

Background

- Denton county Fresh Water Supply District (DCFWSO) Contract with UTRWD – 2.7MGD
- DCFWSO 2015 Water Needs
 - Area south of FM 544 4MGD
 - Area north of FM 544 7MGD
 - TOTAL 11MGD
- Bright Farm 1996 Agreement – DCFWSO to provide Right of First Refusal (ROFR) to Lewisville regarding water supply
- Anticipate ROFR 2007-2008
- City Eastside Pump Station (ESPS) capacity 12.4 MGD
- Currently serves Austin Ranch, Crossroad Center North, and delivers water to core of City.

Water Option 1

- Lewisville provide all water to DCFWSO
 - Wholesale
 - Retail
 - Combination wholesale/retail
- Lewisville assume 2.7 MGD UTRWD contract w/DCFWSO assuming cost

Water Option 2

- Lewisville provide water to DCFWSD to area north of FM 544
 - Wholesale
 - Retail
 - Combination wholesale/retail
- Lewisville agrees/grants DCFWSD to obtain water from UTRWD for area south of FM 544 and east of FM 2281

Water Option 3

- Lewisville agrees/grants DCFWSD to obtain water from UTRWD for all areas

Water Option (cont'd)

- Future Lewisville annual cost for UTRWD (2005 cost)
 - 2.7MGD \$1.43M Option 1
 - 4 MGD \$2.12M Option 2
 - 11 MGD \$5.82M Option 3

Recommendation

- Option 2
- DCFWSD to obtain water from UTRWD for area south of FM 544 and east of FM 2281
- Lewisville provide retail/wholesale water to area north of FM544

Assistant City Manager Steve Bacchus requested direction from City Council regarding which option they preferred. The general consensus of the City Council was that they preferred Option 2.

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for lunch at 12:38 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2:03 p.m.

Neighborhood Policing Initiative

City Manager King referenced the backup material contained in the City Council’s retreat notebooks.

Police Chief Steve McFadden began a PowerPoint Presentation regarding this item. He began by reviewing the background information for this project as follows:

- Mayor and Council recognize the need to enhance “sense of security in neighborhoods.
- It has long been recognized that fear of crime is as detrimental to quality of life as the actual crime rate.
- Traditional police programs target order maintenance and criminal violations, but have little time for quality of life issues.
- Code compliance and code enforcement issues greatly affect neighborhood sense of security and quality of life

Primary Program Goals

- Enhance residential neighborhood “sense of security”
- Increase police and code enforcement visibility in selected neighborhood.
- Reduce incidents of business burglary, residential burglary and burglary of motor vehicle and reduce patrol calls for police service in selected neighborhood.
- Reduce code violations and complaints of code violations in selected neighborhood.
- Involve the neighborhood in the effort

Program Philosophy

- Dedicated team provides:
 - Increased citizens’ sense of security in their neighborhood
 - Improved quality of life in the neighborhood
- Increased police presence can affect crime as well as sense of security.
- Code enforcement is integral in avoiding the “broken window syndrome” and improving the neighborhood appearance.
- Team concept takes advantage of specific knowledge and experience of both departments.
- Problem-oriented Policing allows extended time in neighborhood and focuses on specific, recurring crime problems.
- Promote understanding of neighborhood needs and nuances.

- Provides understanding of what the citizen perceives as the real neighborhood problems.
- Additional resources are available and will be used as appropriate and available. These resources include all PD units, FD, PALS, Public Services and other departments.

Chief McFadden then reviewed the Strategies to Achieve Goals as follows:

Goal #1 – Enhance residential neighborhood “sense of security”

- Media campaign to inform and present as positive program.
- High police visibility and personal acquaintance.
- Personal contact with citizens and business owner/operators to learn actual concerns and problems.
- Provide crime prevention programs

Goal #2 – Enhance police and code enforcement visibility in selected neighborhood.

- Team of one code enforcement officer and two police officers dedicated to area.
- Program includes weekend code enforcement visits and varying police hours for up to seven-day police visibility.
- Team may request additional resources or expertise.
- Police utilize foot patrol, bicycle patrol and vehicle patrol.
- Increased crime-watch meetings and neighborhood gatherings.
- Police mobile Special Operations Center used as base for events.

Police Chief McFadden reviewed the program staffing as follows:

Program Coordinator – Captain Todd Taylor

Program Supervisor – Sgt. Gordon Blair

Two Police Officers – One Code Enforcement Officer

Goal #3 – Reduce incidents of business burglary, residential burglary and burglary of motor vehicle and reduce calls for police service.

- May experience temporary reported crime increase due to lessening of fear of reporting.
- Uncommitted time allows rapport with homeowners/businesses.
- Business and home security surveys to “harden the target.”
- Additional resources to combat crime trends.

- Team provides cellular number for direct contact with team on non-emergency calls.
- Detailed and timely crime analysis to notify team of crime trends.

Goal #4 – Reduce code violations and complaints of code violations.

- Dedicated code officer establishes more continual presence in target area.
- Conduct/host neighborhood meetings to inform citizens of code issues and receive feedback.
- Produce/distribute friendly, easy to read information packets to proactively educate about common violations.
- Coordinate with other departments as needed to provide additional services or provide additional information.
- Compare initial compliance rates with end results.
- Team police officers readily available for uncooperative contacts.

City Manager King advised that the Code Enforcement Officer would be a reassignment along with the Police Officers. He explained that the Police Department would be back filling their positions. City Manager King stated that the existing Code Enforcement Officers will have a slightly higher service area to cover which will result in a lower level of service for the other areas. He further stated the only way to avoid this would be to add a Code Enforcement Officer to the budget to avoid; however, he recommended they wait and see how this program works first.

Goal #5 – Enhance public relations and marketing efforts to selected neighborhood.

- Press release explains ideology of program.
- Team and support elements participate in “kickoff events.”
- Police administrator directly involved to provide support and involvement
- Periodic press releases to enhance program image.

Goal #6 – Involve the neighborhood in the effort.

- Officer contacts seek direct input from residents and business owners/operator to understand their fears and concerns.
- Officers anticipate dedicating 20% of time to direct citizen contact, information gathering and problem solving.
- Facilitate and foster additional neighborhood groups and involve them in neighborhood security.
- Identify informal leaders to assist, facilitate and assist team.

