Board members in attendance: Doug Stevens, Lorrie Hamilton, David Harwood, and Dave Coleman

Board Members absent: Karen Ward Reimer (Chair), Amy Vlasic and Bob Wright.

Council Liaisons present: Lou Rasmussen

Council Liaisons absent: Julie Cain

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

Doug Stevens called the meeting to order at 5:44 p.m.

Lorrie Hamilton made a motion to approve the June 8, 2014 meeting minutes. Dave Coleman seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

I. Old Business

A. Dog Park - Update

Brian reported that the fence installation is nearly 70% complete. They had to stop working abruptly due to an approved change order from Mega Industries to do the ADA trail improvements. Trail access will be closed beginning tomorrow while the work is being done. It should take two-three weeks to complete, weather depending. The equipment needed to regrade a few needed areas is on site and the amenities have been ordered. He is uncertain of an estimated ship date. He is happy to report that the water line is in under the creek. The total cost is less than $10,000; which is under the original estimate. He requested they not only do the creek but directionally bore all the way to the water line and extend it to the tap. Everything will be functional once the drinking fountain is set.

Council Liaison Rasmussen congratulated Brian for the cost being less than $10,000. Everyone originally panicked at the potential $50,000 cost. He asked if we received any adverse effects from the heavy rain received last night.

Brian reported that we did not. His crew was able to mow the area today.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if the shelter locations have been staked.

Brian replied that they haven’t been staked. The pads will be built once the plan drawings are received, determining where the posts should be mounted. The project is moving along nicely. He is motivated to get done.

B. Dog Park Name – Recommendations for Consideration by Governing Body
(Continued to the July 21 Council Agenda)

Chris reported that the City Administrator recommended continuing this to July 21, she will know more at that time.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if two names were submitted going forth.
Chris replied that the list provided to the park board was provided and presented along with two recommended names from the Board of Canine Creek and LEAWOOF. She hasn’t received any further comments at this time.

C. 123rd and Mission Trail Update

Brian reported that the trail opened to the public Thursday of last week (July 3). There are a few in house projects remaining in addition to installing the trail entrance sign soon.

Brian reported that he received a call from a concerned resident that now that the area is open he is afraid someone may mistake the entrance at 123rd and Mission Road as a road and not an actual trail. The area is a lot more open than in the past.

Brian reported that he suggests a small half gate similar to Ironwoods and I-Lan Parks that will constrict the opening area roughly five feet to allow bikers and walkers access to the trail. Staff will also have access through the gate with their trucks when needed. This may eliminate any risk of a vehicle driving on it.

Chris reported that she is unsure if the Mayor will be in favor of this. The areas within other parks Brian referenced with similar gates are in an interior piece of the park and not on a main road.

David suggests adding a pole to the center of the area to prevent cars from having access.

Brian added that there have been issues with bollards in the past. It may not be a problem if painted a bright color with reflectors but is usually an impediment when located in the center and we run the risk of someone hitting it. This may not be the best option.

David reported that he suggests addressing this if it becomes an issue. He understands that if done, the steep hill could pose a problem for cyclists going in either direction.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if the project is on budget.

Brian reported that it is. Chris added there is $59,000 remaining in the force account.

D. Ironwoods Restroom Update

Chris reported that the project is close to completion. A final meeting will be held tomorrow to discuss punch list items. The restrooms are tucked in nicely. The contractor has been great to work with.

David asked if it will be open for the Hello Dolly performances.

Brian reported that there are a few minor details to finish. They are near a completion date.

David asked if it is a change order free project.

Chris added that the majority of the change orders received have been credits. The credits outweigh the charges.

David expressed kudos to the designers.

Chris reported that more landscaping will be done in the fall due to the heat we’ve experienced.

Brian reported that this is the best plan. It is difficult to get grass to grow due to the heat.
E. Update on Bike/Ped Master Plan

Brian reported that a Work Session was held last night; a major draft was recently completed. He suggests revisiting the estimated numbers and would like to meet with the Public Works Department and discuss their standards to determine if they have been thinking along the same lines regarding costs, etc. The routes have been determined. He recently led a group ride through a collection of neighborhood routes (consisting of thirty miles) with the Committee and members of the Police Department. Everyone was pleased with the routes.

Brian added that they’ve been realistic determining where to spend maintenance dollars on the sidewalk system near schools and shopping centers, as a priority to improve walkability within a quarter mile within same type facilities. This will be presented to Council for acceptance in the near future.

Lorrie reported that it was a nice summary in the online version of the newspaper today.

