



**ADVISORY BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes – April 8, 2014 - 5:30 p.m.**  
**Leawood City Hall – Maple Room**

Board members in attendance: Karen Ward Reimer (Chair), Amy Vlastic, Lorrie Hamilton, Dave Coleman,

Council Liaison present: Julie Cain and Lou Rasmussen

Staff members present: Chris Claxton, Kim Curran, Brian Anderson, April Bishop and Tonia Morgan.

Chair Ward Reimer called the meeting to order at 5:46 p.m.

Amy Vlastic made a motion to approve the March 11, meeting minutes. Lorrie Hamilton seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

## **I. Old Business**

### **A. Staff Reports**

Brian reported that his staff has been busy this week working at Gezer Park. The pond was drained for cleaning; the process should take a week.

- The landscape crew is working on mulching and pruning. The contractor will begin tearing out the old trail to lay in the new trail at 123<sup>rd</sup> and Mission soon. The wall will be stained and landscape work completed soon after. He has another project to coincide with that in regards to five hundred seedlings that were purchased along with bare root trees that will be used throughout, in addition to the landscaping in the initial plan. Additional oak trees and shrubs will be added on the hillside to reforest the area. Volunteer Naturalists will assist as part of their projects. They have also done work at Ironwoods.

Brian added that we were told that there weren't any AT&T communication lines at Mission Road but one was found when his crew began digging. We are at their mercy awaiting them to relocate it. This needs to be scheduled as soon as possible to be able to focus on completing the trail work.

Council Liaison Cain asked if the staining of the rock is a one-time deal or done more than once.

Brian replied that typically this is done once. It may fade overtime but everything darkens and gets dirty anyway. It may have to be done again possibly twenty years from now. If so, it will be contracted out. The supplier of the ready rock materials has someone who does the stain work; three different stain colors will be blended together to obtain the perfect color and mimic the natural stone and blend well with everything on the hillside. A portion of the retaining wall on the north end of Ironwoods lake was stained once and has been there since 2005 or 2007.

Council Liaison Cain added that this is awesome. It will make a big difference.

Brian reported that he agrees it will make a big difference. This can be done without increasing the cost of the project. Money was built in to handle unforeseen items like this.

Amy asked when the project will be finished.

Brian replied that the contractor is focusing on a June completion date.

Kim reported that Eggstravanza is Sunday. The event is sponsored by the National Bank of Kansas City who purchased 20,000 eggs for the event.

- Seasonal workers will be put on payroll next week.
- All mass testing will be done in preparation for getting 160 kids added. Pool passes go on sale May 1. All supplies needed have been ordered in preparation of this day.
- Registration for summer programs is ongoing. A lot of people are taking advantage of our online registration program.
- The t-ball/coach pitch registration deadline is April 22. Usually 500 children participate.
- The first Fearless Friday event will be held May 2.
- Duck sales have started; eighteen have sold so far. Lorrie Hamilton came in Friday and marked additional ducks for the event. The goal is 450 this year.

April reported that Watch on the Rhine was this past weekend. It was well attended. The Tea with Shakespeare is sold out. They are preparing for “Hello Dolly”, a production meeting will be held next weekend. Rehearsals will begin June 1. The “Porch Lights” piece that was hit is back to normal.

Council Liaison Cain asked if we paid to repair the damages, or is it covered by insurance.

April added that we have a \$5,000 deductible. We paid for the repairs.

## **B. Discuss Findings of Master Plan – Phase I**

Chris reported that it was determined at the last meeting that Committee members were to review the appendix and discuss up to ten initiatives that could be pursued.

Chair Ward Reimer asked if everyone understood what Phase I covered and what we were supposed to get from the Master Plan and what additional phases would add up to later. Did we receive what we expected in Phase I.

Amy reported that it contained a lot of information but honestly feels someone could have Googled ninety percent of the information that was in it. We didn’t receive a lot of suggestions or better ways to expand on the community’s needs. It focused on facts and figures but lacked creativity.

Lorrie added that she disagrees. The appendix from Lose is a detailed inventory of each facility that specifies suggested improvements. This is exactly what we asked for. We received it to the letter.