- Neighborhood kickoff and follow-up meetings to obtain feedback and allow citizen input.

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Blair questioned if the Horizon was delivered to every resident and if this information could be placed in the Horizon to notify the citizens. Communication Manager James Kunke advised that was in the plans. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Blair also stated he wanted to be sure that the kids were very involved in this process because most times they are more aware of what is going on than the adults. Assistant Police Chief Jerry Galler explained the programs that were geared toward children and that this was a program for the entire family.

City Manager King advised that the while people would want to be involved in the beginning, the trick was to keep them involved and the program growing.

Discussion was held regarding getting former members of the Citizen's Police Academy involved in this program. Discussion was held getting Police Officer involved that had the "fit" for this program.

Chief McFadden reviewed the target areas and explained they had been divided into three sub areas.

Chief McFadden then reviewed the Targeted Crimes and Code Violations as follows:

- Burglary of Vehicle
- Burglary of Habitation
- Burglary of Business
- Vandalism
- Gang Activity
- Parking/driving on wrong side of street
- Blocking mailboxes
- Abandoned/Inoperative vehicles
- Vehicles parked on grass
- Inoperative vehicles in yard
- Recreational vehicles (storage/size, use, etc.)
- Unsightly matter
- High grass and weeds
- Weight limitation parking (trucks, wreckers, etc.)
- Tree limbs needing trimming
- Illegal signs
- Structures in need of repair/substandard
- Fences in need of repair

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 22

- Construction permitting
- Illegal accessory building occupancy
- Occupant load violations
- Garage sale compliance
- Illegal home occupations
- Graffiti and graffiti abatement

Chief McFadden then reviewed some sample code violation photos.

Chief McFadden then reviewed the Program Timeline as follows:

First Quarter, 2006

- Select police officers for team
- Initiate team member planning meetings
- Develop and print program flyers, brochures, and other materials needed to initiate program
- Initiate program description mailing to program area (March 15)
- Follow mailing with media campaign to highlight program

April 1, 2006 – September 30, 2006

- Program officers begin door-to-door introductory contacts.
- Officers describe program and solicit input.
- Kickoff event in one neighborhood of initial target area including program personnel and support from various departments.
- Door-to-door contacts and kickoff events are held in additional areas.
- All activities associated with six primary goals become active as appropriate.
- Initial estimate required to serve each of three sub-areas in 60 days.
- As program moves out of sub-area, NRO's and other units increase time in area to avoid feeling of abandonment.

October 1, 2006 – Evaluation phase

- Compare crime statistic to previous year.
- Compare code compliance to previous year.
- Post-program survey of citizen perception.

Councilman Nowels clarified that this plan was not based on results that showed reduced crime calls. Chief McFadden advised that City staff does hope there will be a reduction in crime; however, initially the calls will probably increase.

Councilman Ueckert suggested contacting various organizations to see if they would let City staff explain this program at their monthly luncheons.

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for a break at 3:14 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 3:19 p.m.

July 4 Event: Current Issues, Future Options

Assistant City Manager Donna Barron began her PowerPoint Presentation regarding the July 4th Event as follows:

July 4th Event

- Event Considerations
 - Continuing July 4th Event at Vista Ridge Mall or moving event to Lake Park
 - Discontinuing July 4th Event and developing unique event at alternative time/place
 - Funding Issue

Current July 4th Event at Vista Ridge Mall

- Fire Marshall will allow launch from Vista Ridge Athletic Complex site (temporarily)
- Can continue to shoot up to 14” shells (Note: Bldg.’s w/in fallout zone must be unoccupied.)
- Future commercial development along Lake Vista Drive could result in NFPA violations as early as next year

Ms. Barron showed an aerial view of the current launch site with a lay-in of current buildings. She pointed out that there are new building located in this area since the last fireworks show. Mr. Barron advised that the Fire Marshall that the fireworks cannot be shot from this location if the buildings are occupied.

NFPA Rules Related to Fireworks

- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- NFPA 1123 – Fireworks Display
 - Establishes all Criteria
- Equipment, Site Selection, Operation & Fallout Areas
- Mortars (Aerial) Fallout Areas (Diameters)
 - 4 Inch - 280’
 - 6 Inch - 420’
 - 8 Inch - 560’
 - 12 Inch - 840’
 - 14 Inch - 980’

- 16 Inch – 1120’
- Distance of Largest Mortar Increase by 75’ - Safety

Festival Site

- Theatre construction has eliminated current festival site (southeast parking lot) for 2006 (and possibly permanently)
- Mall has stated event can only be held on Sunday prior to July 4th or July 4th
- Mall preference to move festival site to Sears parking lot between store and “restaurant row” on I35

Map of Launch Site and Festival Site

- Considered various launch sites on northeast side of I-35
- Mall has approved use of Sears parking lot for festival site
- Considered:
 - Huffines Property
- Would need owner approval
- Does not provide long term solution due to future development
 - City-Owned 54 Acres
- Fire Marshal recommends against use due to power line proximity
 - Waste Management Property
- Methane Recovery Unit representative has stated that methane levels at launch site would not be problematic
 - All have “I35” considerations

Ms. Barron next showed a aerial map of potential launch sites. She advised that the company that launches the fireworks did not like any of these sites due to the lights along the interstate and the commercial businesses.

Discontinue July 4th Event and Replace with Unique Event at Alternate Date/Location

- Lake Lewisville
 - Partner with Highland Village and develop Music Festival
 - 1st weekend in June
 - Shoot fireworks on Lake Lewisville
 - Could also include lake sporting event
- Western Day Celebration
 - Partner with OTBA to expand Western Day Celebration per PricewaterhouseCoopers recommendation

Ms. Barron recommended if the City Council wants to move the fireworks show to the lake that it not be on July 4th due to how busy the park already is on this day. Ms. Barron

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

advised the City Council that Sneaky Pete’s had indicate if the fireworks show is brought to the lake they would fund at least 50%, if not 100% , of the fireworks.