Brian thanked Lorrie for this information. He wasn’t aware, but will look at it soon.

F. Referral by Governing Body: Discuss Advertisement at/near Dog Park

Chris passed around examples of different signage for discussion purposes.

David reported that the topic of dog park sponsorship was discussed at a previous meeting and it was determined by the Committee at that time that it wasn’t an avenue we wanted to pursue at this time. What is the dramatic change? Why are we revisiting this so soon.

Chris reported that this was brought forth by a Council member. The Committee didn’t change but sponsorship is different than advertising. It is on the agenda to determine if it needs to be revisited.

Chris reported that some advertised on kiosks, bricks, stones, etc., and on a website depending on the type of sponsorship. The program guide and the Facebook page are great resources. We can find a way to develop a package depending on the level of sponsorship if advertising is desired. She researched many municipal websites and found various options. A local artist designed tiles to choose from with the option of three styles, one choice cost $100 for a 7x7. It was an interesting design but expensive. Another had a paw with a QR code attached. A municipality offered the option of sponsoring a canine calendar where a dog is nominated and votes decide the winner.

Lorrie asked if funds from advertising can be used to offset maintenance costs if we choose to pursue advertising sponsorship.

Chris replied that the question is if advertising is being used to raise money, and provide Leawood residents the opportunity to promote their business or both. What is the goal. A decision doesn’t have to be made tonight but this needs to be determined moving forward.

Lorrie reported that it sets an interesting president for advertising at the dog park only for people to question advertising around the soccer fields, other areas, etc.

Dave added that many allow advertising. The Blue Valley Parks and Recreation ball fields as well as the Overland Park Soccer Complex both offer it. He would like direction from Council regarding advertising.

Chris reported that Council has determined they only want it at the dog park but would like the Committee to discuss it and bring forth a recommendation. Personally she is glad it was only brought up only for this location. There are opportunities to do it but we need to determine how it can be done tastefully. Where do we draw the line. She isn’t in favor of it unless we are in desperate need for funding. If decided, there has to be parameters for advertising.
Dave suggested tabling the idea until the park is open and has been operating for approximately six months; the topic can be revisited at that time instead of trying to formulate what we are going to do without knowing who is going to use it, traffic flow, etc. He would hate to go down the road of unknown.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he and Councilmen Andrew Osman were trying to figure out how to gain sponsorship for amenities, such as tunnels, handicap courses, etc. that Council wouldn’t approve. He and Brian determined $50,000 in the original guesstimate but he didn’t receive a sympathetic audience from Council. Andrew has a commercial constituent interested in contributing as a corporate entity but it falls under advertising. It needs to be determined how we can gain $50,000. He has no objection to Petsmart, or anyone who wants to contribute but isn’t in favor of it being done in perpetuity.

David asked how is it different if someone wants to make a donation for a tunnel in memory of their dog or if Petco makes a donation on behalf of all of the pets they service in Leawood. One is sponsorship that can be limited duration, and one is a certain amount of money which is basically selling advertising. We receive donations in our parks such as trees, benches and plaques that are there in perpetuity.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that if a capital investment is established for amenities it doesn’t last forever. They will need to be replaced. He doesn’t visualize future Council being different than what he’s experienced the past twenty plus years. A time limit should be established regarding recognition of contributions so funds are available for replacement when needed. We don’t have depreciation in the state, county or city. He has to figure out how the future staff and Council will gain replacement. Amenities aren’t a necessity, they are an enhancement. Memorials and sponsorships should be handled the same, even benches need to be replaced over time.

David reiterated that he feels the same. Does it run with the life of the donated item.

Council Liaison Rasmussen appreciates David’s feedback. He has good suggestions. It makes it administratively easier to establish a time limit. For example, we are lucky if the benches at I-Lan last five years due to termites, normal weather, wood rot etc. which is why he suggests establishing a duration period for replacement or have money to do it when the time comes.

April reported that she is a citizen and she isn’t in favor of a lot of signage unless it is event driven advertising, which is good for attendees. Dog related events are extremely lucrative. For example, Heartland had an event at the Lodge before and raised $60,000 in one night. This is a better way to handle it than trying to manage putting up signs that will need to be replaced over time and going through a process each time someone wants to participate. If an event is held, we can set the rules.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that this is a good suggestion and should be considered to reach the $50,000 goal, and not have to rely on the Council. A reserve or “fund” must be established so if an event, as April is suggesting, then the money would pour into it and be distributed by parks and recreation.

Chris reported that April’s suggestion could be put in a package, which could offer the option to participate in one or all events. The program guide is mailed to single family homes and could be used as an advertising tool. The Parks and Recreation Department could put together packages.

