

LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED - SPECIAL
RETREAT WORKSHOP SESSION

FEBRUARY 1, 2 AND 3, 2007

ASHTON HOTEL
610 MAIN STREET
SCOTT ROOM
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2007

Present:

Gene Carey, Mayor

Council Members:

Rudy Durham, Mayor Pro Tem
Dean Ueckert, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem
David Thornhill
Greg Tierney
Mike Nowels

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 6:20 p.m. on Thursday, February 1, 2007. Other City staff in attendance was Lauren Crowley, Eric Ferris, T.S. Kumar, Zane Miller, Gene Lewis, Elizabeth Trosper, Jason Kirkland, and Liz Plaster

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2006

2006 Retreat Recap

City Manager King advised that due to the number of items included in the Retreat Packet, there may not be enough time to review everything.

City Manager King recapped the 2006 Council Retreat Direction and reviewed the current status of each of the following items:

- Age 65 / Disabled Exemption
- Railroad Street Park
- Capital Improvement Projects
- July 4th
- Neighborhood Enhancement Team
- Castle Hills Water Supply
- Old Town “Phase 2”
- Health Plan
- Compensation Plan
- Goal Setting Workshop

General Fund Reserves/Financial Projections (Requested by Councilman Ueckert)

City Manager King reviewed the following fund balances:

General Fund

2006 Ending Balance	\$26.653M
2007 Capital (RR St., Etc.)	-3.526M
2007 Fire Station Land Purchase	-1.100M
2007 Fire Station Construction	-2.750M
2007 Windhaven Reimbursement	+1.600M
? RR St. Reimbursement	<u>+2.400M</u>
	\$22.777M
Current Reserve	<u>-8.200M</u>
Balance	\$15.577M

Plaza??

Arts Center?

4B Reserve - \$7.0M

City Manager King reviewed his PowerPoint Presentation regarding General Fund Reserves/Financial Projections with the City Council. City Manager King advised that John Polser with Innovative Transportation Services was present should the City Council have any questions.

City Manager King explained that the drop in 2002 was for the City Hall Facility and in 2006 on the revenue and fund balance is related to the reimbursement by the County of the SIB Loan for the 121 Roadway.

City Manager King then referenced a December 2006 article by Len Woods & Associates regarding “Guarding the Public Checkbook” that was located in the City Council backup material. Discussion was held regarding historically the City of Lewisville has maintained a good picture because the Council does not spend their operating reserves for reoccurring expenditures and have been aggressive in making sure the tax rate is set where it needs to be.

City Manager King stated the caveat was that the City has used a very conservative assumption on General Fund Revenue and Expenditures.

Discussion was held regarding what the reserves were held for. City Manager King advised that it would be for a major catastrophe, such as Katrina. City Manager King advised as an example, if sales tax tanked in one year and you wanted to keep things rolling like you had on the service level side you would have to tap into those reserve. Councilman Nowels stated that it was his opinion that the City has always maintained a policy that they never even got close to those numbers.

City Manager King then began a PowerPoint on Staff Report; Multi-Year Financial Plan; General Fund; and Fiscal Years 2007 – 2011, as follows:

Key Assumptions

- Total tax rate FY 2006-07 = actual tax rate FY 2005-06
 - remaining at \$0.45679
 - projected tax rate planning years = effective rates ranging between \$0.45811 to \$0.45921
- Property values increase at 2.0% per year in planning years

Key Assumptions - continued

- Revenue changes range from -3% to 3% per year
- Expenditures increase 2% - 3% per year with 0% Capital Outlay increase

Key Assumptions - continued

- Debt issue projections
 - 2007 \$13.35M
 - 2008 \$7.485M
 - 2009 \$4M
 - 2010 \$2.06M
 - 2011 \$4.6M

Key Assumptions - continued

- Debt issue projections
 - 2007 \$13.35M
 - 2008 \$7.485M
 - 2009 \$4M
 - 2010 \$2.06M
 - 2011 \$4.6M

Highlight of General Fund Plan

- Adjusted Ending Fund Balance is projected at \$23.1M for end FY 2006-2007:
 - declines each planned year
 - by FY 2011, declines to \$18.5M

Property Value Projections

- Average increase last five years: 3.8% per year
- Projected increases: 2.0% per year
- New construction: decreasing from \$79.4M in 2006-2007 to \$67.4M in 2010-2011

Key Revenue Projections

- Sales Taxes: total increase of 1% annually after effect of excess collections
- Franchise Fees: increase of 1% annually except 0% fiber optic increase and 1% telephone decrease annually
- Licenses & Permits: no increase projected; maintain current levels
- Fines: increase of 1% annually except library fines
- Recreation: remains at existing levels
- Charges for Service: 1% increases annually, except for county library funding (3% decrease ea. yr.)

Financial Stability Ratios

<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual Forecast</u>
Fund Balance	=15%	31% - 42%
Debt to Market Value	<3%	0.9-1.0%
Debt Service to Operating Expenditures	<5% low >15% high	12% all years
Debt per Capita	<\$1,000 low >\$2,500 high	\$565-\$652
Debt Amortization Over 10 Years	At least 5% per year	>7%
Days in Working Capital	=55	Beg at 155 end at 112

Councilman Nowels' questioned if the City Council wanted to have a policy to keep 90 days in reserves could that be done. Discussion was held regarding this question and that based upon current practice the City may already be above those 90 days.

I35 Impacts/Mitigation/Enhancement

Economic Development Director Zane Miller advised his PowerPoint Presentation regarding I35 Impacts/Mitigation/Enhancement would cover the following items:

- Project Overview
- Billboards
- Total Property Impact
 - Acquisition
 - High Risk
 - Moderate Risk
- Financial Impact Forecast
- Code Issues
- Temporary Signage consideration
- Sound Walls
- Enhancement Considerations
- Incentive Options
- Recommended Next Steps

Project Overview

Project Limits: President George Bush Tollroad to F.M. 2181 (Swisher) Estimated Timeline:

Public Hearing:	Spring, 2007
Appraisals and Acquisition:	Fall, 2007
Begin Construction:	2009
Project Complete:	2014

Billboards

State Law – Transportation Code 391.031

- Unlawful for a person to erect or maintain outdoor advertising:
 - Within 660 feet of the nearest edge of a ROW if the advertising is visible from the main-traveled way of the interstate or primary system
- Except
 - If the advertising authorized by law, pertains to a natural wonder or scenic or historic attraction
 - Is for the sale or lease of the property on which it is located
 - Is solely for the activities conducted on the property on which it is located (on-premises advertising)
 - Is located within 660 feet of the nearest edge of the ROW in an area in which the land use is:
 - Designated industrial or commercial under authority of law (zoning ordinance)
 - Is not designated industrial or commercial but the land use is consistent with an area designated industrial or commercial
 - Outdoor advertising that has as its purpose the protection of life or property
 - Outdoor advertising erected on or before October 22, 1965 with designation as a landmark or other historic significance

S.B. 111 (Corona)

New Section 391.0331

- If any outdoor advertising use, structure or permit may not continue because of widening, construction, or reconstruction of a highway, the owner of the outdoor advertising is entitled to relocate the use, structure, or permit to another location
 - On the same property
 - On adjacent property
 - On the same highway not more than 1 mile from the previous location

- If the outdoor advertising is within a municipality or the ETJ of a municipality, within that municipality or its ETJ
- Relocation under this section shall be to a location where outdoor advertising is permitted under Section 391.031
- The county or municipality where the use or structure is located shall, if necessary, provide for the relocation by special exception to any applicable zoning ordinance
- The relocated use may be
 - Erected to a height and angle to make it clearly visible to traffic on the main-traveled way
 - The same size and height as the previous structure, but not exceeding the size and height established by this subtitle
 - Relocated to a location with a comparable vehicular traffic count
- Any governmental entity that acquires outdoor advertising by eminent domain or causes the need for the outdoor advertising to be relocated under this section shall pay the costs related to the acquisition or relocation
- If a governmental entity prohibits the relocation of outdoor advertising as provided under this section, the governmental entity shall pay just compensation as provided in Section 391.033

Discussion was held regarding billboards and pole signs that would be affected by this construction.

S.B. 111 (Corona) - continued

New Section 391.038

- If the view and readability of outdoor advertising is obstructed due to a noise abatement or safety measure, a grade change, construction, an aesthetic improvement made by an agency of this state, a directional sign, or widening along a highway, the owner of the sign may:
 - Adjust the height of the sign
 - Relocate the sign to a location within 500 feet of its previous location if the sign complies with the spacing requirements under this chapter and is in a location in which outdoor advertising is permitted under Section 391.031
- A county or municipality in which the outdoor advertising is located shall, if necessary, provide for the height adjustment or relocation by a special exception to any applicable zoning ordinance
- Except, regardless of any height requirements established under this subtitle, the adjusted or relocated outdoor advertising may be erected to a height and angle to make it clearly visible to the traffic on the main-traveled lanes, but must be the same size

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 8

Discussion held regarding if signs could be relocated to a non-state road. Mr. Polser advised that yes, as long as it was in the same jurisdiction. Mr. Polser recommended that the City Council work with their House Representative to help with this. City Manager King advised that the City's Lobbyist Connie Johnson was working to arrange a meeting during Denton County Days.

Current Status

- 45 – total billboards on the IH35E corridor
- 17 – billboards within the proposed ROW at risk of acquisition
 - 16 – double faced
 - 1 – single faced
- All billboards at some form of risk of relocation due to new provisions of visibility
- Current Lewisville Sign Ordinance prohibits “a sign which advertises or directs attention to a business, product, service or activity which is available at a location other than the premises where the sign is located”

Billboard

Estimated Acquisition Value per Billboard

\$1,500,000 - \$2,000,000 purchase price per sign

\$25,500,000 - \$32,000,000 purchase price all signs

Proposed Ordinance Corrections

- Amend ordinance to reference Section 391.031 and allow relocations as provided within State law

TxDOT General Acquisition Process

- Properties slated for acquisition will be appraised
- Owners will be offered “fair market value” for entire property
- TxDOT will pay owner for entire property, but will leave owner with “remainder” property
- Owner will retain ownership of property TxDOT does not need

Discussion held regarding the City purchasing the property that reverts back to the owner. Both City Attorney Ron Neiman and Mr. Polser advised that the City would have to have a public purpose in order to purchase the property. Mr. Neiman advised that since 2005 the City cannot act as the State's agent to purchase property. Mayor Pro Tem Durham stated that the

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 9

people in this area are unable to sell those homes expressed his concern what would happens a property owner lost their job and could not afford the home. Mr. Polser advised that the State has the ability to do hardship acquisitions.

Mr. Miller then reviewed 25 slides of the entire City as it relates to the I35E expansion starting at the north and working south. He explained the legend on each slide referenced the following: indicating the areas of acquisition, high risk, moderate risk, proposed ROW, property lines, billboard 1-side, billboard 2-side, areas of concern, along with a capture of the City's zoning map.

Mr. Miller then reviewed two maps showing streets and reduction of 65 parking spaces and potential loss of front fire lanes at Summit Business Park where Harcourt is located.

Mr. Miller returned to the slides of the entire city relating to the I35E expansion.

Discussion held regarding if TxDOT was only taking a portion of a hotel; however, there was still enough remaining to stay in business would they become non-compliant or would they be grandfathered even though their parking was now reduced and they no longer meet City codes. Mayor Pro Tem Durham stated he felt that they would have to come in for a whole new building permit because portions of their building would be non-existent and that could be denied due to code issues. City Manager King advised that if they were able to manage to operate without a building permit then the City would not be able to force them to close.