Ms. Barron then review an aerial of a proposed shared site plan

Funding Issue

- TML General Counsel has conservative opinion concerning use of hotel/motel funds
- *Two-Prong Test*:

All HOT expenditures must

- a. “Promote tourism and the convention hotel industry”; and
- b. Fit into one of six statutorily-authorized categories:
 - convention & visitor center
 - convention registration
 - advertising (print or other media) and promotional programs (undefined) to attract tourists
 - promotion of the arts (15% cap)
 - historical restoration or preservation (50% cap)
 - sporting events in county under 290,000 population

- ❖ TML Article: Most fireworks shows probably do not meet either of the two prongs
- ❖ Mall area hotels survey – July 4 event does not put “head in beds” and results in “security” costs for hotels

2005 Red, White and Lewisville

Fireworks Show	\$35,000
Talent	\$42,250
Misc. (stage, generators, sound system, restrooms, fencing, etc.)	<u>\$26,750</u>
	\$104,000
HOT covered 69% of expenses	
Sponsorships/Landfill Agreement/Coppell Contribution covered 31% of expenses	

Other Events and Two-Prong Test

1. Holiday at the Hall (2005)
 - Event cost - \$88,140
 - 24% of cost covered by sponsorships/ED agreement/landfill agreement
 - HOT covered 76% of expenses
 - Used to promote Old Town as an attraction – “Promotional Program”
 - Has potential to put “heads in beds” due to fact takes place on weekend and advertised as part of Shop & Stay package
 - Promotes “arts in Old Town” per PricewaterhouseCoopers (Art Carving Village, etc.) (promotional program)

2. Music Series
 - Falls under 15% Arts cap
 - Tuesday & Sunday event dates deter overnight stays
 - Needs improved hotel stay tie-in (difficult linkage)

Option #1

- Continue July 4th Event at Vista Ridge Mall
- Use other revenues to fund fireworks show and talent
- Limit festival to match to space available (local talent)
- Gradually reduce size of shells and increase distance from spectators

Option #2

- Move Fireworks/Event to Lake Park – create Music Festival
- Move date to match Highland Village Blues Festival (Avoids July 4 crowds at Park)
- May need to cover costs of fireworks through sponsorships or general fund (best approach)
- Entertainment selected must meet two-prong test . . . may be difficult
- Need to conduct test launch on lake
- Highland Village could be approached to share costs of fireworks
- Sneaky Pete’s potential offer to share fireworks cost
- Lake Lewisville poses logistics concerns that must be solved through off-site parking/busing
- Development of hotel packages around event would help meet two-prong test

Option #3

- July 4th Event at Lake Park
 - I35/407 construction impacts
 - Problems with massive traffic logistics and ingress/egress on Lake Park’s most crowded day

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 27

- Still has “two prong” test problem for funding unless event is changed substantially

City Council Direction

- Either
 - Proceed with July 4th planning at Vista Ridge Mall
 - On July 4th
 - Sunday before July 4th
 - Drop July 4th Event
 - Develop alternative event plan that meets two-prong test or event funded elsewhere
 - Move July 4th Event to Lake Park
 - Stay with July 4th date
 - Consider earlier date shared with Highland Village

Discussion was held regarding not having a July 4th event. Councilman Ueckert stated that a number of residents will be unhappy if there is no event. Councilman Durham stated that this event is the one he gets the most positive feedback from. Councilman Nowels stated he was not happy with the concept of canceling the July 4th event.

Discussion was held regarding the funding issue and the opinion from TML General Counsel and whether the 4th of July met both prongs. City Manager King reiterated City staff's opinion that the fireworks show does not qualify to utilize hotel/motel funding. He added that if the City Council decides they want to use that type of funding then they would be doing so with the risk of being challenged.

Discussion was held regarding holding it at the current location. Councilman Durham requested that City staff obtain information whether or not the two buildings will be occupied on July 4th. Councilman Durham stated that it could possibly be held for one more year at its current location.

Councilman Nowels stated he was not opposed to having two events; however, he wanted to be sure the City has the fireworks show. Councilman Durham concurred with Councilman Nowels statement. Councilman Nowels stated he likes the festival event idea out at the lake that could tie in and piggy back with the Highland Village Festival. He further stated that he felt this had a lot of marketing potential. Discussion was held regarding partnering with other area cities to create a regional type of event.

City Manager King verified that the City Council wanted to try and have the Fireworks show at the Vista Ridge Mall at least one more time, more if possible. He also verified that they

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 28

were interested in doing a special type of event with Highland Village and other area cities along with the 4th of July event, but perhaps not this year.

Discussion was held by the City Council that they wanted to spend Hotel/Motel Funds on this year's event and look at a budget package for future years. They also wanted for City staff to research sponsorships for this event. City Manager King and City Attorney Neiman requested clarification from the City Council that they wanted to use Hotel/Motel Funds for this year's event. The consensus of the City Council was that they wanted to use the Hotel/Motel Funds for this year's event.

(Mayor Carey left the room at 4:52 p.m.)

With no further discussion, Mayor Pro Tem Tierney adjourned the called – special Council Retreat Workshop Session at 4:53 p.m.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2006

With a quorum of the Council Members present, the called – special retreat workshop session of the Lewisville City Council was called back to order by Mayor Carey at 9:00 a.m. on Saturday, February 4, 2006. Other City staff in attendance was Budget and Research Manager Gina Thompson, Jason Kirkland, Budget Analyst, Assistant City Attorney Liz Plaster, Communications Manager James Kunke, Economic Development Director Zane Miller, Old Town Planner Shawn Lewis, Planning and Community Services Manager Gene Lewis.

Old Town: Phase 2

City Manager King referenced the maps where the City Council had recently drawn on showing how they viewed the various land use plans in the City. He stated that while there were some similarities, they were all quite diverse and in order to make decisions, there would have to be some consensus.

Old Town Planner Shawn Lewis reviewed a PowerPoint Presentation regarding Old Town, Phase Two, as follows:

- Progress Report
- A. Land use/zoning update
- B. Private development activity report
- C. TIRZ financials
- D. Way finding status
- E. Facade grant program status

II. Issues

A. Retail & Residential Development, Redevelopment

1. Space or lack thereof for new retail
 - a. Center District Business List
 - b. Center District Vacancy List
2. Types and differences of retail business
3. What types of retail could be targeted? Buxton?
4. What kind of incentives are needed?