Dave added that donations may be a good place to start rather than signage in the dog park. A fund can be established within the Leawood Foundation. A designated area within the dog park with envelopes for anyone who would like to donate would be nice also. Advertising should be considered only if the $50,000 isn’t met by a certain timeframe.

Council Liaison Rasmussen suggests that he highly recommends taking this into strong consideration.
David asked if the City is responsible to replace the amenities once they are worn out and can no longer be used if donations are raised and money is no longer available. Are the amenities removed if the money is not available to replace them.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he is also concerned about this. In his opinion they would have to be removed at that time.

Chris added that benches are also removed when they become worn beyond repair. The plaque isn’t removed and placed on a new bench.

David suggests securing artists to develop ideas for dog related agility pieces that double as art pieces. Small signage could be included with information about the artist, what each piece represents, and who donated it. Doing so would have a purpose, include art and provide something useful and meaningful to incorporate Leawoods love for the arts. Art pieces are generally more durable, last longer and would give corporate and community donors something to be proud of when they visit and incorporate a sense of community pride and have purpose versus just trying to get funding.

Council Liaison Rasmussen replied that he appreciates the good discussion about this topic.

Chris reported that she will Google information on dog agility courses. Lorrie reported that she agrees with Dave to wait until it has been open for a while and usage is determined before getting carried away trying to figure out where to get money from. Everyone with the exception of Lou preferred a bare bones dog park when the Work Session was held. It is important to see who uses it and how they feel. She is certain a large amount of money can be raised in a short amount of time at dog related events. For example, Barks in the Park always provides freebies such as tennis balls, bandanas, etc. If sponsors pay a fee and are in charge of the items given away, a handful of sponsors can raise $50,000 in a minimal amount of time. It may be determined that $50,000 is an excessive amount of money and not needed once feedback is received.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that this is a very good point.

Dave reported that the topic is great discussion but he would like to read directly from the minutes from the last meeting that stated “Chair Ward Reimer reported that the consensus of the committee is to keep it on the radar and revisit the topic if the need becomes necessary for advertising.” “Chris reported the potential opening date is in August, she recommends revisiting this topic in November after the area has been open for several months to determine if it should be considered at that time.” He recommends keeping on the same path. This was discussed in detail at the last meeting.

Chris reported that she is aware it was discussed at the last meeting but wanted to report to Councilman Osman that we researched the topic further. The discussion tonight has been great.

Council Liaison Rasmussen requested an action agenda item that we follow up on April’s suggestion. He would like more information on how the donation/funds are tagged for the dog park.

Chris reported that the Foundation will tag it similar to the money that was raised for the Gezer playground. She received a monthly report during that project. A check was written when the money was needed.

April reported that post card size comment cards can be placed at the Doggie Dunk event if input is needed requesting them to return them by to mail to the Parks and Recreation Department.

Lorrie doesn’t think this is necessary. People will provide feedback whether asked or not.

Chris reported that she would rather use the Survey Monkey option.
David reported that Leawood has a good handle on what percentage of dogs are licensed. Input from the community is important. The approach used to establish what goes in a regular park should be the same here. Why is this treated differently. The only difference is this park will service animals and not children but the same tools should be used regarding amenities.

Chris reported that it comes down to financing.

Brian asked if approval is needed from the Planning Department if someone wants to donate $40,000 for a dog playground. Their approval was needed regarding the number of benches etc. the dog park will have.

Chris added that she is uncertain if their approval is needed if it isn’t a permanent structure.

Brian asked how this is different. A concrete tunnel and other amenities are permanent similar to a bench.

Chris reported that a bench is, but a picnic table is not and approval isn’t needed from the Planning Department for these items. Approval isn’t needed if it isn’t permanent. Most dog pieces aren’t mounted or permanent. The art work David suggested would need approval.

Council Liaison Rasmussen clarified that he understands the Committees decision to wait until the dog park opens and feedback is received from users and money for amenities can be tagged in the Foundation. Are corporate sponsors handled the same. He would like to report to Councilman Osman how this will be handled moving forward. Staff should continue researching options so we can move forward without delay in November if the need presents itself.

Chris reported that the problem with big companies is that money is often given with restraints, or there is a match and they require naming rights. There are also grants available. She will continue to research options.

G. Review Project List

Chris reported that she will revise the list into three sections, ADA, repair/replace and new at the direction of the City Administrator.

Committee members had a brief discussion of items on the list.