Mr. Miller returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows

Lakepointe Center

Property Value – \$68.3 million

Current Estimated Total Revenue - \$1,679,374
27.17% of entire IH35 corridor revenue

Estimated Sales Tax Revenue - \$1,138,333
33.80% of entire corridor revenue
6.5% of entire City sales tax revenue

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

	Lakepointe Collection	Loss	Loss % of Corridor
Revenue Collection	\$1,508,816	\$ 170,557	16.68%
Revenue Collection	\$1,211,920	\$ 467,454	31.12%
Revenue Collection	\$251,992	\$1,427,382	32.48%

Mr. Miller then showed maps reviewing the regional locations of the following business locations:




- Saltgrass
- Abuelo's
- TGI Friday's
- Don Pablos
- Red Lobster
- Olive Garden
- Logan's
- Academy Sports
- Petsmart
- Ethan Allen
- Chuck-E-Cheese
- Home Depot

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Corridor Financial Impact

	Current
Land Value	\$ 112,503,041
Improvement Value	\$ 130,794,634
Personal Property Value	\$ 155,965,128
Total Value	\$ 399,262,803
Sales Tax Revenue	\$ 3,367,458
Alcohol Tax Revenue	\$ 835,332
Hotel Tax Revenue	\$ 153,634

Corridor Financial Impact

-  Acquisition – 144 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor A
-  High Risk – 21 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor B
-  Mod. Risk – 87 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor C

	Prior	Loss	Remaining
Land Value	\$ 112,503,041	\$ 24,812,717	\$ 87,690,324
Improvement Value	\$ 130,794,634	\$ 30,913,997	\$ 99,880,637
Personal Property Value	\$ 155,965,128	\$ 15,685,900	\$ 140,279,228
Total Value	\$ 399,262,803	\$ 66,188,434	\$ 322,850,189
Sales Tax Revenue	\$ 3,367,458	\$ 454,498	\$ 2,912,960
Alcohol Tax Revenue	\$ 835,332	\$ 87,896	\$ 747,436
Hotel Tax Revenue	\$ 153,634	\$ 153,634	\$ -

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Corridor Financial Impact

- Acquisition – 144 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor A
- High Risk – 21 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor B
- Mod. Risk – 87 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor C

	Prior	Loss	Remaining
Land Value	\$ 112,503,041	\$ 24,812,717	\$ 87,690,324
Improvement Value	\$ 130,794,634	\$ 30,913,997	\$ 99,880,637
Personal Property Value	\$ 155,965,128	\$ 19,837,627	\$ 136,127,501
Total Value	\$ 399,262,803	\$ 75,533,466	\$ 323,907,337
Sales Tax Revenue	\$ 3,367,458	\$ 696,016	\$ 2,671,442
Alcohol Tax Revenue	\$ 835,332	\$ 307,175	\$ 528,157
Hotel Tax Revenue	\$ 153,634	\$ 153,634	\$ -

Corridor Financial Impact

- Acquisition – 144 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor A
- High Risk – 21 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor B
- Mod. Risk – 87 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor C

	Prior	Loss	Remaining
Land Value	\$ 112,503,041	\$ 24,812,717	\$ 87,690,324
Improvement Value	\$ 130,794,634	\$ 30,913,997	\$ 99,880,637
Personal Property Value	\$ 155,965,128	\$ 110,391,592	\$ 45,573,536
Total Value	\$ 399,262,803	\$ 166,087,431	\$ 233,175,372
Sales Tax Revenue	\$ 3,367,458	\$ 2,789,058	\$ 578,400
Alcohol Tax Revenue	\$ 835,332	\$ 692,535	\$ 142,797

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Hotel Tax Revenue	\$ 153,634	\$ 153,634	\$ -
--------------------------	------------	------------	------

Total Combined Revenue Impact

- Acquisition – 144 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor A
- High Risk – 21 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor B
- Mod. Risk – 87 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor C

Corridor Revenue	Prior	Loss	Remaining
City	\$ 6,180,216	\$ 1,022,233	\$ 5,157,983
County	\$ 925,970	\$ 165,620	\$ 760,350
LISD	\$ 6,547,910	\$ 1,171,167	\$ 5,376,743
Corridor Revenue	Prior	Loss	Remaining
City	\$ 6,180,216	\$ 1,501,995	\$ 4,678,221
County	\$ 925,970	\$ 175,249	\$ 750,721
LISD	\$ 6,547,910	\$ 1,239,255	\$ 5,308,655
Corridor Revenue	Prior	Loss	Remaining
City	\$ 6,180,216	\$ 4,394,038	\$ 1,786,178
County	\$ 925,970	\$ 385,262	\$ 540,709
LISD	\$ 6,547,910	\$ 2,724,340	\$ 3,823,570

Total Combine Revenue Impact

- Acquisition – 144 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor A
- High Risk – 21 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor B
- Mod. Risk – 87 Properties or Tenants – Risk Factor C

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Corridor Revenue	Prior	Loss	Remaining
4B	\$ 841,864	\$ 113,624	\$ 728,240
DCTA	\$ 1,683,729	\$ 227,249	\$ 1,456,480
Corridor Revenue	Prior	Loss	Remaining
4B	\$ 841,864	\$ 174,004	\$ 667,860
DCTA	\$ 1,683,729	\$ 348,008	\$ 1,335,721
Corridor Revenue	Prior	Loss	Remaining
4B	\$ 841,864	\$ 697,264	\$ 144,600
DCTA	\$ 1,683,729	\$ 1,394,529	\$ 289,200

Code Issues

General Development Ordinance

 Parking

 Landscape strip

 Signage

 TxDOT temporary business signage

 Reader boards

Turn/Deceleration Lanes

Fire Lane/Access

Driveway Access/connections

Zoning Set-backs

Enhancement Considerations

Design standards

- TxDOT will approve and fund basic design standard
- Enhancements will be funded by City

Options

- Themed depending on area of Lewisville
- Entire corridor themed alike

Themed Bridges

- SH 121 Toll (none established)
- F.M. 3040
- Corporate
- SH 121 Business
- Fox Avenue
- Main Street (historic theme)
- Valley Ridge
- F.M. 407
- Garden Ridge

Enhancement Considerations

Improvement District

- Establish overlay district (PID) to create new funding source
- Funding would support increased landscaping, bridge financing, “gateway” entry features for commercial properties, etc..
- Would be “added” money and not adversely impact City General Fund
- Would be “**new**” tax to property owners

TIRZ District

- Create TIRZ zone along IH 35 corridor in year immediately following property demolition to establish lowest base year value
- Beneficial model if County would participate
- Would limit general fund revenue in future

IH 35 Urban Design overlay for redevelopment

Discussion was held regarding if nothing was done then the tax base that would have to be made up would be an additional four (4) cents.

Mr. Miller reviewed various designs of sound walls and locations they would be located.

Discussion held regarding the difference between a screening wall and a sound wall. Mr. Polser advised that the State does not build screening walls. Discussion held regarding whether or not the State had to put a sound wall in. Mr. Polser advised that if it is warranted by an environmental assessment and property owners adjacent to those walls that are affected vote if they want a sound wall and if 50% of the residents want them then the State puts in a sound wall. He further advised that they would not get to pick their ascetics or location.

Next Steps – Design Consideration

- Determine level of “standard” improvements to roadway
- Determine desired enhancement level of entire system
 - Input from adjacent property owners?
 - Community driven design?
- Hire design consultant to prepare concepts for TxDOT consideration
- Determine timing for agreements / funding
- Determine boundary of enhancement program (public and/or private property)
- Begin consideration of funding sources for City initiated enhancements (above and beyond)
 - Improvement District
 - TIRZ
 - Reserves
 - Bonds (GO)
 - Sales Tax (new 4A/4B)
- Modify Sign Ordinance to accommodate Billboards (depending on legislative outcome)
- Identify problem area on proposed ROW schematics which need realignment consideration

Discussion held regarding making the aesthetics have a signature look that will set the City apart. Further discussion held regarding if the City will have to fund some of this. City Council wanted to explore the options of using this as a marketing tool for economic development to provide an opportunity for when a person enters the City of Lewisville there are nine interchanges that are unique, not just a plaque, something dramatic and unique. Mr. Polser advised that if there is something that the City can come up with as a base then the State will work with the City; however, there may be some cost to the City depending upon what is decided for a corridor wide design. City Manager King advised this could be very costly. Councilman Nowels advised that it would be a 50 year investment. Discussion held on how to finance this type of project.

Mr. Polser encouraged the City Council to work with TxDOT prior to contacting any architects to design anything. Discussion held on how to get assistance from TxDOT for a

design base and determining what we want. Mr. Polser reviewed how TxDOT would bring forward designs and if the City Council does not like what they see then they can hire someone.

Next Steps – Business Retention

- Identify 1st priority tenants along corridor and initiate contact
 - Determine candidates interested in Lewisville relocation
- Initiate contact with all retail anchor tenant property owners to develop short and long term plan of action
- Develop incentive guidelines so standard position is agreed upon if needed to retain 1st priority businesses
- Develop fast-track review process for corridor businesses
- Develop IH35 survival guide of city programs during construction process

Next Steps – Incentive Options

- Non-direct financial incentive
 - Code waivers
 - Relaxed signage standards during construction period
 - TxDOT installed business directional signs
- Tax abatement
- Misc. Incentives (Ch. 380's)
 - Property tax rebate (City/County/LISD)
 - Sales Tax reimbursement (City - 1%, DCTA - ½%, 4B - ¼%)
 - Relocation/retention options
 - Job retention bonus
 - Broker commission
 - Broker bonus
 - Redevelopment permit fee waivers
 - Incentive to continue to operate during construction period

City Manager King questioned if there were any of these that the City Council did not want to do. Discussion was held regarding what the abatements would be for at the request of Mayor Pro Tem Durham. Mayor Carey questioned job retention bonuses. Mr. Miller advised that the restaurants are a major employee that can employ up to 200 people. Councilman Tierney wanted to remain on the caution side because most are going to be walking away with a

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 18

wallet full of cash. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert advised most of the major ones only want to establish themselves on a major corridor and if that looks as nice as it is supposed to then they will want to stay. Discussion held regarding the biggest incentive may be working with them to get them to the point they can get their new sites ready. Mr. Miller advised that this will be a very powerful corridor and we will have some time starting now until 2015 to have the opportunity to come back stronger. Mr. Miller reminded the City Council that there may have some vacant centers for awhile but once the corridor is completed the numbers will go up.

Mayor Pro Tem Durham requested that discussion be held regarding allowing late hours for alcohol sales. Discussion was held regarding underground utilities. Assistant City Manager Steve Bacchus advised that cities are having a hard time forcing utility companies to put the lines underground. Mr. Polser advised that if the City wanted to have these lines put underground when the lines were being relocated due to the explanation then the City would have to pay the difference between the relocating cost and underground costs.

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert addressed Mayor Pro Tem Durham's request regarding late hours alcohol sales. He expressed concern that the Convention Center would not be able to stay open late for New Year's Eve. Discussion held among the City Council regarding allowing late hours alcohol sales. The consensus of the City Council was to allow late hours alcohol sales.

With no further discussion, Mayor Carey adjourned the Called – Special Council Retreat Workshop Session at 10:15 p.m.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2007

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 9:01 a.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007. 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, Director of Community Development Eric Ferris, Director of Economic Development Zane Miller, City Engineer T.S. Kumar, Community Services and Planning Manager Gene Lewis, and Economic Development Specialist Elizabeth Trosper.

“No Truck Traffic” Options

City Engineer T.S. Kumar presented a PowerPoint Presentation regarding “No Truck Traffic” options.

Prohibition of Thru-Truck Traffic on City Streets

1. Background
2. Current Streets with Restrictions
3. Discussion of City Council Direction and Actions in 1994/1995
4. Recent City Council Actions & Direction to City Staff
5. Proposed Overlay of New Streets with Restrictions
6. Future Considerations/Options
7. Final Analysis/Recommendations

Background

- Truck prohibition or restricting truck traffic on city streets primarily started on a complaint basis (and still does!!).
- First ever ordinance adopted in 1985; Edwards Street, east from its intersection with Charles Street.
 - Primary reason was to keep trucks from accessing the Moore Lumber Company (currently occupied by R.E.W. Materials).

Background (cont'd)

- College Street between IH-35E to Mill Street was added in 1987.
 - This segment was used extensively by trucks as a straight access from IH-35E to the landfill site (BFI).
 - Street character was mostly residential with a park and an elementary school located within the limits.
 - Truck definition (1985-1987): “No truck or other motor vehicle with carrying capacity in excess of one (1) ton.”

Background (cont'd)

- More streets were added to the Truck Prohibition Ordinance between 1987 and 1994 – mostly on the east side of IH-35E along residential neighborhoods.
- Truck definition changed to: commercial vehicles with more than 3 axles.