Chris reported as a result of Amy’s question. Recreation wasn’t supposed to be included in this, which will narrow what is received. They go together. You can’t have one without the other.

Amy replied that maybe she doesn’t have the appendix.

Chris reported that she e-mailed this information to the Committee.

Chair Ward-Reimer reported that it was distributed at the last meeting.

Amy reported that she was unable to open the document on her computer. She appreciates the clarification and will read all of the information soon. It is nice to have all of the information in one spot as a reference but still feels that this is what she’s missing. She still believes that a lot of information received could have been found on the computer.

Brian reported that he took note of twenty-two things they suggested being done at City Park, some major, some minor. All together this included things we hadn’t thought about and big ticket items.

Dave reported that he likes the power point that was done. It suggested very high level suggestions bullet pointing the findings.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that the intent to divide it into two phases was to determine finance requirements to implement recommendations out of Phase I. We need to recommend to City Council what the report says about Phase I in terms of improvements. A recommendation is

needed from Parks and Recreation Department as to whether or not they agree and determine what the staff thinks if the items will require finance approval. The 2015 budget was recently approved. None of it was put into the financing. This concerns him. The Committee and staff need to nail down specifically if the recommendations are doable. For example, it was recommended that restrooms should be provided at Tomahawk Park and City Park trail heads.; He would estimate this could cost \$500,000 each, which isn't feasible considering the location of the flooding there. It is important to rely on Chris and her team to provide this important information and give their opinion.

Chris reported that Scott allotted money in the budget in the unfunded category for the three restrooms.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he understands this but it is unfunded including a catalog of other things in the unfunded category. The staff should provide an extensive list for the Committee in regards to what should be done in 2016.

Council Liaison Cain and Committee Chair Ward-Reimer agree that this is important moving forward.

Amy reported that a prioritized list should be compiled to get funded.

Dave asked if in terms of priority, are some things legal exposure items such as the ADA issues that will cause a liability issue. What does our Attorney think of this. Where do we need to begin. These issues are a priority.

Brian added that he contacted Lose & Associates regarding the bleacher issue to clarify a portion of the language in the report that stated accessible seating is required if it is fixed seating. But, our bleachers aren't fixed; they are moved all the time. It would be a problem if required due to our field size and constant changes regarding the way our program is run. Bleachers are constantly moved from one field to another. His opinion of "fixed seating" is anchored down on concrete pads that never move. If so, handicap access to the bleacher would also be required. If we don't, you may not have to do this.

Chris recalls that a pathway was required, not to each field, but along the end that allows access from the parking lot to the path. .

Brian added that the language is vague in many areas regarding ADA. He is anxious to receive a definition.

Amy asked if a handicapped person could sue the City because they would like to attend their family members T-Ball game and can't. Are we setting ourselves up for future complaints or lawsuits.

Chris reported that the t-ball area was taken care of due to complaints.

Dave reported that this is what he was referring to. In regards to their findings and recommendations, the priority should be to legally comply with all the laws. An opinion is one thing but this is merely advice. It is the responsibility of the City to make sure we meet codes. What is the City Attorney's interpretation of them.

Chris reported that we have to go between the ADA and the Department of Justice. Neither gives concrete information. They are not connected or equal. Both could say something different. Our Attorney advised that if there is anything that we are not in compliance with, it needs to come first.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that this is what the consultant was paid for. To notify us of the latest interpretation, the latest letter of compliance and all the letters sent from the IRS.

Amy asked if we were in compliance years ago when the park was built 15-18 years ago or has it all changed.

Kim reported that it has changed.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if there are ADA issues at the pool ( counter height etc.).

Brian reported that we are in compliance at the pool regarding counter height. The only problem is if a handicap person is employed at the pool due to the height of the counter on the inside behind the scenes. There may be issues if an employee is hired .

Chris reported that the City Attorney would advise being compliant up front from the beginning. It isn't feasible to wait until a handicapped person, or person with other disabilities, are hired and decide to take the time to fix the problems then.

Amy replied that this would also be a problem if an employee becomes handicapped temporarily.