Issues (cont'd)

5. Marketing OT retail: who and how?
6. Residential
 - a. MF vs TH/SF. Is high density MF needed or wanted? If so, where?
 - b. Is city driven SF lot assemblage and redevelopment an option?
 - c. What kind of residential incentives are needed?

Issues (cont'd)

1. Parking
 - a. Review first block project
 - b. How much and what kind of parking is needed to support retail objectives?
 - c. Where should parking be? (Prop Acq)
 - d. Should the TIF issue bonds to improve parking options? Can TIF resources be leveraged with other city resources (4B, GF) to enhance options and achieve the objectives?

Issues (cont'd)

8. Which areas should be targeted for redevelopment?
 - a. King Drug/lumber yard/laundromat
 - b. McKenzie Hembry
 - c. Triangle area (see below)
 - d. Depot area (see below)
 - e. Kealy Corridor
 - f. Inca/Andes/LISD/MHP/CCA (see below)
 - g. Temple Church
 - h. Miscellaneous SF assemblage
9. Is 4A needed to accomplish objectives?

Issues (cont'd)

B. Public Investment/Facilities

1. Church property: public use or private use?
 - a. Retail, MU
 - b. Housing, TH, SF
 - c. Rec Center site
 - d. Arts/Multipurpose Activity Center
 - e. Other ideas
 - i. Indoor Event/Festival Space
 - ii. Training/Seminars
 - iii. Fitness Center
 - iv. Visitor Center/Staff Offices

Issues (cont'd)

2. Rec Center site (Property Acq)
 - a. Bonds sold
 - b. Need?
 - c. Leveraging with other objectives
3. Plaza (Property Acq)
 - a. Big, small or not at all?
 - b. Parking leverage?

Issues (cont'd)

4. DCTA Rail Stop: Best Location?
 - a. Depot site (+ east/west)
 - b. Triangle site (+ east/west)
 - c. Feasibility/cost effectiveness of large scale transit related redevelopment
 - d. Leveraging with other objectives
5. OT Planning Area, TIF Zone, Regulatory Zone: Expanded?
6. VB Center: where?

III. Should an objective, third party put all of the pieces together?

Discussion was held regarding hiring a third party, such as the Buxton Group to do research marketing for this area and if it would be beneficial.

Example (Prop Acq)

- City partners with developer. Developer acquires King Drug, lumberyard, laundromat, etc. City obtains COG \$ (Sust. Dev.) to offset certain infrastructure costs for high density MF/MU redevelopment

- City acquires ½ acre on site for Rec Center (future amenity for development, 4B \$ offset to developer acquisition costs). Shares parking with development using:

Example (cont'd)

- Developer/City jointly financed parking facility (TIF \$) for residents, Rec Center users, OT retail
- City leases MU space for VB center (H/M \$)
- City sells/leases church site for retail/TH
- City passes 4A 1/8 or 1/4¢ sales tax for ED

Example (cont'd)

- Use proceeds to begin land banking/ business relocation east and west of train stop site and in McKenzie/Hembry, Kealy Corridor (also used for OT marketing)
- City acquires Mulkey Mason (GF \$ or 4B \$ and uses 4B \$ to develop Demers/Poydras/MM as plaza park with TIF \$ funded surface parking
- City expands planning & TIF zone to 121 and Dart line. Targets high density MF locations.

Old Town: Phase 2 (cont.)

Assistant City Manager Donna Barron gave a PowerPoint Presentation regarding the Old Town Activity Center as follows:

Mesquite Arts Center (MAC)

- Revenue
 - FY 2004-2005 GF Revenue:

\$14,625	Facility Rental
<u>\$30,000</u>	Arts Council*
\$44,625	

*Arts Council "contribution" to Arts Center Administrative Staff salaries; comes from HOT funds given to Arts Council by City

Mesquite Arts Center (cont'd)

- GF Operating Costs - FY 04-05 (36,700 sq. ft. facility)

Utilities (electric, gas)	80,000
Administrative Support (2)	84,000*
Custodial Crew (3)	<u>70,000</u>
	\$234,000

(Does not include landscape and building maintenance)

*\$30,000 offset from Arts Council

Mesquite Arts Center (cont'd)

- MAC Mission:
 - Present the arts in full in Mesquite
 - Focus on "unique" performers; "one-of-a-kind performances"; track performances that have a potential for putting heads in beds
 - No arts group has a preference for rental of space
 - MAC affiliate nonprofit arts organizations pay an annual lease for rental based on ability to pay – do not pay in excess of \$4,500 annually; six local arts groups; limited to designated number of rentals
 - MISD limited to 22 one day rentals annually (contributed to original construction budget)

Mesquite Arts Center (cont'd)

- Arts Council Role [501(c)3]
 - Self-appointed (11 member board)
 - Board make up – business; MISD; CVB; Misc. (no art group members)
 - Raise money through memberships, theatre camp, piano use fee (\$37,255 in FY 04-05); Arts Council also received \$20,000 from state/federal grants
 - Given 15% of HOT Fund (\$110,057 in FY 04-05); required to fund a % of Arts Center administrative salaries

Mesquite Arts Center (cont'd)

- Arts Council Role [501(c)3] (cont'd)
 - Arts Council funds marketing, office supplies, acquisition of art and provides grants to arts groups; open to all arts organizations (do not have to be member of any particular arts group)
 - No Mesquite arts group can receive in excess of \$5,000 annually
 - Major limitation for revenue generation is size of facility (city staff allowed to use at no cost/consumes a high percentage of day use)

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Mesquite Arts Center (cont'd)

- Operation:
 - Visual Art Exhibits 3-4 weeks per exhibit/12 exhibits per year
 - (5 exhibits devoted to leasing group; 7 exhibits produced by Arts Council)
 - Black Box 10 performances/yr.
 - each show requires 4-5 weeks:
 - 1st wk. Blocking/Rehearsals
 - 2nd wk. Tech
 - 3rd – 5th wk. Production

Lewisville Arts Groups

- HOT Grants
- Administration by GLAC

	<u>Grant</u>	<u>% Total Revenue</u>
Lewisville Lake Symphony	\$ 30,135	30%
*GL Community Theatre	38,452	41%
Lake Cities Ballet Theatre	33,634	26%
Visual Art League	28,073	85%
Musical Feast Choral Society	9,536	49%
	\$139,830	

*Also received \$18,500 for facade improvement.