Background (cont'd)

- Garden Ridge Boulevard on the west side of IH-35E was an exception: ordinance adopted in February 1990.
 - Restriction from FM 407 south to approximately 2100 linear feet.
 - Martin Brower trucks tearing up curbs and sidewalks at intersection.

Mr. Kumar reviewed photos of trucks from 1990 showing the trucks tearing up curbs which led to the prohibition.

Current streets with restrictions

- Church Street from its intersection with Mill Street to its intersection with Herod Street.
- College Street from the service road of IH35E to its intersection with Mill Street.
- Edwards Street - east of its intersection with Charles Street.
- Garden Ridge Boulevard from Interstate Highway 35E to FM 407.

Current streets with restrictions (cont'd)

- Greenland Lane from its intersection with Parkway Drive to a point 100 feet south of Simmons Avenue.
- Jones Street from its intersection with Interstate Highway 35E northbound frontage road to its intersection with Mill Street.
- Kealy Avenue from its intersection with Mill Street to its intersection with Purnell Street.

Current streets with restrictions (cont'd)

- Lake Park Road from the service road of Interstate Highway 35E to its intersection with Mill Street.
- Main Street from its intersection with Interstate Highway 35E northbound frontage road to its intersection with Mill Street.
- Mullins Street from its intersection with College Street to its intersection with Lester Street.

Current streets with restrictions (cont'd)

- Parkway Drive from a point beginning at the intersection of Mill Street & Parkway Drive to the intersection of Parkway Drive & Kealy Avenue.
- Pine Drive from its intersection with Interstate Highway 35E northbound frontage road to its intersection with Yates Street.
- Simmons Avenue from its intersection with Greenland Lane to its intersection with Kealy Avenue.

Mr. Kumar then reviewed aerial photos of the following streets:

- Main Street – From its intersection with I-34E Northbound Frontage Road to its intersection with Mill Street
- Mullins Street – From its intersection of College Street to its intersection with Lester Street
- College Street – Between I-35 E Northbound Frontage Road and Mill Street
- Edwards Street – East of its intersection with Charles Street

- Church Street – From its intersection with Mill Street to its intersection with Herod Street
- Garden Ridge Blvd. – From I-35 E to FM 407
- Greenland Street – From its intersection with Parkway Drive to a point 100 feet south of Simmons Avenue
- Simmons Street – From its intersection with Greenland Drive to its intersection with Kealy Avenue
- Parkway Drive – From a point beginning at the intersection of Mill Street and Parkway Drive to the intersection of Parkway Drive and Kealy Avenue
- Jones Street – From its intersection with I-35 E Northbound Frontage Road to its intersection with Mill Street
- Kealy Avenue – From its intersection with Mill Street to its intersection with Purnell Street
- Lake Park Road – From I-35 E to Mill Street
- Pine Drive – From its intersection with I-35 E Northbound Frontage Road to its intersection with Yates Street

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert questioned how the enforcement was working. Discussion was held that most drivers know the routes and may go down once; however, they are paying attention to the message boards. Mr. Kumar returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Discussion of City Council Directions and Actions in 1994

- Members of the City Council, in early 1994, expressed concerns of truck traffic on certain city thoroughfares.
 - Mainly west of IH-35E: Valley Ridge Boulevard, Garden Ridge Boulevard, Old Orchard Lane, Summit Avenue and Valley Parkway.
 - City Staff was directed to contact other cities on how they handled such issues.

City Council Directions and Actions in 1994 (cont'd)

- Staff surveyed the following cities:
 - Duncanville, Carrollton, Coppell, Plano, Grapevine, and Farmers Branch
 - Results were varied with no restrictions in Coppell to selective signage and enforcement in other cities.
- Staff presented 3 options, on February 7, 1994, to the City Council for consideration:
 - Truck prohibition on selected thoroughfares.
 - Consider establishing truck routes.
 - Identify truck routes for local trucking companies and seek voluntary compliance.

City Council Directions and Actions in 1994 (cont'd)

- City Council, after much discussion, tabled the item and directed staff to conduct truck traffic counts and report back to the City Council in 90 days.
- New truck traffic counts completed by staff and presented to the City Council on May 2, 1994.
- City Council tabled the item again and directed staff to conduct a city-wide (thoroughfares) truck traffic study.

City Council Directions and Actions in 1994 (cont'd)

- Truck traffic studies completed and presented to the City Council on January 9, 1995.
 - Results indicated that there was a very small percentage of thru-truck traffic using city streets outside of local delivery destinations.
 - City Council agreed with staff recommendation to not create truck routes and directed staff to continue with the practice of addressing complaint-driven prohibitions.
 - This practice continued until 2005.

Recent City Council Actions and Direction to Staff

- July 2005 – A resident expressed his concerns to the Mayor regarding excessive truck traffic on Garden Ridge Boulevard between FM 407 and IH-35E.
- At the Mayor's request, staff conducted a truck survey on Garden Ridge Boulevard in August 2005.
- Subsequent to the finalization of the survey results, the Mayor requested staff to pursue a truck route plan limiting all trucks (more than 3 axles – semi trailer truck types) to the State Highway System only (IH-35E, SH 121, FM 1171, FM 3040 and FM 407).

Recent City Council Actions and Direction to Staff (cont'd)

- A Truck Route Plan was presented to the Transportation Board on January 19, 2006.
- The Transportation Board recommended approval of the plan with the exception that the truck designation be applied to all commercial vehicles with more than two (2) axles.
- The Transportation Board recommendation clearly was more restrictive and in conflict with the existing language in the Ordinance.
- More staff research indicated that adopting such a restrictive ordinance was impractical.
- During this process, the City Attorney's office shed light on a new Federal lawsuit dealing with truck prohibition along the Interstate system (City of Lancaster).
- City of Lancaster adopted a truck route ordinance without any specific safety reasons supported by engineering studies.

Recent City Council Actions and Direction to Staff (cont'd)

- The two critical elements of the Federal Transportation Code:
 - Enactment or enforcement of a law (ordinance) which denies a commercial motor vehicle reasonable access between an interstate and truck terminals, facilities for food, fuel repairs, etc.
 - Enactment or enforcement of a law (ordinance) which denies access within one road-mile from the national network using the most reasonable and practicable route available except for specific safety reasons.

Recent City Council Actions and Direction to Staff (cont'd)

- Due to the impracticality and cost-prohibitive nature of conducting safety studies on every city street connecting to the interstate system, a truck route plan was eliminated.
- Map Overlay (Street Network Along IH-35E One-Road Mile Limitations (3 pgs)

Discussion was held regarding how the City Council was able to prohibit truck traffic on Garden Ridge. Mr. Kumar returned to this PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Recent City Council Action and Direction to Staff (cont'd)

- Staff was able to find some safety reasons for truck access restriction on Garden Ridge Boulevard
- Section 15-104 – Operation Restricted – For Commercial Vehicles was modified with restriction placed on vehicles with more than two (2) axles with an additional provision exempting pick-up trucks and passenger vans (one-ton capacity and under) towing one or two-axle trailers.
- The City Council, on June 5, 2006, approved the new ordinance including Garden Ridge Boulevard from IH-35E to FM 407.
- The City Council, on June 5, 2006, directed staff to review additional streets based on safety reasons for truck prohibition.

Proposed Overlay of New Streets

- Keeping the Garden Ridge Boulevard residential street character as a baseline condition, staff reviewed the overall network of city thoroughfares traversing through residential neighborhoods.
- A cursory review basically revealed that a majority, if not all, of the thoroughfares in the city somehow impact residential neighborhoods and can be candidates for truck prohibition.
- Map Overlay Truck Prohibition on Various City Streets (New Locations) 5 pgs.

Future Considerations/Options

- I. Review of non-compliant streets with truck prohibition along IH-35E related to the Federal guidelines of one-road mile.
 1. College Parkway: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 2. Jones Street: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 3. Lake Park Road: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 4. Main Street (East): From IH-35E to Mill Street
 5. Pine Drive: From IH-35E to Yates Street

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

Action Steps:

- College Parkway: IH-35E - Mill Street
 - Conduct new safety study/new documentation supporting truck prohibition.
 - Influencing factors – residential neighborhood, neighborhood park, elementary school.
- Jones Street: IH-35E – Mill Street
 - Delete street from truck prohibition ordinance.
 - New realigned street near Fairway Business Park.
 - No longer a major impact to residents facing Jones Street.

Discussion held regarding holding this until I35 is complete because the argument will not longer be there to prohibit trucks. City Manager King advised that there were still existing prohibitions that do not comply with existing law.

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

- Lake Park Road: IH-35E – Mill Street
 - Conduct new safety study.
 - Drawbacks: Mixed use neighborhood – retail stores, golf courses, some multi-family, and single-family uses.
- Main Street (East): IH-35E – Mill Street
 - Conduct a new safety study.
 - Influencing Factors – Downtown pedestrian activity; on-street parking maneuvers.

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

- Pine Street: IH-35E – Yates Street
 - Conduct a new safety study.
 - Influencing Factor – Residential neighborhood; easy alternate access to Yates Street via Bennett Lane

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

- II. Review of Proposed New Streets for Truck Prohibition Connected to IH-35E within One-Road Mile
 1. Bellaire Boulevard: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 2. College Parkway: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 3. Corporate Drive: From West City Limits to intersection with Teakwood Drive
 4. Fox Avenue: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 5. High School Drive: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 6. McGee Lane: From IH-35E to intersection at Bogard Lane
 7. Purnell Street: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 8. Valley Ridge Boulevard: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 9. Vista Ridge Mall Drive: From Denton Tap Road to Lake Vista Drive

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

1. Bellaire Boulevard: from West City Limits to IH-35E
 - A 4-lane divided thoroughfare with residential subdivisions either backing or siding
 - Retail businesses/apartment complexes near SH 121 Business
 - One-road mile extends approximately to just east of Edmonds Lane intersection.
2. College Parkway: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 - Mostly residential throughout the limits with homes fronting the 4-lane divided thoroughfare
 - One-road mile extends approximately to east of Old Orchard intersection.
 - A good candidate for truck prohibition

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

3. Corporate Drive: From West City Limits to intersection with Teakwood Drive
 - A 4-lane undivided thoroughfare with residential subdivisions, park, elementary and middle schools fronting the roadway
 - Less than optimum roadway geometric characteristics (sharp s-curves, vertical and horizontal curves, etc.)
 - One-road mile extends to just west of the proposed limits.
 - A good candidate for truck prohibition

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert expressed concern that this prohibition did not go far enough as the remainder of the street was mostly residential with high pedestrian traffic. He stated that this was just a cut through for truck traffic. City Manager King advised that it could be carried further down.

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

4. Fox Avenue: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 - Mostly residential subdivisions siding or backing up to the 4-lane undivided thoroughfare
 - Retail businesses, churches, Lakeland Elementary School, and other non-residential uses along corridor
 - One-road mile extends to approximately Valley Parkway
 - Direct interchange connection to IH-35E

5. High School Drive: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 - Predominantly residential street with elementary and middle schools served off the roadway
 - One-road mile extends to beyond Mill Street.
 - A good candidate for truck prohibition

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

6. McGee Lane: From IH-35E to intersection with Bogard Lane
 - A short street segment with direct access to residential neighborhood on Bogard Lane
 - A direct access connection to industrial users on McGee Lane between FM 407 and Bogard Lane
 - Future IH-35E widening by TxDOT will eliminate this short street segment.

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

7. Purnell Street: From IH-35E to Mill Street
 - Mostly residential neighborhood with direct front-entry access; middle school frontage
 - An extensively used truck route by R.E.W. Materials
 - One-road mile extends beyond the proposed limits.
 - A good candidate for truck prohibition

8. Valley Ridge Boulevard: From West City Limits to IH-35E
 - Residential subdivisions siding or backing for the majority of the limits of the divided thoroughfare
 - Mostly retail uses east of Summit Avenue
 - One-road mile extends past McGee Lane/Old Orchard intersection (across from First Baptist Church).
 - Direct interchange connection to IH-35E

Future Considerations/Options (cont'd)

9. Vista Ridge Mall Drive: From Denton Tap Road to Lake Vista Drive
 - Four-lane undivided thoroughfare with mixed uses along the corridor – apartments, retail businesses, etc.
 - One-road mile extends to MacArthur Drive.