Council Liaison Cain asked if \$200K was set aside at the meeting last night for ADA accessibility.

Chris reported that she didn't submit it. She believes Scott put the money in.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he assumed that it was a generic statement with a generic sum of money attached.

Council Liaison Cain reported that it was set aside for this very reason. This was discussed in the budget model. She is hopeful this amount will be enough to cover the cost.

Lorrie reported that it is important to define what is meant by "park access". Is this just general access or fixing ADA issues in the park.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he agrees. This should be defined. Is it ADA issues or actual paving, etc. in the park.

Council Liaison Cain reported that is what was identified to solve the ADA issues. This part is funded.

Amy asked if the dog park will be handicap accessible.

Chris reported that the West side entrance will be handicap accessible. A detailed list was discussed two months ago.

Chair Ward Reimer asked if it is the policy that all newly built items must meet ADA requirements moving forward. How long has this been a factor and are we addressing this issue on new facilities.

Chris reported that we've been doing this but there was a revision to the requirements in 2010.

Kim added that this was taken in account when the Nature Center was built. ADA accessible tables were also recently ordered for the pool. The problem would be if counters and brick would need to be removed.

Amy asked if grants or government funding is available for ADA issues.

Chris reported that she isn't aware of any.

Council Liaison Cain reported that she doubts we qualify as a government entity. We are civic.

Chris asked if all agree that the consensus is to start broad regarding the following, 1. Compliance with laws and ADA issues. 2. Unfunded Items. 3. Other Repairs and 4. New. She recalls Park Board advised taking care of what we have first. She referenced notes from a previous staff retreat several years ago in 2005 and the shelters, forestry issues, park ambassadors, seniors, were goals in

2005, which from a five year standpoint should have been completed in 2010. It was discussed at several meetings afterwards but nothing was done.

Remember in 2006 (but actually starting in 2002) we discussed to revise the plan and then in 2004 and a revision was done . The better trail connections, three dimensional amphitheater, bath issues etc. Some things were done at Ironwoods. They were removed off the list. She is trying to find out the logistics as well as timing. She thought the new fire station wasn't to be built in 2019. She thought the plan was to leave the fire fighters in the old station until the new one was built and didn't understand the 150K for a park in 2015 because the station won't be built then. She will get clarification from the City Administrator. There was a lot of discussion about this as well as the tennis courts, which are also unfunded.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that Scott puts money in as a placeholder.

Brian reported that he researched track shield for the tennis courts, which is basically a top coat. It was \$30K per coat and we have six courts.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that this is what he means regarding a \$1,000,000 add up quick.

Council Liaison Cain agreed. We need to take care of in-house needs first, and what we have. We don't need to discuss Phase II before finalizing Phase I.

Council Liaison Rasmussen requested an excel spreadsheet listing recommendation from this report and the legal requirements, with a cost breakdown and things that require immediate attention to comply. The rest of the items should also be listed: tennis courts, bridgework, etc.

Chair Ward Reimer reported that Chris has given the headings and Committee members can prioritize their list and move forward with unfunded, repairs etc. The list can be presented to Council once complete.

Lorrie reported that Brian and Chris are on track finding out what needs to be done with ADA requirements so it doesn't do us any good to prioritize a list. We wouldn't know. They are already asking questions of the consultants. We should leave this topic with them. It will prioritize itself.

Chris reported that she and Brian can make the recommendation to Council if this is the consensus of the Committee. Some things will get fed into a different fund based on the cost. Some things have also already been addressed. Some things will come out of the operating budget where monies are already available.

Brian wrote down twenty two items about City Park., Out of all, there are six of them that are C.I.P. The rest can be done in house from an operating account. Next year will be the picnic table swap out year and at that time they will order handicap tables. There are a lot of things that will require making changes.

Chair Ward Reimer requested a list of items regarding the ADA and what will be done in house as well as a cost.

Brian added that a permanent building, nicer than a portable restroom, can be added. Many inquire why it doesn't have a bathroom. The option may be to find a nicer portable restroom.