Chris added that the committee discussed at the last meeting that there were too many 5’s and 4’s, and not enough 2’s and 3’s when initially ranked. She would like to complete the list and request a Work Session with the Governing Body on how and when to move forward. Council is on board with the ADA issues and money has been set aside in the 2015 budget to address them. Staff compiles 2016 C.I.P. documents in October and Council will discuss them in January. It is best to complete this sooner than later. Some of the items to complete for the C.I.P. in 2016/2017 need to come to the surface or we’ll miss the opportunity for another cycle.

Dave requested ranking each category by importance of priority. This would be easier to follow.

Chris added that she will revise the list as requested and agrees it will be helpful and better to understand. This list is similar to the C.I.P. process, which is reviewed yearly but things will change. For example, the creek bank stabilization is ranked a 3 but it will become a 5 if we experience a huge storm and a significant amount of the bank is lost.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that Council is expecting the Committee to make recommendations that can be discussed in detail moving forward.

Chris reported that she will modify the list including additional information once the ranking is complete.
Council Liaison Rasmussen asked clarification regarding the category to hire a designer to improve way finding signage that would cost $20,000. Wasn’t this already established.

Brian reported that this is correct. The symbol was done. Is a more branded version needed.

Chris added that this was done before the final draft was reviewed. She and Brian discussed different styles. It would cost the same if the portion about the designer is removed and the cost is added about the signage and installation.

Doug asked if the way findings will all become the same.

Chris added that they will be listed together as one, referencing the bicycle/ped plan and standardization. She suggests using the “L”. People are familiar with its style.

Doug asked why adding handicap parking at I-Lan Park isn’t in the 5 category and referenced with other ADA issues.

Brian reported that the ADA requirement was met at I-Lan Park. It was listed because they didn’t like the number of stalls the park offers and they recommended a reconfiguration of the area.

Chris reported that Doug brings up a good point. It can be removed from the list.

Kim added that the restriping can be done the next time a restriping project is needed.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that since becoming a Council member he is shocked that we are putting $65,000 in the North Pond, a lot of money has been spent there over the years. The list also references $300,000 to fix the middle pond leak. Why don’t we fill it in.

Chris suggests engaging an engineer to research this. The North Lake was considered the low one before the construction on the west side of the parkway, when it received a lot of the silt and runoff. A lot of the storm water isn’t diverting to the middle pond now. The $300,000 is an estimate. She is uncertain what is causing it but this needs to be researched soon. It could be a crushed pipe. Continental Engineers have plans from the seventies when it was originally done.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked why we wouldn’t know if it is a crushed pipe. He fought for a long time for the entire system to be televised. Why wasn’t Joe Johnson, Public Works Director been contacted to research the problem. He has the equipment.

Chris reported that she is uncertain how extensive it was researched.

Brian recalls that the pond held water before Tomahawk Creek was developed on the west side. It was never completely full but it held better. The overflow area settled and collapsed and the soil is poor in that area but there isn’t a storm pipe that fills into the middle lake.

Chris added that neither she nor Brian can confirm if there are any storm drains around it or under it.

Brian added that a big storm drain goes through the median that we can tap into and houses a lot of water which would help but a natural gas line is in the vicinity and we are uncertain if we would have clearance.

Council Liaison Rasmussen doesn’t recommend spending this amount of money. He doesn’t want to shock his fellow Councilmen with a $300,000 amount without facts as to why this is happening. He would rather hire an engineering to survey the area to determine why before any money is spent.

Doug agreed. This should be investigated further to make a determination before moving forward.

Brian reported that there are options. He also agrees that the cause should be determined soon.
David asked if an action item is needed or is this for discussion purposes only.

Chris reported that a recommendation on the entire list will be needed at the next meeting. It is important to determine what the Committee wants done.

David reported that in regards to cost estimates it is helpful to know if those are plug numbers or if they have a basis for the estimate and the information is included in the report. If a plug number for $300,000 is reported we can be off by an order of magnitude which will change everything. It is important that this information is clarified to show a range in the report. If Committee members don’t know the range of a small to a large play equipment set, they could range from $200,000 to $800,000 and information has yet to be determined, at least they understand that there is some range there and yes it’s important. On a larger end it is going to be more of a funding challenge.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that he agrees.

Chris reported that she also agrees. An example Scott Lambers, City Administrator added $150,000 to for the future park at 96th and Lee but they didn’t think this was enough money so it was raised $250,000. Parks can vary; $100,000 was spent on Brook Beatty Park.

Lorrie asked if the $250,000 references an area with bare ground with all the buildings gone.

Chris reported that this is correct but she doesn’t know the size of the footprint or the number of parking spaces.