Final Analysis/Recommendations

- Recommendations:
 1. Amend current Ordinance Section 15-104 – Operation Restricted Related to Trucks/Commercial Vehicles by deleting Jones Street only.
 2. Consider list of proposed new streets recommended for truck prohibition that have the one-road mile limitations (Bellaire Boulevard, *College Parkway, *Corporate Drive, Fox Avenue, *High School Drive, *McGee Lane, *Purnell Street, Valley Ridge Boulevard, and Vista Ridge Mall Drive).

*Good candidate for truck prohibition.

Discussion held regarding Valley Ridge Boulevard and Vista Ridge Mall Drive and the reason they were listed if staff did not feel they were good candidates. Mr. Kumar advised that it was staff's opinion that studies could still be done on these streets; however, there was a lot of commercial on these two roads. Councilman Nowels advised that residents could come in and ask for those streets and then if the study does not justify prohibition then there is a reason to prohibit.

Discussion was held regarding how these studies were conducted and who would do these studies. Further discussion was held regarding prioritizing these streets as which should be studied first. City Manager King advised he was not a big supporter of prohibiting due to the similarities of the streets. City Manager King stated he felt it almost gets to an all or nothing approach. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert advised he would like to see the City start with Corporate Drive and Fox Avenue mainly because there is a school located there. Mayor Pro Tem Durham advised that this could become never ending and questioned Mr. Kumar on how many requests the City has received since the year 2000. Mr. Kumar advised that since the year 2000 the first request was Main and Church and that had been City driven; and then Garden Ridge was requested. Mayor Pro Tem Durham expressed concern that the City was overreacting because of one situation, he stated that the road was made for travel and designed for trucks.

Final Analysis/Recommendations (cont'd)

3. Perform a comprehensive safety study using the one-road mile rule including current non-compliant streets for the following selected streets:

*College Parkway (I35-Mill)	*Lake Park Road
*Main Street (East)	*Pine Drive
Bellaire Boulevard	*College Parkway (WCL-I35)
*Corporate Drive	Fox Avenue
*High School Drive	*McGee Lane
*Purnell Street	Valley Ridge Boulevard
Vista Ridge Mall Drive	

*Good candidate for truck prohibition.

Note: Cost of study is unknown at this time.

Final Analysis/Recommendations (cont'd)

4. Consider list of all other proposed new streets for truck prohibition (not affected by one-road mile rule).

Edmonds Lane	Rockbrook Drive
Garden Ridge Blvd.	Summit Avenue
Highland Drive	Uecker Drive
McGee Lane/ Old Orchard	Valley Parkway

5. Amend and adopt a new ordinance (Section 15-104) inclusive of all selected streets.
6. Continue to handle truck prohibition on streets as needed, on a complaint basis.
7. City Council direction to staff.

Mr. Kumar then reviewed a six (6) page Exhibit of Street Network Along IH-35E One-Road Mile Limitations

City Manager King stated staff needs to know how far the City Council wants to proceed. Mayor Carey stated he did not think we need to spend a lot of time and tie up staff. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert stated that when he made the motion that the City Council approved the prohibition on Garden Ridge he did it with the understanding that they would go back and look at other streets. He further stated that if the City Council decided not to do any other streets then he would want to bring the other back and change that street. Discussion held regarding doing an enhanced or limited study. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert stated that he did not feel all the streets have to be studied, perhaps just start with Corporate, Fox and Bellaire. Further discussion was held on which streets the City Council wanted to have a study done.

Mayor Pro Tem Durham stated that he felt the City Council was wasting time with this study.

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert stated that he would be comfortable doing nothing if the truck prohibition was removed from Garden Ridge.

Old Town “Missing Links”

City Manager King reviewed the Final Report for Old Town Lewisville Development Implementation Plan Market Analysis report. City Manager King advised Council was going to have to come up with a consensus. He explained how the TIRZ worked and what needed to be done. Mr. King reviewed what the recommendation of the Spillette Study on page 1-2 of their report.

City Manager King then conducted a PowerPoint Presentation regarding Parking Lot Locations, Costs, Concepts, and Financing in Old Town as follows:

Old Town Parking

- G/A conceptual plan drawn up for 2005 retreat
- Included major rehabs of alleys behind NW, NE and SE blocks (including the now acquired and improved Long/Holsclaw tracts). Also included 37 spaces on Karimi and vacant portion of Heath tracts.
- Council Direction: Use G/A plan for NE block including the City owned property. Try to get 75 spaces on south side using Boenker/Karimi tracts, Heath optional.
- Subsequent private development of NW block drove alley, minimal parking improvements in late 2005.

Old Town Parking

- Improvements to Long/Holsclaw lots completed about same time (added green space plus 12 spaces).
- Acquired Demers tract in 2006. Demolition pending Council decisions.
- Major difficulties exist in alleys, including drainage, utility lines, sewer services and reluctance of property owners to grant permanent right-of-way/easements (some envision future “use” of property despite historic access by public).
- Used limited “parking easements” on NW block. “Public” parking rights expire in future if owners wish to expand in accordance with OT GDO.
- Alley still protected by City sewer easement.
- Permanent easements/fee simple preferable for any further alley improvements.

- G/A and Spillette studies recommend alley connection to parking lot behind Lewisville State Bank. Would require ROW/easement. Connection to Church through Mulkey-Mason another option.
- Fall 2005, Council opts to not pursue Boenker tract based on stated selling price. Heath wants acquisition of laundromat included (total asking price \$500,000). Plan suspended pending further decisions on funding/locations desired.
- Fall 2006, Council renews interest in Mulkey. Owner “non-committal.” Appraisal update ordered and received in December (\$555,000). Original offer was \$375K, counter was \$595K plus “perks”.
- Summer 2006, Boenker tract placed on market asking \$700,000.
- Late 2006, appraisal of Boenker tract ordered by staff (\$575K).
- Fall 2006, DeShazo/Tang examines parking as part of Spillette market study.
- Concept of “mews” in alley ways introduced. “Enhanced” surface designed for pedestrian traffic, limited vehicular traffic (deliveries, access to private parking).

Discussion was held regarding changing to parallel parking on Main Street. City Manager King advised that the Spillette study did not recommend changing parking from angled. City Manager King returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

- Also recommends use of Mulkey Mason, Karimi/Heath, and Demers/Long/ Holsclaw for parking.
- Recommends Plaza extension to Church St. along current Poydras corridor.
- Surface parking has been recommended by staff due to cost per space for surface vs. structured and overall budget for parking.

Discussion was held regarding the alleys and current uses of those in Old Town area. City Manager King returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

- Generally, surface parking is cheaper than above ground structured until land prices are above \$30/ft. (source: Mary Smith, Walker Parking Consultants). Underground parking can be twice as expensive as above ground structured.
- However, surface parking also removes more potentially developable property than structured parking.

Mayor **Carey** adjourned the called-special session of the Lewisville City Council into Closed Session at 10:40 a.m. p.m. Friday, February 2, 2007, in accordance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Law.

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 31

Closed Session

In accordance with Texas Government Code, Subchapter D, Section 551.072 (REAL ESTATE), the Lewisville City Council convened into Closed Session at 10:45 a.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007, Scott Room of the Ashton Hotel, 610 Main Street, Fort Worth, Texas, in order to discuss matters pertaining to the following:

1. Property Acquisition

The Closed Session was adjourned at 11:20 a.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007.

**Reconvene into Regular Session and
Consider Action, if any, on Items Discussed
in Closed Session**

Mayor Carey reconvened the Called-Special Session of the Lewisville City Council at 11:23 a.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007, in the Scott Room of the Ashton Hotel, 610 Main Street, Fort Worth, Texas.

Mayor Carey opened the floor for action to be taken on the items discussed in the Closed Session. There was no action taken.

City Manager King then returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Plaza?/Parking Lot Bonds

- Need to be COs. TIF revenue bonds are not cost effective. COs avoid statutory limits on terms for TIF Bonds (20 years max).
- “Agreement” with TIF Board desirable. Commits and documents TIF repayment of bonds.
- COs ultimately backed by City property tax authority.
- Election not required for COs (or TIF Bonds)
- Current TIF ordinance has County increment decreasing (85% in 2011, 80% in 2016, 75% in 2021. Entire TIF “ends” December 31, 2021.
- TIF can be extended after ~ 60 day hearing process.

- Extending County’s participation requires Commissioners Court approval.
- No “new bonds” after Dec. 31, 2012 w/o consent of Commissioners Court (“....no bonds shall be authorized for repayment after Dec. 31, 2012”).
- Bond capacity for repayment schedule terminating in 2021 is estimated at \$5.91M (say \$6M).

- Bond capacity for repayment schedule terminating in 2027 is estimated at \$7.785M. Assumes County increment terminates as currently designed but that zone is extended by Lewisville.
- Extending county participation does not materially increase debt capacity unless non-TIF revenues are contributed in early years.
- TIF revenue estimates assume a “cushion” of \$100,000 annually for “operating expenses.” However, any shortfalls in TIF revenues would have to be made up, probably from the GF.

Plaza

- Several concepts developed in 2003 by CSI
- Reviewed concepts with potential “patron” but no interest in participating.
- Plaza can, depending on scope, conflict with prime parking options on north side.
- Can be designed along with parking if scope is reduced.
- Backs of building, dumpsters, sheds, storage, utilities and alleys are detriments to plaza (or the “mew” concept). Screening walls, landscaping, owner cooperation are “mitigators”

- Parking lots, nicely landscaped, can also help screen or transition to a Plaza
- Through access for the alleyway is a “must do” if Poydras is closed (requires purchase from bank or connection to Church St.)
- DeShazo uses “mew” concept, expansion of Ferguson Plaza to Church St. and possible “new” Plaza on Charles St.
- Plaza costs are eligible TIF or TIF bond (CO) project.

Discussion was held about the Milton Powell study and the price range for Concept 10B, which the City Council had preferred. City Manager King reminded them the cost of the concept was \$4 million. City Manager King returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

- Could be eligible 4B Park project. (4B reserves currently approx. \$6.7M)
- Combination of sources also possible, including GF
- Scope is the critical decision. Cost could range from \$250K to millions.

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 33

Discussion was held that there was roughly \$14 million or \$15 million that can be spent from a variety of sources. City Manager King then began his PowerPoint Presentation regarding Church Property Use as follows:

- 3.8754 acres total
- Investment approx. \$2.75M
- Numerous options for adaptive re-use of building for Art/Civic Center developed by Milton Powell (19 versions)
- City eventually opts for Civic/Conference Center partnership with Hilton Garden Inn
- March 2004 Council directs staff to issue RFP to potential developers

- Two respondents
 - Gault Co.
 - Second Century Investments
- Both used north tract for TH or MF
- Both used angle in parking on Church and Main
- Various MU options for southern tract, some with and some without existing building

- No consensus to use either proposal
- May 2005 - last “re-use” option provided to Council
- Feb. 2006 - last formal discussion at retreat
- Spring/Summer 2006 - LV Shopping Center (4 acres) under contract by local developer, then Fairfield for redevelopment as MF, along with Church property

- Proposal:
 - City land at no cost (\$2.75M)
 - \$1.4M COG Sustainable Living Grant (City match \$280K) for parking/streetscaping improvements to Church, Main, S. Poydras (Ferguson) Plaza
 - Probable City san sewer improvements \$2M
- Fall 2006 – Contract expires w/o closing
- Current – Building has limited utility in current condition

- Est sale price LV Shopping Center \$2.1M (11.80/sf). Blended cost of land \$6.05/sf. “High.” COG grant reduces basis somewhat.
- Spillette cites weakness in MF market in LV and competitive disadvantages in OT that could drive rental rates down to a “low-moderate” income level or much lower quality units. Higher priced land and high construction costs exacerbate this scenario.

- MF densities in OT increased to 40 units/acre when MU districts were created. MF2 density – 24 units/acre.

- Increased densities often exist in TOD locations or in high land cost locations
- Parking then becomes a problem that often has to be solved with structured approach
- Often, densities for such projects are 80-100/acre.