History of Old Town Activity Center

Purchased in 2000

2004 Retreat Direction

- Option 10 B-1 selected – Multi-Purpose Facility
 - guts existing sanctuary facility to create flexible space
 - No exterior modification
 - Reconstructs classroom wing
 - Full-service kitchen
- Construction costs - \$3,710,000
- Put on hold pending convention center RFP process

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

May 23, 2005 Called-Special Meeting

- Option 11 presented
 - guts existing sanctuary to create Black Box Theatre/exhibit hall
 - Constructs Main Gallery and small gallery
 - Add courtyard on west
 - Total space 27,770 sq. ft.
 - Total project costs \$7,990,000
 - Projected operating costs:
 - Utilities \$70,490
 - Center Supv (salary & benefits) 52,949
 - (2) Custodians (salary & benefits) 57,728
 - \$181,167**

Ms. Barron reviewed the Option 11 and the floor plans for the various floors.

Recreational Arts Center

- Scheme 11
 - Recreation Center with an art class focus (dance, theatre, music, painting, ceramics)
 - Can be used for OT Special Events
 - Special room for ceramics (drying/mud room)
 - Design/Construction Costs \$7,900,000
 - Operating Costs \$185,000
- (Class costs will be covered by fees)

- Demolish OT Activity Center
- Construct 20,000 sq. ft. Recreation Center (similar to Memorial Park)
- Costs
 - Demolish \$ 100,000
 - Design 380,000
 - Construction 3,800,000
 - FFE 150,000
 - \$4,430,000**
 - Operating Cost s \$250,000

Ms. Barron pointed out the letter in the City Council backup from the Arts Council advising the City that they do not want to use this facility for a true performing arts center. City Manager King stated that he felt the underlying fear was the City Council would require them to use this facility in lieu of funding. City Manager King reminded the City Council of the consultant mentioned during Old Town Planner Shawn Lewis' presentation. Councilman Ueckert wanted to move forward with hiring a consultant to see if what the City Council thinks

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

makes sense. Councilman Ueckert questioned the time frame for this. City Manager King advised he felt it would take six to nine months.

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for lunch at 11:55 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 1:31 p.m.

Health Insurance Planning

Human Resource Director Melinda Galler introduced consultants Randall Martell and Brent Weegar from IPS Advisors, Inc. Mr. Martell advised that he felt the best approach for the City of Lewisville was to look at a Wellness Plan to help reduce costs. Mr. Martell began a PowerPoint Presentation regarding an overview of the City of Lewisville’s Health Plan as follows:

- Claims and Plan Performance Review
- Benchmarking Analysis
- Consumer Driven Healthcare
 - HSA Overview
 - HSAs vs. HRAs
 - Savings Analysis of an HSA
- Wellness; Shifting Paradigms of Cost Control
- Initial Recommendations for 2006
- Wellness Program Proposal

City of Lewisville
Medical Per Capita Claims Cost
2004 - 2005

	Medical	Nation
2004	\$3,314	\$4,160
2005	\$3,741	\$4,630
Percentage Δ	12.9%	11.3%

City of Lewisville
2005 Medical Per Capita Claims Costs by Plan and Group

	Enhanced	Basic	Retiree Enhanced	Retiree Basic	2005 Total
Net Medical Claims	\$1,536,583	\$565,769	\$176,608	\$76,112	\$2,355,072
Employees / Retirees	386	201	24	17	628
Per Capita Cost	\$3,981	\$2,815	\$7,359	\$4,477	\$3,750

Impact of Large Claims

- In 2004, City of Lewisville had 36 claimants over \$10,000 accounting for \$800k. In 2005, City of Lewisville had 52 claimants over \$10,000, accounting for \$1.6m.
- In 2005, 3% of the total population covered, under the City of Lewisville's Health Plan, accounted for over 59% of the City's claims cost

Risk Analysis of Chronic Cohort



Chronic Disease Category	Risks	Disease Related Claims	Claims
Asthma	80	\$17,187	\$215
Inpatient Claims	2	\$5,982	\$2,991
Congestive Heart Failure	6	\$2,009	\$335
Inpatient Claims	-	-	-
Coronary Artery Disease	42	\$147,453	\$3,511
Inpatient Claims	5	\$104,984	\$20,997
Diabetes	82	\$25,948	\$316
Inpatient Claims	-	-	-
Maternity	51	\$86,353	1,693
Inpatient Claims	16	\$45,580	2,849

Mr. Martell recommended that the City implement a disease management plan and get personal health coaches involved. He stated that given the fact that this much money as been spent, it is important that this type of program be established to mitigate those chronic cohorts and slow them down.

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

City of Lewisville Per Capita Prescription Claims Cost 2004 - 2005

	Rx	Nation
2004	\$1,043	\$1,027
2005	\$1,305	\$1,168
Percentage Δ	25.1%	13.7%

City of Lewisville Total Per Capita Claims Cost 2005

	Lewisville	Nation
2004	\$4,357	\$5,187
2005	\$5,046	\$5,798
Percentage Δ	15.8%	11.8%

Mr. Martell reviewed the Explanation of Data Sources.

Mr. Martell continued with his PowerPoint Presentation and reviewed the Benchmarking for the City of Lewisville as follows:

Average Total Premiums for Various Coverage Levels – Includes only Contributory Plans

PPO	Employee Only	Employee Plus One Adult	Employee Plus Child(ren)	Employee Plus Family
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	\$367	\$722	\$705	\$1,015
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	\$358	\$708	\$687	\$1,004
City of Lewisville Basic	\$315	\$672	\$577	\$1,039
City of Lewisville Enhanced	\$344	\$733	\$653	\$1,164

Average Monthly Employee Contributions for Various Coverage Levels – Includes only Contributory Plans

PPO	Employee Only	Employee Plus One Adult	Employee Plus Child(ren)	Employee Plus Family
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	\$68	\$199	\$183	\$305
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	\$86	\$246	\$224	\$344
City of Lewisville Basic	\$10	\$160	\$110	\$270
City of Lewisville Enhanced	\$55	\$252	\$189	\$412

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Average Monthly Employer Cost for Various Coverage Levels – Includes only Contributory Plans