Doug asked why the access route to the playground at Gezer Park is a ranked so high. Why is it a 4.

Dave reported that it could be because access from Mission road to the playground is challenging. It requires going all the way around on the sidewalk or jumping over the creek or scale the hill coming over the other side.

Chris reported that this could be ranked lower.

Lorrie asked if a sidewalk option has been researched to access the water fountain at the South Lake. Many people take the short cut instead of walking around. It could get heavily used if redirected.

Brian reported that he’s researched this option in the past. He can revisit it again.

Chris thanked the Committee for the input. This is good progress. She will revise the list with new rankings and better descriptions and bring it to the next meeting for a final Committee recommendation.

II. New Business

A. Staff Reports

Kim reported that staff has been busy with the following:

- The Duck Derby event was a huge success. A record number of 289 were sold. A big thanks to Lorrie for selling additional ducks at the event. $500.00 was donated to the Leawood Foundation.
- The camps and swim lessons are winding down. A new Lego Camp was offered this year, which is very popular. It filled quickly with a waiting list. Swim championships are next week.
- The fall soccer league is approaching fast. The deadline to register is July 23.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked for an update with the relationship we had with The Legends Soccer Program.
Kim replied that what both sides thought would happen, didn’t. We marketed it to the best of our ability but not many took advantage of the extended program. They continue to rent fields from us but the partnership dissolved. The rental fees are a good revenue stream.

Chris reported that we may rebid the partnership in the future but this is not crucial.

April reported the following:

- “Hello Dolly” begins July 17th. It is a fabulous show. Contact her in advance for reserved seats.
- The Schoolhouse is busy with field trips.
- The book club has been busy. This program has been successful.

B. Call for Miscellaneous Items

David reported that the Kenneth Road ball fields have been demolished. The area is fenced and would be a great location for south area Dog Park. He brought this up before at previous meetings but is making another pitch for Leawood to consider purchasing the land.

Chris asked if anyone looked the area up on the AIMS map.

Dave asked if it we are certain the land is in Leawood.

David replied that it is in County, unincorporated. It would be a nice area to take ownership of. The parking, water and electricity are already established.

Dave asked Council Liaison Rasmussen why the City hasn’t annexed the area especially since David has brought this up in the past.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that the area was formerly called Aubrey Township but he is uncertain if it is on the radar. He has no knowledge of any efforts or if anything is being done on behalf of the City regarding the property. He suggested David contact the Mayor to notify her of his determination regarding the property.

Dave reported that he and his family recently visited Lea McKeegan Park in Lee’s Summit. It is a great, kid-friendly park with a zip-line, and three story climbable gym. His children loved it.

Chris reported that the park is very busy. The zip line experienced so much use it already needs repair. She asked Scott, City Administrator if we can get a zip-line with an inclusive component for a wheelchair bound child to be able to experience the fun. He agreed.

Brian reported that Grandview is opening a new park next week. He and Chris will attend the grand opening.

David asked if the Parks and Recreation Department can sponsor a City wide triathlon event. Would this type start with the Parks and Recreation Department. There is a need for this type of event in the community. There are great resources highlighting our trails, bike friendliness and other uses. It would be nice to establish a special event benefiting a good cause such as the Leawood Foundation. It could be an entry limited event.

Chris reported that this was done years ago in conjunction with the 4th of July event. The pool and City Park were used. The numbers began to dwindle so it wasn’t repeated.

Brian reported that Elite Cycling sponsors some nature events and could possibly sponsor it if it is brought back again.

Chris reported that logistics would be the hardest due to the resources, especially if adults are included.
David reported that he would like to pursue this.

April reported that it may be best to start with the bike group.

Brian reported that time is limited. We wouldn’t be able to do rides and events at this time.

Chris reported that a decision package would be needed for this type of “new” event in order for it to be included in a future budget.

Dave reported that Olathe opened their new community center earlier this week.

Council Liaison Rasmussen reported that it’s more than a meeting center, it’s $30 million dollars.

Chris reported that we are restricted on programming due to limited room space. Participants are usually on top of each other during certain time of the year on the lower level.

April reported that campers are using every room when it is held here.

Council Liaison Rasmussen asked if Committee members will receive a copy of the bike/ped plan when it was accepted.

Chris thanked Lou for this suggestion. She will make sure they do.

C. Next Scheduled Meeting Date – August 12, 2014

The next meeting is August 12, at 5:30 p.m. in the Maple Room.

Dave Coleman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Lorrie Hamilton seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Claxton, Director
Parks and Recreation Department