“Rec” Center (Arts)

1. Staff does not recommend a conventional Rec Center in Old Town
 - a. Needs can be met in other two facilities and with expansion of Memorial
 - b. Population is not sufficient
 - c. Rec Center master planned at East Hill Park
2. Facility needs to serve all of City, not just East Side
3. Staff is recommending CC consideration of a multi-purpose Cultural Arts Center (or similar alternative)
4. This would not be a “Performing Arts Center” designed for large productions.
5. It would be a center designed for adult and children’s art classes (painting, dance, photography, ceramics, sculpture, film/video, writing, wood/metal crafts, etc.), art display and small performance (solos, quartets, small chorals, bands, name artists, recitals, small theatrical productions.
6. It would be designed as multi purpose to facilitate other needs (meetings, training, lectures, classes) that do not conflict with LV Conference Center.
7. A LV Cultural Arts Center would meet needs for:
 - a. OT
 - located at Charles/Church or elsewhere close to downtown
 - bring people from entire community to OT side of City
 - b. VB
 - A location for visiting artists or touring artists that do not require “concert hall” facilities
 - A location to market various arts exhibitions, programs
 - An enhancement of OT as a visitor attraction and special events
 - c. Lewisville Citizens and Residents
 - The primary focus would be expanded programming in Arts related activities, leaving the Rec Centers to conduct more of the “physical” activities
 - Additional opportunities for resident participation in performances, exhibitions
 - Meeting space (not of the kind that competes with Conference Center)
8. Funding
 - Zone Z \$943,000 (some other projects pending)
 - Tree Mitigation Fund \$228,000
 - CIP Fund balances
 - COs

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 35

- GO Bond Election
- 4B Reserves (\$6-7M)
- GF Reserves
- TIF Bonds (depending on other projects) (\$3-4M)

Councilman Tierney questioned if on a General Obligation Bond was they City not stacked up. City Manager King agreed it would be difficult to do that as the City would be paying for it out of the debt rate City Manager King returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

9. Critical Decisions
 - Do this?
 - Do something else?
 - Scope? Budget?
 - Where?

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for lunch at 11:56 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 1:44 p.m.

City Manager King returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

- d. Downtown 'Facility': Types, Location, and Financing
- e. Density preferences (requested by Councilman Durham)

Mayor Carey adjourned the called-special session of the Lewisville City Council into Closed Session at 1:45 p.m. p.m. Friday, February 2, 2007, in accordance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Law.

Closed Session

In accordance with Texas Government Code, Subchapter D, Section 551.072 (REAL ESTATE), the Lewisville City Council convened into Closed Session at 1:45 p.m. on Friday, , February 2, 2007, Scott Room of the Ashton Hotel, 610 Main Street, Fort Worth, Texas, in order to discuss matters pertaining to the following:

2. Property Acquisition

The Closed Session was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007.

**Reconvene into Regular Session and
Consider Action, if any, on Items Discussed
in Closed Session**

Mayor Carey reconvened the Called-Special Session of the Lewisville City Council at 4:15 p.m. on Friday, February 2, 2007, in the Scott Room of the Ashton Hotel, 610 Main Street, Fort Worth, Texas.

Mayor Carey opened the floor for action to be taken on the items discussed in the Closed Session. There was no action taken.

Castle Hills – Partial Annexation

City Manager King advised that City staff had received a call regarding a partial annexation. He explained the reason they were interested and the concern with the fire service contract. Assistant City Manager Donna Barron presented a PowerPoint presentation for this item as follows:

Legal Basis

- “Strategic Partnership Agreement” between City and DCFWD1-A by mutual consent under LGC 43.0751
- Service Plan and Procedures similar to full annexation, but this is a Limited Purpose Annexation
- Property taxes – **CANNOT BE LEVIED** in the LPA area

Legal Basis (cont’d)

- City Sales Tax (1-1/4%) - **APPLICABLE** in LPA area
- DCTA Sales Tax (1/2%) – **NOT APPLICABLE** in LPA area
- Hotel Occupancy Tax (7%) – **NOT APPLICABLE** in LPA area
- Alcohol Sales – **NOT affected** by LPA area - still must have election to change

Legal Basis (cont’d)

- Service Fees – **CAN CHARGE FEES** for services rendered (e.g. building permits)
- Voting – Residents **CAN VOTE** in regular city election. Residents **CANNOT** hold an elected city office. Residents **CANNOT** vote in city bond election.
- Full Annexation – when City can assume outstanding debt of water district – all city taxes then apply

Discussion was held regarding the residents being able to vote in City Council elections and potential implications should the City Council decide to agree to their request. City Manager King advised that the sales tax would be lucrative; however, the City Council had to determine if

they wanted to bear the potential political ramifications. Further discussion was held regarding the potential of absorbing their debt and that the City's tax rate could raise.

Discussion was held regarding they were paying \$1.00 per \$100 in taxes which was far more than what Lewisville residents were. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert did not want to do this because he did not want to let non-citizens vote on controlling what happens in the City. Councilman Nowels questioned if this was a money maker for the City. City Manager King advised that when annexed they would be voting and running candidates. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert recommended that once the City decides to annex them in then perhaps the City should go to Single Member Districts so one area is not controlling the whole City. Discussion was held regarding single member districts and if the City Council contained three members controlled by Castle Hills they would be able to raise the taxes.

Discussion held regarding that \$71 million has been issued in bonds for Castle Hills. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert expressed concern about the citizens of Lewisville being upset about allowing non-residents of Lewisville vote in City elections.

(Councilman Tierney left the room at 4:37 p.m.)

Ms. Barron returned to her PowerPoint presentation as follows:

Sales Tax Projection Methodology

- Determined current number of occupied homes; projected residential growth based on developer's recommendation
- Made assumptions for future commercial development
- Determined current sales tax collected and projected future sales tax based on commercial development and residential growth

Number of Occupied Homes

- 1300 occupied homes currently
- Developer projects that occupied homes will grow to over 2200 in next 5 years
- Conceptual Land Plan includes 2 multi-family tracts projected to include 700 units and 2000 additional single family residential homes
- Based on "average" usage – projected utility sales for new growth
- Assumed that 20% of new housing would occur each year between 2008 and 2012

City Manager King advised that 2,200 homes would create approximately 3,000 voters if they were motivated. Mayor Pro Tem Durham stated that is why he felt the City should have Single Member Districts if this was to occur. Ms. Barron returned to her PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Future Commercial Development

- ED office used model to make assumptions for commercial development based on tract location and size (Handout A & B)
- Planned Super Target at SE corner of Josey and Hwy 121 included in calculation (under contract; projected to open in 2007)
- Assumed retail sales in existing businesses would increase 2% annually

Ms. Barron referenced the Land Use Plan and Castle Hills Sales Tax Assumption sheet that had been handed out to the City Council and returned to her PowerPoint as follows:

Future Commercial Development

- Developer noted which tracts would develop in 6-12 months and which would develop in 12-18 months
- 2007 Revenues are difficult to project and are dependent on date of Super Target Opening

Current Sales Tax Collected

- Grande Communication \$13,199
 - (cable, phone, internet)
- CoServe Electric \$36,202
- Golf Club \$30,000
- Village Shops \$16,710
- Total \$96,111

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Future Projected Sales Tax (1%)

Year	*Projected Current Development	on **Projected on New Development	Total Add Sales Tax
2008	\$103,886	\$2,152,110	\$2,255,996
2009	\$111,679	\$2,195,152	\$2,306,831
2010	\$119,491	\$2,239,055	\$2,358,547
2011	\$127,323	\$2,283,837	\$2,411,159
2012	\$135,174	\$2,329,513	\$2,464,687

*2% increase annually + new growth in existing development

**composed of new retail development, residential growth (utility sales) and 2% growth in retail sales

Fire and Police Service Contracts

- **Current Fee for Fire/EMS Service***
- \$134,124 annually
- **Current Fee for Police Service***
- Basic--\$58,000
- School Crossing Guards--\$30,000
- Alarm Billing--\$3,400
- Total Police--\$91,400

*Both formulas based on calculation of a “cost per call” multiplied by the # of calls for service

Fire and Police Service Contract Revenue

Based on growth in # of new households and 2% growth in “rate”:

- 2008 \$357,438
- 2009 \$494,539
- 2010 \$636,980
- 2011 \$784,922
- 2012 \$938,526

Assumes calls for service increase as # of households increase

Revenue: Service Contract vs. Sales Tax

Sales tax revenue generated in excess of service contract revenue

- 2008 \$1,898,558
- 2009 \$1,812,293
- 2010 \$1,721,566
- 2011 \$1,626,237
- 2012 \$1,526,161

Additional Sales Tax for 4B

2008	\$563,999
2009	\$576,708
2010	4589,637
2011	\$602,790
2012	\$616,172

Future Issues

- Castle Hills Annexation Projection - due to debt pay off schedules, and assuming a 3% growth rate in valuations, the earliest the City could annex Castle Hills would be in 2031. This analysis is exclusive of commercial properties or the O & M impact.

Councilman Nowels stated if the City modified the agreement to annex the commercial property they would collect a little over a million and a half. He further stated that the City could provide police and fire services and will give Mr. Bright half the excess revenue with the stipulation that he must use that to lower their oldest debt first until they get down to our debt load. City Attorney Ron Neiman advised it would still take Castle Hills 20 years to get down to the City's debt load.. Discussion held regarding this suggestion and why Chris Bright would want to do this. Ms. Barron reminded Councilman Nowels that the property owners were paying the debt. Further discussion held on this recommendation.

City Manager King wouldn't it be better for us to take the money and put in our pocket. City Manager King advised he did not think it will make a difference in the timing of your annexation. City Manager King stated that the way they will pay their debt down was with the commercial property. City Manager King advised that district 1b isn't going to want 1a carved off because they are the commercial. Discussion held regarding being able to pull a piece at a time. City staff advised that they were not sure it could be handled that way.

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 41

Further discussion held regarding working this deal to rebate half the sales tax back to Mr. Bright for him to pay into the past debt by annexing their commercial property. Mayor Pro Tem Durham stated his concern that Mr. Bright would have no obligation to pay that debt. Ms. Barron advised that Mr. Bright does not get the sales tax currently. She further advised that the Districts, not Mr. Bright, are responsible for the police and fire payments.

City Manager King advised that City staff can conduct further research regarding Councilman Nowels' suggestions. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert advised that he did not have a problem with Councilman Nowels; suggestions; however, he did not want to do what Mr. Bright had requested.

Discussion held regarding just annexing the area where Target was going to be located. City Manager King reviewed a map of the Districts. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert stated he felt the consensus of the City Council was to not do the proposal but to work out some type of deal regarding Councilman Nowels' recommendation where the City could get sales tax revenue, and potential income.

Further discussion was held regarding limited annexation of 1f and 1g were the City could collect sales tax which is basically the unreceived revenue now that is available and for that the City would provide police and fire and take a certain percentage to retire the Castle Hills oldest debt.

Ms. Barron referred to the agreement and advised it did show that they cannot annex any undeveloped areas of the lands that are developed for commercial without first annexing residential.

Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert stated that he did not want to do any form of annexation that will give people outside of Lewisville voting rights. All the City Council Members agreed with this statement.

City Manager King then began a PowerPoint Presentation regarding the Lord Property as follows:

- Lord Property
 - General Information
 - ❖ 300+ acres
 - ❖ Within Town of Hebron
 - ❖ No services provided by Hebron
 - ❖ Water and sewer Certificate of Convenience and Necessity held by Carrollton
 - ❖ Lewisville has sanitary sewer through site servicing Austin Ranch

- Lord Property Owner Alternatives
 - Property remain in Hebron
 - ❖ Hebron obtain services by others for Fire/Police/Water/Sewer
 - ❖ New PID/District
 - ❖ No connection to Lewisville sewer line (outside city)
 - Property de-annexed by Hebron, annexation by Carrollton
 - ❖ Carrollton provide services

Future Issues (cont'd)

- Lord Property Owner Alternatives (cont'd)
 - Property de-annexed by Hebron, annexation by Lewisville
 - ❖ Services by Lewisville fire, police
 - ❖ Carrollton to decertify water/sewer service area
 - ❖ Lewisville provide w/s; water @ Windhaven and Josey; sewer on-site
 - Property de-annexed by Hebron, annexation 5' strip by Lewisville, create independent PID/District (e.g. Lantana)

Future Issues (cont'd)

- Lord Property Owner Alternatives (cont'd)
 - Property de-annexed by Hebron, annexation 5' strip by Lewisville, expand existing Castle Hills PID or Castle Hills create new PID/District

Discussion was held regarding if there was a revenue benefit for Lewisville. With the exception of Mayor Pro Tem Durham, the general consensus of the City Council was to say no thank you, as he did not feel they City would be out anything. City Manager King advised that they also wanted fire and police services. Mayor Pro Tem Durham stated they could get the water services from next door.