Lorrie reported that it isn't necessary, feasible or practical to install restrooms at Tomahawk Creek. It is beyond what is sensibly responsible. There are many fast food restaurants near 119<sup>th</sup> St.

Council Liaison Cain reported that she doesn't want to speak for the group but this wouldn't be high on our priority list. There are more important items that need to be addressed.

Amy reported that people consistently ask her why there isn't a restroom in Tomahawk Park. She informs them that it is in a flood plain and can't be done.

Chris added that JOCO Wastewater has already stated that we cannot connect there in the flood plain but a restroom could be added.

Amy replied that it may be in a flood plain. But, she receives the same question as to why there we don't have restrooms there. Portable works for some but when you have younger children it doesn't work.

Brian reported that some have asked about additional parking at I-Lan but this was done not too long ago.

Chris agrees but if additional parking is added it may be an issue where to add it.

Council Liaison Rasmussen is eager to see the list once completed by Brian and Chris.

Chris replied that the list won't be a problem as most things are already revealed.

Brian replied that if numbers are being discussed we should discuss the design of the parking lot at Gezer. The turnaround was designed as a lot for tour busses to drop off kids touring the park.

Chris reported that it may be squared off. . It was also revealed that it is awkward coming off Mission to get to the playground. You have to go all the way down the trail and come back west.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he and Council Liaison Cain will attend a budget session by the end of June and if they are going to get anything done for 2015, now is the time otherwise; the funds aren't available. Chris is responsible for going to Scott for recommendations regarding the needs to run the department and Capital requirements etc. The Committee should receive a report before the 24<sup>th</sup> of June so the two Liaisons can review the budget moving into 2015. He doesn't want to receive this information without ample time to review it.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he thinks we are together regarding needing a spreadsheet that lists all items. .

Amy asked if any of the ADA items will go past 2015.

Chris reported that we are not going to see the majority of them in 2015 due to funding availability. 2015 budgets were submitted Friday, which only asked for equipment for Brian. Scott allowed requesting three maintenance permanent part time positions.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that none of these items were funded last night.

Chris reported that this is correct. We also have issues with the lake. We've taking care of the North lake and are experiencing problems with the South lake and are trying to free funds for repairs. We also need to have a long term plan for the trails. We will always experience areas that need repair.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked Chris to clarify that when he attends the June budget meeting will the issues in Phase I be proposed for 2015 by the staff.

Brian reported that the tennis courts were proposed but are unfunded.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that this will postpone Phase II another year. We can't move into Phase II if we haven't got a picture for Phase I.

Chris reported that Phase II is prioritization and funding.

Chris reported that she will prepare the spreadsheet and have it for the committee's review prior to the May meeting. We need to start moving forward with some of the items.

Chris reported that she thought \$500,000.00 was budgeted for three years, for the future improvements to Ironwoods Park..

Council Liaison Cain recalls this but she will have an issue considering improvements to Ironwoods over things that have been on the list forever and a day.

Chris suggested that the recommendation could be that the Council will determine how to spend the budgeted money.

Council Liaison Cain reported that we have stellar parks and facilities. It is important to maintain good care of what we have and fix the holes we know we have, as well as the ADA needs. We have unfunded for example, the dog park that has sat for close to double digit years. There will be future needs for e updating the Lodge and Aquatic Center . All new items at Ironwoods should be last. It is important moving forward that we need to prioritize before we can move into Phase II.

Chris reported that Dick Fuller discussed a potential dog park in 2002, but it was just a mention.

Chris reported that maybe everything else can be done internally.

April reported that the old City Hall facility area should come before new land at Ironwoods to give the residents in the North area park land they have wanted for so long.

Council Liaison Cain reported that this is a good point.

Chris reported that she will compile a spreadsheet for the May meeting. A timeframe can be determined of what should be accomplished during the discussion. She will distribute it prior to the meeting for review.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he would also like Brian's list and his schedule so the two Liaisons are in position attending budget sessions recognizing what staff and Committee agree regarding prioritization.

Chris reported that in terms of the unfunded, the tennis courts first began several years ago so if it stays moved out staff should take three percent compounded as inflation and increase the number. .

