Bobbie Walthall

From: Betty Lichtwardt [licht@ku.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2013 11:50 AM
To: schummfoods@gmail.com; mdever@sunflower.com; hughcarter@sunflower.com; mikeamyx515@hotmail.com; aroncromwell@gmail.com
Cc: Bobbie Walthall
Subject: email to City Commissioners about Rock Chalk Park
Attachments: CC 3-4-13Problems not considered in RockChalkPark development.pdf

To: Mayor Bob Schumm, schummfoods@gmail.com

Vice Mayor Michael Dever, mdever@sunflower.com

Commissioner Hugh Carter, hughcarter@sunflower.com

Commissioner Mike Amyx, mikeamyx515@hotmail.com

Commissioner Aron E. Cromwell, aroncromwell@gmail.com

Dear Mayor Schumm and City Commissioners:

We have been reviewing the conditions and requirements of the City involvement in the development, participation, and requirements of the City in the operation of the Rock Chalk Park. As citizens we feel compelled to object to the amount of responsibilities and costs that the City is going to incur, not only in the development of these KUEA facilities, but also the costs. Please see the attached comments.

You probably realize that because of the clever location of the City-owned facilities by the designers for the developer on the upper portion of the property in a separate lot that has no direct access to a public street, this forces the access to be through the KUEA facilities. Because these private streets will be furnishing access primarily to the KUEA events, the City will soon find itself compelled to extend George Williams Way to our city property. Because the City is also required to maintain the infrastructure for the entire park and not just the City-owned lot, this places the maintenance costs almost entirely on the City. This is reinforced by the fact that the City is being given the land (but nothing else) and thus the developer will owe no property taxes on it.

This is only one of the major expenses that you have not anticipated in your cost/benefit analyses. We believe that you will find that this project will be much more costly and much less beneficial for the citizens than you now anticipate.

We urge you not to sign the Development Agreement or make any other commitments until you have thoroughly reviewed the on-going costs and currently unanticipated problems and future expenses and have found the cost/benefits to be in favor of the City.

Again, we ask that you read the attached commentary. Thank you for reading our letter.

Sincerely yours,

Betty and Bob Lichtwardt

2131 Terrace RD

Lawrence, Kansas 66049-2736

Attachment

SOME ISSUES AND PROBLEMS POSSIBLY NOT CONSIDERED WITH THE ROCK CHALK PARK DEVELOPMENT

March 4, 2013

ADDITIONAL COSTS: *HAVE THESE BEEN CALCULATED IN THE COST/BENEFIT RETURN?*

The ownership of the land of the entire park will be the responsibility of the City because the City will almost immediately be given the land by the representatives for the KUEA. Because of this, several expenses will incur that the City may not have calculated into their overall costs when they calculated their cost/benefit returns.

A. By declaring George Williams Way a “major thoroughfare” this enables the City to be responsible for opening the road and paving it. This also means that the total cost of the extension and paving will be the City’s responsibility up to, but not into Lot 1. **Was this cost calculated into the cost/benefit return**?

B. During construction of the facilities in the Rock Chalk Park, damage will incur to the access roads both within and outside of the park that will be the responsibility of the City to repair. **Have these repair costs that will fall on the City been calculated into the cost/benefit return**?

C. Protection of the Baldwin Creek tributary will be constantly necessary. The streambed will accumulate junk and construction debris that must repeatedly be cleaned out. **Have these and the constant added cost for trash disposal been calculated?**

D. Following construction of the KUEA facilities and the City Rec facility, we predict that the constant use, traffic, and crowds will frequently clog the access to the City Rec Center. **The city will soon find that it will be necessary to extend and pave the remainder of George Williams Way on the eastern edge of Lot 1 in order to provide open access to the City Rec Center facilities. This will be a major added expense. <u>Has this been calculated into the overall cost/benefit return?</u>**

E. The extensive traffic, crowds, and increased crime will require added police protection and traffic control. The concession stands will contribute major amounts of trash that the City will be responsible for cleaning. This will probably result in the need for added personnel in the police and fire departments, and trash disposal crews. **Has the City considered this in their overall cost/benefit returns**?

F. In Rock Chalk Park the longevity of the buildings, equipment, and all other privately owned facilities probably will not last beyond the 50 years when they will become city-owned property. This means that the City will suddenly become responsible for repairing, maintaining and rebuilding these facilities. **Has the City really thought that far ahead?**

SOURCES OF INCOME FOR THE CITY

What income to the City will there be from the Rock Chalk Park?

A. Will there be a source of income from the Rock Chalk Park beyond the lease?

B. Who, in fact, will receive the proceeds from leasing?

C. Will the City be gaining any income at all from these privately owned park facilities, including taxes?

Because it seems that the ownership of the land in Rock Chalk Park will fall on the City even after the 10-year tax abatement ceases, the land, itself, will yield no property tax. How are the buildings and other structures going to be taxed? Will they be taxed at all?