City Manager King reviewed the letter from the Old Town Business Association.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Councilman Nowels and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Durham, the Council voted five (5) “ayes” and no (0) “nays” to move the two remaining items on the agenda to Saturday, February 3, 2007. The motion carried.

With no further discussion, Mayor Carey adjourned the called – special Council Retreat Workshop Session at 5:59 p.m.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2007

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 8:55 a.m. on Saturday, February 3, 2007. 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 Elizabeth Trosper, Planning and Community Services Manager Gene Lewis, and Director of Community Development Eric Ferris.

Tourism One Year Update

James Kunke began his PowerPoint Presentation regarding the Tourism One Year Update as follows:

Mission/Purpose Statement

The mission of the Convention and Visitors Bureau is to create and promote a positive awareness of Lewisville, Texas as a visitors and convention destination in the DFW region, ensuring increased revenues for hotels, attractions, restaurants, and all retail establishments and stimulating economic development and growth for the community.

Tourism Timeline

2005

Oct. 1 City assumes budgetary control of LVB

2006

- Jan. 1 - City assumes operational control of LVB
- Jan. 9 - Council appoints Tourism Strategic Planning Committee
- March 8 - Community Relations and Tourism merge into a single new department
- June 5 - Council approves three-year Tourism Strategic Plan
- Aug. 9 - Staff attends Visit USA trade show in San Jose, Costa Rica
- Sept. 12 - Fall Concert Series moves to Old Town Lewisville
- Sept. 21 - Members of Costa Rican travel media hold first of two Lewisville fam tours
- Sept. 27 - On-line booking system launched on visitlewisville.com website
- Oct. 1 - Tourism begins operating on first detailed line-item budget
- Oct. 23 - Visitor Information Center opens at 606 W. Main Street
- Oct. 24 - Staff participates in DFWATC blitz of North Texas visitor centers
- Nov. 1 - Tourism billboard posted on southbound Interstate 35E
- Dec. 1 - Letter of agreement signed with GoGo Creative for branding campaign

Major Initiative #1 – Branding

- Staff committee interviewed three companies in Fall 2006
- Agreement signed with GoGo Creative (Austin) to conduct first phase of project
- Public and visitor surveys drafted, to be launched by end of January
- 120-day timeline for research phase sets target at end of March

Major Initiative #2 – Website

- On-line booking system implemented
- Event calendar upgrades implemented
- Attractions list expanded and reformatted
- Accommodations page upgraded and updated
- Attraction coupons added and maintained
- First e-newsletter sent to opt-in database in November
- Valentine Promotion Package giveaway posted in January
- Local maps being developed for February posting
- External travel links being compiled for February posting

Mr. Kunke reviewed a photo of Major Initiative #3 – Destination Development

- Old Town Shopping Guide, Historic Home Tour brochures designed and being printed in January
- Co-op magazine advertising with Texas Downtown Assoc.
- Fall Concert Series moved to Old Town (Sept. & Oct.)
- Channel 8 Bus Tour broadcast live from Old Town (Oct.)
- Boxing tournament (Sept.) and “Dracula” ballet (Oct.) held in Activity Center; Old Town Farmers Market operated by OTBA
- Council approved retail incentive grant program
- Valentine Promotion Package marketed in January
- Arts events being marketed to hotel guests; Lewisville-area arts marketing brochure designed and being printed in January

Major Initiative #4 – Corporate & Group Tourism

- Awarded the 2010 Texas Firefighter Olympics
- Host hotel site for Texas Forensic League state contest being held February 24 through March 4 in Carrollton
- Forwarding leads to Hilton Garden Inn, which made its first official booking in January (FAA meeting in 2008)

- Exhibiting at and sponsoring American Bus Association conference in Grapevine in January
- Exhibiting at the Texas Society of Association Executives conference in Austin in February; three local hotels have paid to participate with the Lewisville CVB

Major Initiative #5 – Retail Tourism

- Tax Free Shopping and Vista Ridge Mall reached agreement in August for service center at the mall, aiming for a February 2007 opening
- Implementation of International Tax-Free Shopping District is pending debut of the service center
- More than 5,000 information packets (visitors guide, map, dining guide, calendar, welcome letter, seasonal materials) mailed in response to requests generated by print advertising placed in newspapers and magazines
- Advertising campaigns for tax-free weekend and holiday shopping seasons included Vista Ridge Mall coupons

Photo of Major Initiative #6 – Sports Tourism

Major Initiative #6 – Sports Tourism

- Compiling a Recreation Resources Guide for Lewisville and adjacent cities
- Will exhibit at the National Association of Sports Commissions conference in the spring
- Held initial meeting with potential Lewisville Fishing Guides Association, working with group on by-laws
- Worked with youth leagues and private athletic facilities in the Lewisville area to serve as host hotel site for more than a dozen events generating more than 3,000 room nights during 2006

Major Initiative #7 – Regional Outreach

- Participated in Dallas-Fort Worth Area Tourism Council tour of state visitor centers
- Co-op advertising with DFW council and Dallas CVB
- City Council decided not to pursue multi-city lake event at this time, but other joint marketing efforts or events with lake communities being researched by staff
- Participating in comprehensive DFW council marketing and advertising campaign being launched in March 2007
- Assisting with Arlington/Dallas bid for 2011 Super Bowl

Major Initiative #8 – Visitor Information Center

- Tourism committee recommended Old Town; several lease and purchase options were researched in the Old Town Center District
- With assistance from committee chairman Wayne Ferguson, a lease was arranged for a site on hospital property at Main Street and Interstate 35E
- Visitor Information Center opened in October 2006
- Full-time staff of four people, open six days a week
- Center being promoted with billboard on southbound 35E
- First out-of-town visitor came on first day of operation

This concluded Mr. Kunke's presentation.

City Manager King began his PowerPoint Presentation regarding Railroad Street Park. He handed out and reviewed the latest design of the Master Plan for the Lewisville Athletic Complex. He advised that their backup contained a previous design so they could see how it had been adapted

Railroad Street Park

- Latest design includes additional parking added to northwest section and associated relocation of maintenance facility
- Also includes four baseball (one grass infield, three clay) fields instead of four softball fields and one baseball. Greater outfield, infield distances required reconfiguration of fields.
- Lake design slightly different
- Still includes dog park, skate park
- Skate park "design" public meetings conducted in January

Railroad Street Park (cont'd)

- 4B board has approved \$18.2M bond issuance for spring '07
- Construction costs may affect how much can be constructed and drive difficult cost-or scope-cutting decisions
- Value-engineering being conducted by design consultants
- Continental Baseball League may be possible future "tenant" for "championship" baseball field. Issues include 4B financing, scope/cost of desired enhancements, and impact on current design

Discussion held regarding sponsorship funding. City Manager King stated that you would be talking about significant money – you can go a little way or a whole lot further – range of cost from another addition one million to five or seven.

Councilman Nowels advised that he would be abstaining from discussion and consideration of this item due to a conflict of interest. The appropriate Conflict of Interest Affidavit has been filled out and filed with the City Secretary. Councilman Nowels stepped out of the room.

Discussion held on land for race track located on this complex site or another area, such as the 54 acres. Additional discussion was held regarding parking and access to the park and if changes needed to be made or if it should stay as currently designed. City Manager King advised that once the bids on the park came in then cc would have to review what would stay.

Councilman Nowels returned to the room.

Fox Avenue Study Area (FASA)

Director of Economic Development Zane Miller advised that the City had hired someone to take the model for Old Town and have standards created for that to this area. Mr. Miller began his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Introduction

Study Area

North – Main Street
East – I.H. 35E
South – Bellaire
West – Old Orchard

Size of Area - 1,600 acres
(Old Town 400 acres)

Study Purpose

- Evaluate current demographics and trends
 - Compare existing infrastructure to current design standards
 - Complete survey of property conditions
 - Compute land/house appraisal ratios to assess neighborhood viability
 - Analyze key economic indicators
 - Establish action plan for enhancement of residential and commercial properties
 - Establish funding source(s) for programs
-
- In 1994, the 2010 Plan described Central Lewisville as follows:

- This is a second tier of development in Lewisville with most neighborhoods 23 to 36 years old.
- Land accounts for some 26% to 38% of the total value of property in this area, about the average for older residential areas.
- Median household income for the area are in the lower range of Lewisville incomes.
- This area has the highest number of people with incomes from public assistance.
- People with incomes from social security are also concentrated in the area.

- The 2010 Plan states that without a concerted City response early in the process of neighborhood decline, blighting effects can rapidly spread to entire sections of a community.
- In a community that has aging development, redevelopment often occurs to maintain sustainable, quality living for the residents of the community. Sometimes this process occurs naturally but sometimes needs assistance from private stakeholders or through governmental assistance.

- 2010 Plan
 - In December 1994, the 2010 plan noted that some single family residential areas in the City were having emerging characteristics of neighborhoods that were on the decline.
 - As stated in the 2010 Plan, one indicator of potential neighborhood decline:
 - Percent of single family homes that are occupied by renters vs. owner-occupied homes because property maintenance can be worse for properties with absentee owners.

Mr. Miller showed demographics maps, population change charts, ethnic population distribution, and age distribution (2000), Charts.

Mr. Miler showed a rendering of schools which serve FASA. Those schools are as follows:

- Lewisville High School
- Delay Middle School
- Central Elementary School
- Lakeland Elementary School
- Hedrick Elementary
- Hedrick Middle School
- Dale Jackson Learning Center
- Jackson Early Childhood Center.

Mr. Miller reviewed the definition of economically disadvantaged.

Urban Image

Edges

- Linear features that function as boundaries, often act as barriers and divisive elements. They can serve a unifying or organizational purpose.

Path

- Elements that provide movement, supply visitors and residents with routes into, out of, and within a City. They are vital to a City's image because they are central to the experience of the City. Perception of the City will be formed by what they experience along the path.

Node

- Strategic points in a City, made important either because they are the main point of entry, the convergence of several paths, or simply the symbol of or focus for a district.

Implementation Idea's

Urban Overlay District (Old Town concept)

- Impose specific design standards for redevelopment
- City installed corridor beautification, enhanced pedestrian linkages

Themed District

- Family Friendly area
 - Starter home area
 - Public improvements oriented towards young families with children (First time homebuyers)

Public/Private Beautification Programs

- Fence rehab program (city fund matching grant for new wood fencing)
- Residential paint program (city funded residential painting program for approved color palette)
- Commercial façade redevelopment program

Discussion was held regarding mandating color palettes for the City such as wood fences. Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Ueckert questioned if Mr. Miller was talking about a main park or a pocket park. Mr. Miller advised he was referring to a pocket park. Discussion held regarding pocket parks and the availability of funds in 4B funds, other funds, and locations for these type parks. Mr. Miller returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

What affects retail decline?

- Individual maintenance of retail properties
- Conditions which make the consumer feel unsafe
- Traffic conditions or patterns which prevent ease of access
- Loss of major anchors which draw the daily consumer away from major retail properties
- Overbuilding the market

Challenges to Redevelopment

- “Full” centers do not warrant additional investment
- “Perceived” extensive code requirements
- Aesthetic investment does not equal increased occupancy or a higher level of tenant
- Trade areas are shifting away from existing centers

What Can We Do?

- Change our consumer
- Enhance marketing to the consumer
 - Proactively promote the Lewisville opportunities to the Lewisville region....forget city boundaries
- Provide incentives to retail property owners to “refresh” existing properties
 - Create a reason for property owners to raise the standard
 - Create destination retail locations through major anchor tenants
- Provide targeted thoroughfare beautification enhancements to raise the community image
 - Maintain the “special touch” that keeps people here.
 - Year round street banners
 - Enhanced medians
 - Clean roads with fresh traffic lane markings
 - Enhanced street lighting in retail areas
- Establish adaptive reuse policies and ordinances to eliminate declining centers
 - Create demand by increasing residential densities and/or reducing supply
 - Review ordinances to ensure ease of redevelopment
 - Adopt a comprehensive redevelopment marketing plan that can be marketed to land owners

How do we do it?