Council Liaison Cain and Rasmussen agreed that this is a good idea as long as a list is being made. A good tool to have is list how old they are and how long they have been on the unfunded list, etc.

Chris reported that she will include this as part of the spreadsheet.

Lorrie asked if the condition of the tennis courts and the fact that they've not upgraded the surface or resurfaced them in a certain number of years impacts the level of service provided. Are people going elsewhere because they are run down.

Chris reported that we receive a lot of complaints; people feel they aren't up to the standard they should be.

Lorrie reported that this justifies them being higher on the priority list.

Chris reported that tennis never makes money it only costs money. It is nearly impossible once they get a crack like some of the ones we have and water gets in them. We do have many residents who enjoy playing tennis.

Chair Ward Reimer asked Committee members to make a priority list to be discussed at the next meeting.

Amy reported that it is hard for her to make a prioritized list because staff knows the condition of the tennis courts, etc. She is unaware of certain things going on in the park. It would be helpful to see it in writing to be able to prioritize it.

Chris reported that this is understandable. For example, we could focus on something simple such as new signage and or way- finding signs. They are expensive; the cost could exceed \$75,000.00

Amy reported that she has expressed before her dislike for signage. It is clutter.

Lorrie added that they only do so much. Perfect example; last weekend while walking near the section of Tomahawk Creek Park and Roe she noticed two ladies who appeared lost and asked how to get to Metcalf and 435 on the trail. She had to explain that they weren't close to this location. As a trail user herself, she would recommend signage but minimal. The best sign as a trail user is a map; every trail head would be great, but if not, one when you come off the bridge from City Park and went Tomahawk and Indian Creek would work. The people who aren't there as often can look at it. Overland Park has one at every trail head. It is easy to figure out. People don't want it to say a lot, something. This would be more than adequate signage.

Chris reported that she understands. If multiple signs are present it gets cluttered and adds to the confusion t, which we don't want. Regarding the constant maintenance of the trail, the way-finding, and upkeep are necessary. We have been fortunate with the pool; \$100,000.00 was allotted this year to replace the pumps. It may seem like a of money but isn't compared to the money saved annually as we aren't buying water.

Amy reported that the report is conflicting when it states that they want to keep the natural beauty of the parks but want to add more signs.

Chris reported that an example is when entering City Park you have no idea where the basketball courts are without driving all over the place. Ironwoods is a good example also. Many miss it because it has no frontage, it is a linear park and will be worse when expanded as it will go even farther to the east.

Lorrie reported that signage will be important to identify the dog park once complete due to the increased traffic. This could be the time to take advantage and put signage at the entrance of the parks relating to the basketball/volleyball/tennis courts, as well as the shelters, to notify people of all things past the soccer fields. She loves the wooden signs with park rules, something with the same style and design, with fairly large arrows. This would be not be obnoxious.

Council Liaison Cain added that Shawnee Mission Park has these all over the park. .

Amy asked if we will have an entrance sign on the outside of the dog park. Will it have a name.

Chris reported that they have been jumping through many hoops this week getting ready for the Planning Commission meeting and a rules and entrance sign are being proposed.

Brian reported that they were considering calling it an off leash area because it is within City Park. If called a dog park it refers to a stand-alone and it is not. It is an area of City Park that has off leash. It can be named if we decide to do so. It could be Waggin Tails.

Lorrie added that she feels an off leash area is appropriate.

Chris reported that there are two Park Board meetings before the Council meets again and since we have direction, certainly by the May meeting she will have the spreadsheet in hopes Park Board can come to a consensus at that time. It may need tweaking at the meeting but this is understandable.

Lorrie reported that the list should be kept minimal and not added to the routine maintenance Brian's staff already provides.

Chair Ward Reimer asked if the East shelter updates are on the list. How far down on the list are they.

Chris reported that they have been on the list since 2004, unfunded in the amount of (\$563K) due to the proposed restroom addition.

Chair Ward Reimer clarified that the May meeting focus on the information provided in the spreadsheet.

Chris replied that she will send it to all Committee members ahead of time for review.

Chair Ward Reimer asked everyone to review it prior to the meeting to be able to discuss it quickly and move the meeting along. Bring notes if they are needed.