PPO	Employee Only	Employee Plus One Adult	Employee Plus Child(ren)	Employee Plus Family
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	\$299	\$523	\$522	\$710
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	\$272	\$462	\$463	\$660
City of Lewisville Basic	\$305	\$512	\$467	\$769
City of Lewisville Enhanced	\$289	\$481	\$464	\$750

Average In-Network Deductible Amounts for Various Coverage Levels

PPO	Employee Only	Employee + Family
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	\$286	\$708
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	\$328	\$828
City of Lewisville Basic	\$500	\$1,500
City of Lewisville Enhanced	\$350	\$1,050

Average In-Network Out of Pocket Maximum for Various Coverage Levels

PPO	Employee Only	Employee + Family
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	\$1,660	\$3,457
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	\$1,738	\$3,516
City of Lewisville Basic	\$3,000	\$9,000
City of Lewisville Enhanced	\$1,500	\$4,500

In-Network Coinsurance For In-Patient Hospitalization as a Percentage of Responses

PPO	70% to 80%	85%	90%	95% to 100%
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	45.9%	5.4%	31.1%	17.6%
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	32.7%	3.9%	40.0%	23.4%
City of Lewisville Basic	•			
City of Lewisville Enhanced	•			

Average Flat Dollar Copayment Amounts Per Visit in-Network

PPO	70% to 80%	85%	90%	95% to 100%
500 – 999 Employees Public Sector	44.6%	4.1%	31.1%	20.2%
500 – 999 Employees Private Sector	32.4%	4.6%	41.7%	21.3%
City of Lewisville Basic	•			
City of Lewisville Enhanced	•			

Mr. Martell then reviewed the Health Savings Accounts (HSAs) as follows:

- HSAs were created by the Medicare bill signed in December 2003 (Medicare Modernization Act of 2003)
- Designed to help individuals save for qualified medical and retiree health expenses on a TAX-FREE basis
- An HSA combines a savings account with a High Deductible Health Plan (HDHP)
- The money deposited is not taxed if used to pay for current and future qualified medical expenses

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

- Any individual covered under a qualified High Deductible Plan (HDHP)

WHO IS NOT ELIGIBLE?

- Individuals covered by Medicare
- Individuals covered by another health plan that is not a High Deductible Health Plan
- Dependents listed as dependents on someone else's taxes

Mr. Martell then reviewed a slide regarding the Annual Cost for Arthritis Pain Relief.

- Vioxx – 25mg - \$941
- Celebrez – 200mg - \$925
- Ibuprofen – 200mg - \$114

What is defined as a High Deductible Health Plan (HDHP)?

- Minimum of \$1,050 Individual Annual Deductible
- Minimum of \$2,100 Family Annual Deductible

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Page 40

- Maximum of \$5,250 Individual Annual Out-of-Pocket
- Maximum of \$10,500 Family Annual Out-of-Pocket

Mr. Martell then reviewed the eligible expenses as follows:

- All services and products covered by IRC 213(d), **except** Health insurance premiums
- Premiums for Long Term Care – COBRA Premiums
- Health insurance premiums for individuals receiving unemployment benefits

Mr. Martell continued his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Examples of Qualified Medical Expenses

A qualified medical expense is defined as an expense paid for care as described in Section 213 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code. Below are two lists which can serve as a guide in determining whether an expense is eligible for reimbursement.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Alcoholism Treatment | • Nursing Homes and Services |
| • Ambulance | • Ophthalmologist |
| • Birth Control Pills (by prescription) | • Optician/Optomtrist |
| • Chiropractor | • Organ Transplant (Inc Donor's Expenses) |
| • Contact Lenses and Cleaning Solutions | • Oxygen and Oxygen Equipment |
| • Crutches | • Podiatrist |
| • Dental Treatment | • Prescription Medications |
| • Dermatologist | • Psychiatrist/Psychologist |
| • Drug Addiction Treatment | • Stop Smoking Programs |
| • Telephone/TV Equipment Asst Hrg Impd | • Eyeglasses |
| • Transportation Exp Relative to Healthcare | • Hospital Services |
| • Lab Fees | • Vasectomy |
| • Weight Loss Programs Treat Exstg Disease | • Laser Eye Surgery |
| • Long-Term Care (certain limits apply) | • Wheelchairs |
| • Non-prescription Medications | • X-Rays |

This is not a complete list

Mr. Martell reviewed the following slides of his Power Point presentation:

- Who Can Contribute
- Are the limitations to the amount of contribution?
- What funds can be withdrawn?
- Health Savings Account Plan
- Representative HSA Plan
- Advantages and Disadvantages of HSA's
- HSAs vs. HRAs
- City of Lewisville Preliminary HSA Analysis
- Wellness Shifting the Paradigm of Health Care Cost Containment
- Wellness.....Why it Matters
- Stratifying Members
- Stratifying Costs
- The ROP – Return on People
- Failures of Care Have Huge Consequences

- Health Care Strategy: Value-Based Innovation
- Healthy Rewards or Shifting Responsibility Through Your Plan
- Why is this a match

Mr. Martell then reviewed the IPS Advisors, Inc. Initial Recommendation for 2006 as follows:

- The savings analysis of an HSA presents a financial challenge to justify its implementation at this time. IPS will re-evaluate at mid year.
- IPS recommends a Disease Management Program be considered for implementation in 2006.
- The development of introductory phases of a Wellness Program is recommended before the 2006/2007 renewal.
- It is recommended for IPS and HR to formulate a communication strategy promptly after the Council's direction is received.
- IPS recommends to bid out all vendors/coverages to gauge competitiveness of current products.

City of Lewisville Wellness Program Proposal

- Elite Wellness
 - Specializes in designing health care cost containment solutions through customized wellness programs.
- Tools and Strategies
 - Biometric Screenings
 - Health Risk Assessments
 - Corporate Coaching Model
 - Onsite
 - Telephone
 - E-mail and Web
 - Team and Group Activities
 - Incentive Administration
 - Custom Web Information Portal
 - Claims and Clinical Outcome Analysis

Mr. Martell reviewed the City of Garland, Texas – Case Study.