- Individually contact declining property owners to establish needs or desires
- Find out what our residents want that they cannot get in Lewisville...AND GET IT
- Institute a comprehensive regional marketing program to promote the opportunities in Lewisville...STEAL THE COMPETITION
- Develop a funding source
- TAKE THE LEAD

Funding Considerations

Improvement District

- Establish overlay district (PID) to create new funding source
- Funding would support increased landscaping, enhancement financing, “gateway” entry features, etc.
- Would be “added” money and not adversely impact City General Fund
- Would be “**new**” tax to property owners

TIRZ District

- Create TIRZ zone over FASA
- Beneficial model if County would participate
- Would limit general fund revenue in future

Retail Opportunities

Buxton Report will not be ready for another couple of weeks.

Discussion was held about the impact of the internet and how that affects retail stores. Discussion was also held regarding the growing Hispanic population and should the City embrace that to create an upscale environment and figuring out how to be successful with all ethnic groups. Further discussion was held regarding the backlash that could create among the residents.

Fiber Backbone

Director of ITS Larry Buchanan began his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Dark Fiber

- Dark Fiber - The City provides the (light) routing equipment and data does not pass out of our network.
- All major city campuses currently connected through dark fiber owned by Time Warner.
- Currently we have a 5 year lease which will expire in 2008.
- Time Warner will not extend our dark fiber lease.
- Time Warner will provide us with a data service through their network.
 - Security and Integrity of network.
 - Communications availability.
 - Additional costs for Firewall's and VPN tunneling.
 - Recurring costs for communications, software and hardware maintenance.

Critical Network Services

- The Cities network provides critical services for voice, data and security to OTCH and Kealy.
- Servers are centrally located at the Annex and high speed communications is essential.
- Voice and messaging system IP based for connectivity for telephony communication.

City Owned Fiber

- Connect the 3 main city campuses. Annex, Old Town City Hall and the Kealy Operations Center
- Aerial Fiber.
 - City ordinance prohibiting new aerial service.
 - Require Variance.
 - Would cost less. Cheaper to hang versus underground bore.
 - Would require franchise agreement for pole use.
 - I35 expansion/ utility relocate.
- Underground Fiber.
 - Use City right of way.
 - Use Directional bore under I35 to avoid I35 expansion.
 - Install additional conduit for lease or sell.

Issues

- Crossing IH 35E
- Future widening of IH 35E
- Obtaining permission from TxDot for crossing IH 35E. Propose bi-directional bore at Purnell Street.
- Coordination of utility relocates before widening project to minimize impact on existing fiber design

Preliminary Design Methodology

Connect all 3 campuses with 12 strand single mode fiber

- Install fiber in ground with innerduct and provide spare innerduct for repairs when needed.
- Stop primary run short of the proposed IH 35E R.O.W. expansion at a junction box that will allow rerouting fiber to innerduct locations provided by TxDot utility relocates from widening project.

Summary

- Estimated Cost: 18,000 to 20,000 feet of 6 pair fiber and 30 to 40 pull boxes.
- Cost estimates \$43 per foot.
 - \$774,000 to \$860,000
- Lease expires 2008.
- Funding needed 2007/2008 budget.
- Project would take 4 – 6 months.

Councilman Tierney questioned how much it would cost for a company to provide this service. Mr. Buchanan advised it would cost approximately \$3,000 - \$4,000 a month for the actual networking services. He further advised that staff was talking to FiOS and see what their cost would be.

Discussion was held regarding working with TxDOT and utilizing their utility bore to put the lines through; however, there could be a timing issue due to when the City needs this and when TxDOT will be ready.

Mr. Buchanan recommended that the conduit be built larger enough to add fiber to it as needed. He explained what dark fiber is and advised it was secure with no other traffic on it; whereas if you go through a service you could be bouncing off various locations and would have

to provide for additional security. City Manager King advised that the problem with that has always been in regard to public safety.

Mr. Buchanan reviewed a map of the fiber options connecting Old Town City Hall, the Municipal Annex, and Kealy. Discussion was held regarding the map.

Mayor Carey recessed the Called-Special Workshop for lunch at 11:57 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Citywide Wireless Network Program

Mayor Pro Tem Durham questioned if anyone in the Old Town Area had this. Mr. Buchanan advised not currently; however, most coffee shops do have this service there are just none located in the Old Town Area at this time. Mr. Buchanan began his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

What is Mesh Network

- **Mesh networking** is a way to route data, voice and instructions between [nodes](#). It allows for continuous connections and reconfiguration around broken or blocked paths by "hopping" from node to node until the destination is reached. A mesh network whose nodes are all connected to each other is a [fully connected network](#).
- Mesh networks are self-healing: the network can still operate even when a node breaks down or a connection goes bad. As a result, a very reliable network is formed.
- A mesh network is a networking technique which allows inexpensive peer network nodes to supply back haul services to other nodes in the same network. It effectively extends a network by sharing access to higher cost network infrastructure.
- Mesh networks differ from other networks in that the component parts can all connect to each other via multiple hops.

Wireless Networking Solutions

A single integrated network infrastructure supporting multiple wireless technologies deployed within or across a community

A Connect Community

- Increase Service Effectiveness
 - Enhance productivity and improve collaboration among city employees by providing online field access to applications for a mobile workforce.
- Maintain a safe environment
 - Enhance public safety by providing police and fire with secure communications for video, voice and data access.
- Drive Economic Development
 - City wide wireless access would be an attractive benefit to existing and potential new businesses.

The Connected Community

Diagram of connected Community

Ownership Models

- City Owned and Operated
- Privately Owned and City Operated
- City Owned and Privately Operated
- Privately Owned and Privately Operated

Emerging Role of Local Authorities

- Opportunity to launch high-speed broadband networks for local communities can be seen as a potential conflict between the public interest and private industry.
- Public and Private sectors both bring complementary assets to partnership opportunities.
- Local Government can create enabling environments, maintain continuity of vision, leverage a variety of funding mechanisms and promote a new service to the community.
- Private sector can provide innovative solutions, entrepreneurial drive, service-level agreements and private capital.

City Owned

- Designed to meet the needs of the municipality for integrated or improved government operations, increase workforce production, enhance public safety and/or traffic management.
- The City may provide affordable broadband service to businesses and residents.

- City may provide free access to certain locations
- Advertising services for zone splash screens

Privately Owned

- City not involved in wireless service
- Enter into an infrastructure, risk-sharing, and revenue model agreement with private sector.
- Entrepreneur deploys the infrastructure and manages revenue flows and much of the network destiny.

Leverage Points

- Prime real estate, public buildings, city owned poles, city owned towers and traffic lights.
- Local government as anchor tenant with large buying power for network and application service.
- Local government can provide incentives to encourage private sector investors to deploy and operate the network infrastructure through tax incentives and/or market protection.

Area Wireless Networks

- Plano – Implementing \$10 M pilot project with Motorola Canopy Wireless Mess.
- Addison – Partnership with Red Moon.
- Farmers Branch- Partnership with Mobile Pro.
- Southlake – City Wide Initiative.
- Burelson – Red Moon Operated.
- Dallas – Developing RFP (Like Houston) for partnership.
- Houston – Joint infrastructure partnership.
- Corpus Christi City Owned and Operated.
- Denton – Targeted hot spots open access.

Lewisville Wireless Initiative

- Lake Park Campground, Lewisville Library, Police Department and pending wireless access at major facilities and fire stations.
- Visitor Bureau – Point to Point Wireless Bridge and access point.
- Lake Park – Point to Point Wireless Bridge
- Lewisville Tower Point to Multi-Point Wireless Bridge. Pending Installation

Discussion was held regarding the wireless bridges. Mr. Buchanan advised that there were two sides, one was the public side (dirty) and the other was the City side (clean). He explained how this worked for City employees (clean) was behind the firewall and the public. He further explained that it was all subjective to web filtering and the City rules when accessed through the Library. Discussion was held regarding the security and that they could not get into the City stuff. Mr. Buchanan explained how the security worked on a secured socket link and then returned to his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

Summary

- Potential benefits and cost savings:
 - Improve services to utility customers by providing on demand meter reading and proactive flow problem resolution.
 - Enable city services personnel to be more efficient by utilizing online applications and dispatching to avoid unnecessary trips to the office.
 - Eliminate subscription communications “EVDO” for non public safety personnel.
 - Provide internet access to designated areas.
 - Advertising.
 - City wide wireless access would be an attractive benefit to existing and potential new businesses.
 - City wide wireless could be a Utility.
 - Enhance Public Safety by providing police and fire with secure mobile video, voice and data access.
- Potential Costs:
 - City owned and operated - One time estimated cost (\$50K to \$75K per sq mile) \$2M - \$3M. + \$200K to \$300K recurring costs. Revenue Example: 1700 subscriptions at \$15 per month (15x12x1700 = \$306,000)
 - Meter Replacement.
 - Shared partnership with private enterprise % of cost and revenue.

Discussion was held regarding if we are trying to stimulate all traffic coming in and putting a wireless network in the Mall for the customers to use which would keep them around the shops area and get perhaps get advertising from main chain stores to help offset the cost.

City Manager King stated he needed to know if the City Council was interested in this concept, and if so, to what extent

Minimal discussion was held regarding WiFi access and the benefits. Discussion held regarding what cost would be or if it would be free. Mr. Buchanan showed a map of City of Lewisville’s proposed wireless network.

Red Light Photo Enforcement

Assistant Police Chief Kerbow began his PowerPoint Presentation as follows:

- TRADITIONAL VS. AUTOMATED ENFORCEMENT
 - Effectiveness
 - Efficiency
 - Safety

- VIOLATION PROCEDURES (Program Methodology)

- ARGUMENTS AGAINST PHOTO ENFORCEMENT
 - Privacy
 - Increase in Other Types of Accidents
 - Cameras are Inconsistent with Other Traffic Enforcement
 - Red Light Camera Enforcement is Illegal

- IMPLEMENTATION
 - Further Research (Legislation)
 - Vendor Selection
 - Location Selection
 - Ordinance Required

Discussion was held regarding speed cameras. Councilman Nowels advised that he could be in favor of this from a safety standpoint.

- FISCAL IMPACT
 - Varied based upon traffic volume
 - Violation Frequency
 - Compliance/Reduction

- RECOMMENDATION

Assistant Chief Kerbow advised that this would likely reduce the number of accidents. Discussion was held regarding if these would free up time for personnel. Assistant Chief Kerbow advised that it would free up time; however, it would not be measurable. Councilman Tierney questioned the cost. Assistant Chief Kerbow advised that the vendors put the lights in for free and take a cut and perform the service with the exception of the officer reviewing there is limited expense for the City.

Mayor Pro Tem Durham expressed concern about cities adjusting the yellow time. Councilman Nowels' stated he would not mind the city doing a pilot on two or three high volume/high incident intersections. Discussion held regarding proceeding with a request for proposal. With the exception of Mayor Pro Tem Durham the consensus of the City Council was to proceed with this program.

'07 Bond Package

City Manager King conducted a PowerPoint Presentation regarding this item.