## **II. New Business**

### **A. Dog Park Rules**

*Chris passed around proposed Dog Park Rules for review.*

Chris reported that she recently read an article where a Council person in Boulder is proposing DNA testing of dog feces to determine which of their residents are not effectively cleaning after their pets. The issue is along their trails. She is uncertain how this would be done. We are not proposing this here, however.

Council Liaison Rasmussen suggested many changes/additions to the dog park document listing rules and regulations presented by Chris. He began with changing the header to Welcome To Leawood Off Leash Dog Park. A Committee recommendation is needed requiring naming the area. He is uncertain if the naming rights will be sold but a starting point is needed, the name he suggested could be a starting point.

Council Liaison Cain asked if off leash dog area will come up if Googled.

Chris reported that it will.

Lorrie asked if it would be ok if it doesn't come up to eliminate the crowds.

Kim reported that it will show up if we put this information in the description once a name is determined.

April suggested naming it *Leawoof*.

Council Liaison Cain loves this name; many agreed. This is a great suggestion.

Council Liaison Rasmussen suggested the following changes to the document.

- He agrees with the hours of operation but would like to add that “no one except City employees are permitted in the off leash area before or after these designated times”. He has experience where people will enter as soon as maintenance staff arrives early morning prior to 6a.m.
- “Dogs if over four months of age must be current on all vaccinations”. Some dogs don't receive their vaccinations until a certain age. He asked Chris to verify the age with a local veterinarian.
- “Collars and ID cards and Leawood licenses or non-resident permits issued by the City of Leawood must be worn at all times”. The question was raised do we want to restrict the park to Leawood dogs only or non-residents with permits or open for anyone.
- “Pinches, spiked, or choke collars” needs verification badly.

Lorrie asked how the licenses and permits will be policed. It would have to be an honor system.

Amy reported that her dog is seven pounds and unable to wear the tags due to their weight. She has her name tag with her at all times but her license and shot records are kept at home.

Lorrie asked Amy if she would feel obligated to have it with you if needed.

Amy replied that she could keep it in her car if required. Anyone should be able to use it as long as they are registered where they reside. She will not feel comfortable with a Leawood only dog park.

Chris asked if we want to require permit registrations to know who is using the parks if it is not limited to residents only. As an example she listed two dogs as the max because this is the Leawood limit.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that the main concern should be the safety of the dogs. It is important that they are licensed, which would verify they are vaccinated. A dog tag would be easily visible. It would be self-policing except when there are undesignated people utilizing the dog park.

In regards to dogs being leashed until safely inside the area; the way it is designed at the present the entrance way is not separate most have leashed areas or an area to walk in towards the small/dog park area. The reason for the separate area is you will bring the dog into a pack with all of the introducing each other and it is nearly impossible to unleash them.

Chris reported that they proposed a half hexagon enclosure to help disburse people that will allow them to go left or right and if the city ever decides to separate the smaller/large dog areas the gates will already be in place.

Council Liaison Rasmussen continued with his suggestions regarding the list.

- “Visitors are allowed a maximum of two dogs in the off leash area at one time”
- “Visitors at all times must visibly carry clean up materials and use them immediately to clean up after their dogs and deposit waste in receptacles”. It is important to say have clean up materials in their possession.
- “Visitors must keep gates closed after entering and leaving the dog park.”
- “Abandonment of dogs is prohibited.”
- “People or dog food is prohibited.” He would suggest no food allowed period.
- “Alcohol is not permitted.”
- “Commercial trainers or walkers using the area to conduct their business is not permitted.”

Brian reported that they will provide biodegradable bags and a large 15 gallon container instead of the 5 gallon they currently provide.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he has a concern with the 16 year old age requirement. It should be younger; 14 would be a responsible age to take a dog to the dog park. He would like staff to check the State of Kansas age requirements regarding driving or the Humane Officer suggestions. He isn't saying they can drive themselves but should be able to be in the dog park at 14 instead of 16.

Chris added that the youngest age she saw was twelve. Sixteen was chosen due to the driving age.