City of Lewisville Wellness Program Proposal

- 4 Month Pilot Program
- Available to 150 Employees through Application

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

- Ramp Up – February and March
 - Communication
 - Application
- Program – April 1 – July 31
 - Baseline and Benchmark Biometric Screenings
 - Health Risk Assessments
 - Corporate Coaching
 - Wellness Workshops
 - Custom Web Information Portal
- Ramp Down – August and September
 - Participation Analysis
 - Clinical Outcome Analysis
- Pilot Program Cost
 - 150 Participant Pilot Program – \$120 Per Employee
 - Minimum billable charge of \$15,000 (120 employees)
 - Maximum billable charge - full participation - \$18,000
 - Incentives will be wrapped around the program to maximize participation.

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for a break at 2:47 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 2:54 p.m.

Comp Plan Survey

Human Resource Director Melinda Galler gave a brief presentation regarding the Comp Plan Survey as follows:

History of Compensation Costs

FY	# of EE's	STRUCTURE	MERIT	TOTAL	AVG. COST PER EMPLOYEE
96/97	497	\$712,138	\$238,389	\$950,527	\$1,913
97/98	533	\$821,728	\$286,330	\$1,108,058	\$2,079
98/99	551	\$903,274	\$278,438	\$1,181,712	\$2,145
99/00	567	\$720,599	\$302,723	\$1,023,322	\$1,805
00/01	602	\$1,228,832	\$302,354	\$1,531,186	\$2,543
01/02	615	\$969,201	\$347,372	\$1,316,573	\$2,141
02/03	633	\$931,692	\$0	\$931,692	\$1,472
03/04	632	\$552,622	\$378,542	\$931,164	\$1,473

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

FY	# of EE's	STRUCTURE	MERIT	TOTAL	AVG. COST PER EMPLOYEE
04/05	631	\$830,024	\$372,323	\$1,202,347	\$1,905
05/06	636	\$801,221	\$387,280	\$1,188,501	\$1,869
06/07	645	\$523,441	\$392,477	\$915,918	\$1,420

History of Pay Increases

	2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
PAY PLAN	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps
General Government	5.00%	3%	4.00%	3%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Police Pay Plan	5.00%	4%	7.00%	4%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Fire Pay Plan	6.00%	4%	5.00%	4%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	4%	6%	4%	4%	4%
Average Increase	5.33%	4%	5.33%	4%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	4%	4.43%	4%	3.43%	4%

Market Analysis Methodology

- The Human Resources Department utilizes the TML survey to conduct an annual market analysis for pay plan comparison.
- The City compares to twenty comparable cities.
- The City of Lewisville uses a lag structure setting salaries at the 50th percentile

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

City	Population
Plano	236539
Garland	221000
Grand Prairie	134450
Mesquite	126000
Carrollton	112700
Richardson	94529
Denton	91588
McKinney	66575
Allen	60611
Frisco	59000
North Richland Hills	58650
Flower Mound	55734
Rowlett	49000
Bedford	47152
Grapevine	45524
Coppell	38540
Hurst	36000
The Colony	31200
Keller	28058
Farmers Branch	27508

2005 Professional Plan Analysis

STRUCTURE				
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville Midpoint	Market Midpoint	Variance
16	Librarian	\$3,601	\$3,904	-8%
17	Support Services Supervisor	\$3,989	\$4,270	-7%
18	Accountant	\$4,419	\$4,233	4%
19	Sr. Planner	\$4,897	\$5,188	-6%
20	Civil Engineer	\$5,427	\$5,659	-4%
21	Traffic Engineer	\$6,196	\$6,162	1%
			Average	-3%

2005 Trades Pay Plan Analysis

STRUCTURE				
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville Midpoint	Market Midpoint	Variance
52	Custodian	\$2,125	\$2,184	-3%
53	Maintenance Worker	\$2,313	\$2,373	-3%
55	Equipment Operator	\$2,746	\$2,693	2%
55	Animal Control Officer	\$2,746	\$2,874	-5%
56	Heavy Equipment Operator	\$2,977	\$2,997	-1%
56	Mechanic	\$2,977	\$3,163	-6%
57	Crewleader	\$3,258	\$3,249	0%
60	Facilities Supervisor	\$4,327	\$4,697	-9%
			Average	-3%

2005 Clerical, Technical, Administrative Plan Analysis

STRUCTURE				
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville Midpoint	Market Midpoint	Variance
53	Clerk Typist	\$2,184	\$2,344	-7%
55	Cashier	\$2,383	\$2,667	-12%
55	Secretary	\$2,593	\$2,804	-8%
57	Payroll/Personnel Tech	\$3,076	\$3,143	-2%
57	Public Safety Dispatcher	\$3,076	\$3,094	-1%
58	Traffic Signal Tech	\$3,352	\$3,293	2%
58	Recreation Specialist	\$3,352	\$3,367	0%
59	Building Inspector	\$3,653	\$3,766	-3%
60	Communications Supervisor	\$3,975	\$4,013	-1%
			Average	-4%

Broadband Pay History

- Market and Merit combined for Directors and Managers for a possible increase which is at risk depending on performance
 - 2000 - 01 – 0 - 7%
 - 2001 - 02 – 0 - 5%
 - 2002 - 03 – 0 - 3.5%
 - 2003 - 04 – 0 - 4 %
 - 2004 - 05 – 0 - 4%
 - 2005 – 06 – 0 - 3%

2005 Police Plan Analysis

		STRUCTURE		
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville	Market	Variance
		Maximum	Maximum	
81	Police Officer	\$4,576	\$4,743	-4%
82	Police Sergeant	\$5,632	\$5,872	-4%
83	Police Lieutenant	\$6,516	\$6,697	-3%
84	Police Captain	\$7,285	\$7,569	-4%
85	Assistant Police Chief	\$8,428	\$8,887	-5%
		Average		-4%

2005 Fire Pay Plan Analysis

		STRUCTURE		
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville	Market	Variance
		Maximum	Maximum	
71	Firefighter	\$4,381	\$4,530	-3%
72	Driver/Engineer	\$4,927	\$5,078	-3%
74	Fire Captain	\$6,087	\$6,322	-4%
75	Batallion Chief	\$7,129	\$7,223	-1%
76	Assistant Chief	\$8,157	\$8,569	-5%
		Average		-3%