GASB 45 Briefing

City Manager King conducted the following PowerPoint Presentation regarding the GASB 45 Briefing:

Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB)

- Determines minimum standards for format and content of financial reports
- An independent board composed of auditors, preparers and users of financial statements
- Auditor cannot state that financial statements conform with GAAP if violate GASB rules

GASB 45

- Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Post Employment Benefits Other Than Pensions (OPEB)
- **Why the new standard?**
 - Post employment benefits are part of compensation for services rendered
 - Benefits are “earned” during the period of employment, and employers need to recognize the obligation over that period
 - The true cost of future benefits needs to be measured, evaluated, and reflected in financial statements
 - Private sector comparisons (FASB 106)
- **Current Environment**
 - No advance funding
 - Expenses reported as they occur
 - Lack of measurement of future obligations
- **What benefits are included?**
 - Health/Dental Insurance
 - Life Insurance

- **Effective Date**
 - Fiscal Year 08-09
 - Staff began working on project in 2006 to understand magnitude of obligations early to plan proactively
- Does not require benefits to be pre-funded, **HOWEVER . . .**
- Does specify how costs, liabilities and funding progress are measured and displayed in financial reports
 - Must report the long term liability and extent to which employer has/has not contributed to pre-fund

Key Measure for GASB 45

- **Annual Required Contribution (ARC)**
 - Calculation that will show up in financial statements
 - Determined by actuarial evaluation
 - Preliminary estimate = \$1.867 M
 - Based on various assumptions including that retirees will pay 60% of required contribution and a 5.5% discount rate

Impacting GASB 45 Costs

- **Plan Design Alternatives**
 - State law requires that retirees be provided the same level of coverage as active employees
 - Liability already reduced by requiring that Medicare eligible employees move to fully insured Part D plan with employer cap on contribution (\$50)
- **Funding Alternatives**
 - Paying an annual contribution to cover current year costs and amortized payments on the unfunded liability
- **Discount Rate**
 - Interest earned on money invested for retiree coverage

Additional Required Disclosure

- **Notes to the Financial Statements**
 - Plan provisions, authority for plan changes, investment concentrations, actuarial method and assumptions, funding policy, etc.
- **Required Supplemental Information (RSI)**
 - Schedule of Funding Progress
 - Actuarial accrued liabilities, value of assets, unfunded accrued liabilities, etc.

- Schedule of Employer Contributions
 - Annual OPEB cost, % of annual OPEB cost actually contributed by employer, and net OPEB obligation for last three years

Impacts/Options

- Private Sector firms offering retiree health benefits dropped from 66% to 33% (1993-2005)
- Reduction of retiree benefits
 - For future employees
 - For current employees/current retirees
- Increased cost participation by retiree group or future retirees
- “Total” pre-funding (bond issuance) and investing in higher yield securities
- Partial and steady increasing pre-funding
- Additional plan options (lower benefit) and encouragement of EEs to participate in HSAs as vehicles for bearing future higher employee borne costs
- Shift of assets from Risk Fund to Health Trust
- Creation of a separate trust for retirees?

Fitch:

- “Steady progress toward reaching ARC will be critical to sound credit quality. Prudent accumulation of assets in a trust account outside of the GF . . . Can forestall liquidity problems or tax capacity concerns that might lead to credit deterioration.”

Comp Plan Survey

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

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

History of Compensation Costs

FY	# of EE's	STRUCTURE	MERIT	TOTAL	AVG. COST PER EMPLOYEE
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
04/05	631	\$830,024	\$372,323	\$1,202,347	\$1,905
FY	# of EE's	STRUCTURE	MERIT	TOTAL	AVG. COST PER EMPLOYEE
05/06	636	\$801,221	\$387,280	\$1,188,501	\$1,869
06/07	645	\$523,441	\$392,477	\$915,918	\$1,420
07/08	662	\$885,681	\$616,627	\$1,502,308	\$2,269

Note: Does not include benefits

History of Pay Increases

	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07	
PAY PLAN	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps	Market	Merit/Steps
General Government	4.00%	3%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	0%	5%
Police Pay Plan	7.00%	4%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Fire Pay Plan	5.00%	4%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	4%	6%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%
Average Increase	5.33%	4%	3.50%	0%	2.25%	4%	4.43%	4%	3.43%	4%	2.33%	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

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

Methodology Continued:

- General Government Pay Ranges are adjusted based on the survey data, but employee salaries are only adjusted should they fall below the minimum of the range.
- General Government Employees receive a merit increase on their anniversary date.
 - 06/07 – 5%
 - 07/08 – 5% Proposed
- Employees at top of the range receive merit equal to the pay plan adjustment percentage assuming it is less than the proposed merit. Currently 72 General Government employees are at top of range.

2006-07 Professional Plan Analysis

STRUCTURE				
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville Midpoint	Market Midpoint	Variance
16	Librarian	\$44,502	\$48,121	-8%
17	Support Services Supervisor	\$49,302	\$52,080	-6%
18	Accountant	\$54,622	\$52,526	4%
19	Sr. Planner	\$60,521	\$63,427	-5%
20	Civil Engineer	\$67,073	\$70,266	-5%
21	Traffic Engineer	\$76,582	\$78,302	-2%
			Average	-4%

2006-07 Trades Pay Plan Analysis

STRUCTURE				
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville Midpoint	Market Midpoint	Variance
52	Custodian	\$26,259	\$26,769	-2%
53	Maintenance Worker	\$28,591	\$29,086	-2%
55	Equipment Operator	\$33,940	\$33,085	3%
55	Animal Control Officer	\$33,940	\$36,217	-7%
56	Heavy Equipment Operator	\$36,802	\$37,407	-2%
56	Mechanic	\$36,802	\$38,714	-5%
57	Crewleader	\$40,272	\$40,285	0%
60	Facilities Supervisor	\$52,371	\$55,657	-6%
			Average	-3%

2006-07 Clerical, Technical, Administrative Plan Analysis

STRUCTURE				
Grade	Job Title	Lewisville Midpoint	Market Midpoint	Variance
53	Clerk Typist	\$27,253	\$29,507	-8%
55	Cashier	\$29,739	\$32,749	-10%
55	Secretary	\$32,365	\$34,955	-8%
57	Payroll/Personnel Tech	\$38,384	\$39,233	-2%
57	Public Safety Dispatcher	\$38,384	\$38,818	-1%
58	Traffic Signal Tech	\$41,828	\$41,049	2%
58	Recreation Specialist	\$41,828	\$41,661	0%
59	Building Inspector	\$45,589	\$46,561	-2%
60	Communications Supervisor	\$49,610	\$50,400	-2%
			Average	-3%

Broadband Pay History

- Market and Merit combined for Directors and Managers for a possible increase which is at risk depending on performance
 - 2001 - 02 – 0 - 5%
 - 2002 - 03 – 0 - 3.5%
 - 2003 - 04 – 0 - 4 %
 - 2004 - 05 – 0 - 4%
 - 2005 – 06 – 0 - 3%
 - 2006 – 07 – 0 – 5%
 - 2007 – 08 – 0 – 5% Proposed

Police and Fire Pay Issues

- Recruitment Issues for Police Officers
 - Testing Standards
 - Background standards
- Meet and Confer
 - Currently Denton has adopted Meet and Confer

2005 Police Plan Analysis

Grade	Job Title	STRUCTURE		
		Lewisville	Market	Variance
		Maximum	Maximum	
81	Police Officer	\$57,111	\$60,610	-6%
82	Police Sergeant	\$70,285	\$73,815	-5%
83	Police Lieutenant	\$80,536	\$84,655	-5%
84	Police Captain	\$90,920	\$93,848	-3%
85	Assistant Police Chief	\$106,195	\$111,980	-5%
			Average	-5%

2006-07 Fire Pay Plan Analysis

Grade	Job Title	STRUCTURE		
		Lewisville	Market	Variance
		Maximum	Maximum	
71	Firefighter	\$54,147	\$56,811	-5%
72	Driver/Engineer	\$60,899	\$64,239	-5%
74	Fire Captain	\$75,965	\$80,398	-6%
75	Battalion Chief	\$86,407	\$90,804	-5%
76	Assistant Chief	\$102,780	\$106,178	-3%
			Average	-5%

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
 CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
 FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

2006-07 Cost Projection

	ADJUSTMENT	MERIT	COST
BROADBAND APPOINTED			82,600 20,443
PAY PLAN A Move Pay Plan 4% Merit 5%	\$3,875	\$78,145	\$82,020
PAY PLAN B and T Move Pay Plans 3% Merit 5%	\$33,380	\$294,067	\$327,447
	MARKET ADJUSTMENT	2006-07 STEP INCR.	
PAY PLAN C - POLICE	\$451,635	\$78,712	\$530,347
PAY PLAN B - FIRE	\$392,065	\$62,635	\$454,700

<i>SALARY TOTAL</i>	<i>\$1,497,557</i>
<i>BENEFITS</i>	<i>\$283,637</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$1,781,194</i>

Direction:

City Manager King reviewed the items that had been discussed during the retreat and requested City Council. The following were the City Council direction on items discussed at retreat:

Interstate 35E

1. Work through TxDOT and TxDOT consultants to develop aesthetic enhancement options (“single theme”) and local cost impacts. – Polster
2. Work through TxDOT and TxDOT consultants to mitigate ROW impacts:
 - Harcourt
 - Lakeland Estates (SF area)
 - The Home Depot
 - Lakepointe Center
 - Brookhollow
 - Restaurants on west side in mall area
3. Modify sign ordinance per outcome of current state legislation
4. “Grandfathering” ordinance for 35E regarding non-conformity with city ordinances for:
 - Landscaping
 - Parking
 - Sign setback
 - Building setback
5. Stick to GDO process for “new” construction
6. Alcohol hours extension on future agenda
7. No incentive program yet. Handle case by case.
8. Relaxed signage program during construction
9. Consider PID and TIRZ at later date

Truck Traffic

1. Delete Jones Street
2. Perform federal study analysis, prepare truck ban ordinance (as applicable) for:
 - College (35E to Mill)
 - Lake Park Road
 - Main Street (east)
 - Pine Drive
 - Bellaire
 - College Street (35E to west city limits)
 - Corporate Drive (35E to west city limits)
 - Fox Avenue
 - High School Drive
 - McGee Lane
 - Purnell
 - (NOT Valley Ridge Boulevard or Vista Ridge Mall Drive)
3. No north-south streets (Edmonds, Garden Ridge, Valley Parkway, Old Orchard, etc.)

Old Town Lewisville

1. TIF bonds approximately \$8M, Spring 2007
2. Extend TIF to 2027-2028
3. Extend county participation to 2027 (subject to approval by Commissioners Court)
4. Tentative budget approximately \$13.5M
 - Bonds \$8M
 - Zone Z \$1M
 - Tree Mitigation \$250,000
 - COG grant \$1.4M
 - General Fund \$3M
5. Tentative uses
 - Parking land \$1.645M
 - Alleys (north and south) \$500,000 (no \$ for easements)
 - Parking lots \$1M
 - Gazebo/plaza/green space \$125,000
 - Screening/demo \$160,000
 - Cultural Arts Center \$8M
 - LV Center land \$2.1M (ED land banking)
 - TOTAL \$13.53M**
6. Close Poydras north of Main, provide alternate north alley connection to Church Street
7. Extend Wayne Ferguson Plaza to Church Street. Include some green space, gazebo or bandshell
8. Parking on Mulkey, Demers, Holzclaw, Long (north); Boenker, Karimi, Heath (south)
9. Appraise, send out formal offers for land (not LV Center)
10. Obtain design for parking, plaza improvements
11. Obtain architect for Arts Center (scrape and build)
12. Arts Center location on southside Church Street land
13. Reserve northside Church Street land (future ED, etc.)
14. Acquisition of LV Center pending:
 - Active residential developer
 - Firm numbers on other improvements
15. No speed bumps
16. No maintenance on alleys until final improvements and easements
17. OTBA “self-help” program

Castle Hills

1. No “limited” annexation unless no voting impact
2. Ask Bright about “full” annexation of mostly commercial WSDs (using new sales tax to offset debt service and service delivery to district); requires amended 96 agreement
3. Lord Property – not interested in special district, will help with infrastructure to extent possible if annexed

Railroad Street Park

1. Complete full design – latest changes okay
2. Issue \$18.2M 4B COs in Spring 2007
3. Bid construction in Fall 2007
4. No changes to championship field

Fox Avenue (FASA)

1. Future workshop
2. Staff prepare priority list of FASA concepts for council consideration of more specific programs (e.g. parks, incentives, fences, etc.)

Fiber Backbone

1. Budget costs in 2007-08 budget

Citywide Wireless Network

1. Quantify potential savings compared to costs of system installation and operation
2. Develop and send out RFP for various models

Red Light Cameras

1. Develop and send out an RFP for installing and operating a red-light camera enforcement program
2. Return to City Council with recommendation
3. Wait to act until legislature acts or adjourns

2007 Bond Package

1. Proceed as described

GASB

1. Continue to plan for impacts
2. Council workshop in near future

Compensation Plan

1. Bring back during budget

**LEWISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
CALLED SPECIAL WORKSHOP SESSION
FEBRUARY 1 – 3, 2007**

Page 71

With no further discussion, Mayor Carey adjourned the Called-Special Council Retreat Workshop Session at 4:15 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