Council Liaison Cain reported that this is a good point; twelve year olds are allowed to be dropped at the pool. She agreed the age should be younger.

Amy reported that the age should be the same for the dog park; we should allow twelve year olds.

Amy added that Lou's updates/changes are a lot of reading. She would never stand and read the entire list.

Chris reported that she asked Scott Lambers, City Administrator, if time allows to be added to the April 21 Work Session to discuss the water line inside the park area and a potential path. Also, The Leawood Foundation has two donors and another ready to provide money for some of the amenities.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that a respectable distance should be established between the off leash area and the drinking fountain due to male dogs establishing property rights. It should not be near the entrance.

Council Liaison Cain reported that she thought the drinking fountains would be located by the basketball goals.

Chris reported that Scott Lambers asked her to provide numbers of what it would cost to bring it into the park. They determined they can bore under the creek and staff dug down four feet and found no rock so this would be less expensive.. It will make it easier to include it now for the Planning Commission. If not, we have to go back for a revised plan.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that flooding is the main issue if located by the basketball courts. He is worried what that what the water district would say about putting it there. Being able to maintain it could be difficult.

Brian reported that the separation area is a good idea. They are considering putting it further away than the main entrance although it may still be in the flood plain it shouldn't be a concern.

Council Liaison Cain asked the cost to bore underneath to bring water in. She thought the decisions were made. Will there also be an area to wash the dog's feet off. This was discussed.

Chris reported that one thing about the path staff feels that it would be advantage for getting to the seated areas. People will wear their own path down walking around. It would be a crushed aggregated lime stone path similar to the Overland Park Arboretum trails and would not be hard on dog paws. It could also help disburse people.

In regards to the water; most people who have contacted us inquire about water. Most dog parks do have water inside. The worse case scenario would be locating it as close as possible outside the park away from the flood plain.

Brian added that a dog wash station can be added near the parking lot if decided to move forward.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if this is going to the Planning Commission soon.

Chris reported that it will go to the Planning Commission on April 29, 2014.

Council Liaison Cain thought the consensus was to get started with a nice facility without the bells and whistles in the beginning. It could be done, but probably should not be at this time.

Lorrie reported that there will be a large path of people walking the perimeter now so it should be added now when we have easy access and we determine the path instead of leaving it up to patrons.

Council Liaison Cain added that she's visited many dog parks without a determined path and they are just fine. It is overkill. We have a lot of wonderful things that could be addressed before installing a path, especially if we are uncertain of the cost.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked what would be a logical dividing area between small and large dogs. This should be determined now if decided to add in the future.

Brian added that the large dog area should be the majority of acreage with one acre for smaller dogs. The fence will be 4x6 post of wood with 2x6 slats. They originally considered adding wire with three rails of wood but were advised by the Planning Department that the style fence doesn't meet code. Oddly enough if coated in vinyl would have been in the code. We are proposing four feet tall with five boards across. It is similar to fencing at Hallbrook on State Line but not painted.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he asked Chris to check into this early on.

Chris reported that she checked and was advised that it could meet the code.

Council Liaison Rasmussen said that we need to keep Hallbrook happy.

Council Liaison Rasmussen that the rule regarding aggressive dogs concerns him. This is a matter of opinion but the rule should state that “aggressive dogs must be muzzled or on a leash”. He isn’t suggesting we have a separate area for them but some dog parks he visited provided this.

Chair Ward Reimer reported that although muzzled or on a leash, it bothers her that they may attack a small dog. Her dog is twelve pounds.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he agrees with her 100% but the current outline is to not have a separate area for small dogs. This will be a political issue. Small dog park owners are going to be very upset.

Council Liaison Cain asked how this could be a political issue when the Johnson County dog parks don’t have separate dog parks for small dogs. How can they be upset with us but not with Johnson County.

Lorrie reported that she can understand there will be complaints because we are the newest park.

Chris agreed. She can’t say how many but anticipates some resistant from small dog owners. They will complain because they will expect to have the separation in the Leawood park.

Chris replied that she told Bob that although we don’t have problems with smoking it will be added to the rules list because some people will bring cigars, etc.