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

2006-07 Cost Projection

	ADJUSTMENT	MERIT	COST
BROADBAND APPOINTED Possible Max - 3%			\$61,478
PAY PLAN A Professional - 3%	\$2,015	\$42,108	\$44,123
PAY PLAN B Admin/Clerical/Tech - 4% Trades - 3%	\$13,119 \$6,465	\$93,698 \$80,993	\$106,817 \$87,458
	MARKET ADJUSTMENT	2005-06 STEP INCR.	
PAY PLAN C - POLICE	\$288,986	\$64,950	\$353,936
PAY PLAN B - FIRE	\$215,856	\$49,250	\$265,106

<i>SALARY TOTAL</i>	<i>\$918,918</i>
<i>BENEFITS</i>	<i>\$172,848</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$1,091,766</i>

Age 65/Disabled Exemption

City Manager King gave a brief PowerPoint Presentation regarding the Age 65/Disabled Exemption as follows:

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Current Exemption (2005)

	<u>Over 65</u>	<u>Disabled Persons</u>
<u>Exemption Amount:</u>	\$60,000	\$20,000

<u># of Properties (2005):</u>	1,735	177
--------------------------------	-------	-----

<u>Taxable Value Lost:</u>	\$99,114,738	\$3,475,075
----------------------------	--------------	-------------

Background

- A property tax freeze was enacted in 2005 for property owners who are over 65 or who are disabled.
- When a person becomes eligible, the city portion of their property tax rate is frozen at that year's amount and is not allowed to increase.
- A \$60,000 exemption for people over 65 and a \$20,000 exemption for disabled persons is also in place.
- Changes to exemptions must be made by July 1. (In order for the exemption to take affect that year)
- Eligible property owners can only claim over 65 status or disabled person status, not both.
- The proposal would phase out the 'over 65' and 'disabled persons' exemptions.
- Anyone who's taxes have already been frozen will NOT be affected by the elimination of the exemptions because the amount they are taxed is not allowed to increase (which it would if the freeze were not in place).
- The reduction of the exemptions means that people who turn 65 or become disabled would have their taxes frozen at a higher amount than those who became eligible a year before them.

Example: Property Owner who is 65 in 2011

Current System with Freeze AND Exemption

<u>Year</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Property Value</u>	<u>City Taxes</u>
2006	60	136,109	\$621.73
2007	61	138,831	\$634.17
2008	62	141,608	\$646.85
2009	63	144,440	\$659.79
2010	64	147,329	\$672.98
2011	65	(150,275-60,000) = 105,612	\$412.37 (Frozen)
2012	66	153,281	\$412.37 (Frozen)

Freeze Only

<u>Year</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Property Value</u>	<u>Exemption</u>	<u>City Taxes</u>
2006	60	136,109	(50,000)	\$621.73
2007	61	138,831	(40,000)	\$634.17
2008	62	141,608	(30,000)	\$646.85
2009	63	144,440	(20,000)	\$659.79
2010	64	147,329	(10,000)	\$672.98
2011	65	150,275	(0)	\$686.44 (Frozen)
2012	66	153,281	(0)	\$686.44 (Frozen)

Example: Property Owner Disabled in 2009

Current System with Freeze AND Exemption

<u>Year</u>	<u>Property Value</u>	<u>City Taxes</u>
2006	136,109	\$621.73
2007	138,831	\$634.17
2008	141,608	\$646.85
2009	(144,440 – 20,000) = 124,440	\$568.43 (Frozen)
2010	147,329	\$568.43 (Frozen)
2011	150,275	\$568.43 (Frozen)
2012	153,281	\$568.43 (Frozen)

Freeze Only

<u>Year</u>	<u>Taxable Property Value</u>		<u>City Taxes</u>
2006	136,109	(15,000)	\$621.73
2007	138,831	(10,000)	\$634.17
2008	141,608	(5,000)	\$646.85
2009	144,440	(0)	\$659.79 (Frozen)
2010	147,329	(0)	\$659.79 (Frozen)
2011	150,275	(0)	\$659.79 (Frozen)
2012	153,281	(0)	\$659.79 (Frozen)

Discussion was held regarding removing the exemption now or having it removed in increments. General consensus of the City Council was to not do anything at this time.

	<p>Railroad St (121-Bennett) \$3.0M</p> <p>6. Planned 2008 GO Sale: Westwood Estates II \$5.820M Misc Sts (Windhaven Reimb) 1.500M</p> <p>7. Planned 2009 G.O. Sale: Railroad St Reimb (Misc Sts) 3.0M Other TBD</p>
July 4	<p>1. Plan 2006 event at Vista Ridge Mall with as close to same show as in past as possible. Use H/M funding source as budgeted for FY 05-06.</p> <p>2. Develop program options for future July 4 fireworks and entertainment at Lake Park location. Use GF and sponsorship revenue as funding source (will be a FY 06-07 budget package)</p> <p>3. Develop options for a new special event funded/authorized through H/M tax. Explore opportunity to do combined event with HV but examine other options as well.</p>
Neighborhood Enhancement Team	<p>1. Proceed as presented by Chief McFadden.</p>
Castle Hills Water Supply	<p>1. Proceed with "Option 2" (LV service N of FM 544, UTRWD S of 544 and E of 2281)</p>
OT "Phase 2"	<p>1. Issue RFP for consultant study of comprehensive land use/redevelopment recommendations, public facility recommendations, train station/transit oriented development locations, financing/incentive recommendations, public infrastructure and parking recommendations, etc.</p> <p>2. No decision on south side of 201 W. Church St (Temple Bapt Bldg)</p>
Health Plan	<p>1. Proceed with wellness program pilot (April-July)</p> <p>2. Include HSA (Health Savings Account) option in next bid and re-evaluate potential savings impacts/structure</p>
Comp Plan	<p>1. Change system for General Government employees to merit adjustments only (market adjustments to pay plan, not to employee salaries) maintain market/step based salary and pay plan adjustment for fire/police.</p>

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 2 – 4, 2006**

Goal Setting Workshop	1. Set tentatively for March 4 th .

With no further discussion, Mayor Carey adjourned the Called-Special Council Retreat Workshop Session at 4:06 p.m.

These minutes approved by the Lewisville City Council on the 6th day of March, 2006.

APPROVED

Gene Carey
MAYOR

ATTEST:

Julie Heinze
CITY SECRETARY