Council Liaison Rasmussen added that by using “the park visitors waive liability of the City for any injuries or damage and dog owners are solely liable for injuries or damages caused by their dogs”. This should be presented to Patty, City Administrator. He will give Tonia a copy of his list.

Council Liaison Cain reported that if the Committee feels strongly about the small dog park area she would rather spend money to bring this to fruition now than putting in a big trail system. If proposed cost is being determined for boring, water, and the trail, the small dog area should be determined also. This is the time to do it now if the group decides to do so moving forward.

Chris reported that this would be a revised plan if desired in the future.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he is unhappy with the meniscal changes happening and then having to go back through the process again. He will attend the meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> as well. With all due respect of the Planning Commission the maturation of dog parks have changed significantly over the past twenty years.

Chris reported that an extensive list was presented to the Planning Department.

Council Liaison Cain asked for a determination regarding non-resident using the park. This was discussed but a confirmation wasn’t determined.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that this is something to think about.

Chair Ward Reimer reported that this was discussed before. She opened the floor for feedback.

Lorrie asked if a non-resident fee is attached it should be non-significant amount of money.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that the point of the fees is to ensure all dogs are vaccinated. Some cities in the United States are suffering from a lot of homeless people with dogs who may not be vaccinated.

Chair Ward Reimer reported that we should collect money if a tag will be distributed.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that registering a dog is \$5.00.

Amy reported that the cost isn't the problem; it is the hassle of having to do it.

Council Liaison Cain asked the compliance of registered dogs in Leawood. To her knowledge 1/3 of them are registered. To say they all have to be licensed to visit the park and expect non-residents to pay also is going to be hard to manage.

Chair Ward Reimer reported that those who don't comply will be unable to go to the dog park.

Council Liaison Cain asked who is going to enforce it.

Chris reported that animal control will likely do spot checks and some will comply when the word of random inspections gets around.

Council Liaison Cain reported that it should, but it should be listed we shouldn't impose requiring nonresident license use the dog park. She is opposed to this.

Lorrie reported that it may police itself when word of mouth gets out that Animal Control is patrolling the area.

Chris reported that she agrees.

Brian reported that when he visited the Lees Summit dog park a sign is posted that a Lees Summit pet license is required to use the park.

Chris added that it (Lee's Summit) is spot checked periodically but anyone can use it and they do.

Amy asked the fine for not having a City license.

Chris added the cost is \$25.00 in Lees Summit.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that we will have associated costs once he determines certain fees with Patty.

Chair Ward Reimer suggests that it shouldn't be for Leawood dogs only but they will have their tags and she will be fine with her dog being in there but how will we know if a nonresident dog is up to date on their rabies shot.

Kim reported that they could have a City license from their City.

Chair Ward Reimer asked if she is supposed to go up to the dog owner and ask to read their tag. We know what a Leawood tag looks like and will recognize it automatically.

Chris reported that Animal Control will know how to police this.

Chris added that there is a \$170,000.00 available now. After the fence, engineering fees, trash cans, pet stations, signage, canopies, pet waste stations, and concrete pads will leave \$114,000.00 not including, path, water, and/or the improvement to the ADA. She has heard from a lady who donated a bench but contacted her inquiring about donating more. Alice Hawk, Leawood Foundation Chair, will be contacting her.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if there will be any concrete tables in the dog park similar to those on the trails. They are used often. He will bring this up to the Planning Commission in case the Council authorizes in the future to determine if this will be a major change. He would like to avoid minutia changes and go through the entire process again. Changes may come over the years and it is best to be aware about them now.

Lorrie reported that she disagrees with the circular tables which would cause a dog owner to have their back to the dog park, which would insinuate they are not watching their dog.

Chris reported that they discussed it but determined that it wasn't needed it at this time. The benches serve the purpose of allowing people the option of getting out of the sun and/or rain.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that the staff left a grove of trees in the middle. This was genius.

**B. Misc.**

No miscellaneous items were brought forth.

**C. Next Scheduled Meeting Date – May 13, 2014**

Dave Coleman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Amy Vlasic seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Claxton, Director  
Parks and Recreation Department