

City of Lawrence
Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
September 9, 2019 Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Marilyn Hull, Bart Littlejohn, Pat Phillips, Sandy Hull, Pat Collette, Val Renault, and Jacki Becker
MEMBERS ABSENT: John Blazek, John Nalbandian
STAFF PRESENT: Penny Holler, Lee Ice, Mark Hecker, Ben Uxa, and Brandon McGuire
PUBLIC PRESENT: Suzanne Hampton, Lisa Larsen

I. Meeting called to order by M. Hull

II. Approval of August 12, 2019 minutes

Motion to approve August 12 minutes by S. Hull, second by Littlejohn. **Motion passed unanimously.**

III. Public Comments

Suzanne Hampton, co-founder of Friends of Lawrence Area Trails wants to advocate for community involvement in the loop design process

- Questions regarding current status of the loop project. City staff have been working with the railroad. It's anticipated that the design group will help gain public feedback on the plan.

IV. Draft LPRD Advisory Memo to City Commission

The request is to clarify Advisory Board's role so the group can set their time and focus accordingly

- During the 2020 budget process, the City Commission wanted input on how to balance the Recreation Fund Budget
- This request stems from the Advisory Board's role to help identify the community values and guiding priorities; budgeting will follow accordingly
- Board members discussed the value of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan from 2017, questioning whether that is still an accurate guide for the community. It would be helpful to know whether the Master Plan should be used as is, revisited, or augmented.
- Board members provided additional language to the drafted memo

Vote: Collette motioned to approve, seconded by Renault, approved

V. Staff Presentation and Discussion of Sponsorships

Steinbrock discussed the history of Parks and Recreation sponsorships and presented the policy approved by the City Commission in 2017

- Staff is looking at how sponsorships have been handled by other municipalities
 - As an example, Johnson County has a system that has paid staff work on sponsorships with 20% of sales going into an account to fund the position and activities associated with it.
- Staff hired an intern for six months that has worked on sponsorships

- He has been successful in bringing in a decent number of small sponsorships
- Current sponsorships include –
 - Metal plaques at SPL (we can do this in house)
 - Banners in outside sports fields
- This might be an opportunity to identify a sponsor to support needed maintenance and upgrade of Parks and Recreation locations
- Staff is trying to answer questions regarding when would be “too much” sponsorship that it would detract from the aesthetics and quality of facilities and areas
- Holler commented that community feedback had been solicited through a survey in 2017 on Lawrence Listens. Board members requested to review the results of that survey.
- Board members wanted to know if staff could identify cities where this had been successful and places where sponsorships were unsuccessful
- Discussion was had regarding the naming of facilities and whether it was fair that the City spend millions on a facility while a business gets naming rights for \$100,000 per year
- M. Hull suggested that staff try to get the “low hanging fruit” in-house rather than paying a 20% commission through an RFP
- The Arboretum structure was one of the largest projects paid for by outside funds. The structure was fully funded through a large fundraising effort for the complex (the City paid for the parking lot).
- Sponsorships with LMH at SPL had several other things like social media posts that were written into the contract
- Board members suggested that it would be helpful for a subcommittee to design the survey for Lawrence Listens
 - Becker, S. Hull, and Renault can look at the 2017 survey as a guide
- Board members had questions on the timeframe for an RFP
 - The timeframe will rely on staff resources to complete it
 - Makes sense to complete the asset management prior to the RFP
 - That list could inform the survey
- If possible, staff could also consider having the survey available at the recreation centers
- Advisory Board generally agrees with Sponsorship Policy from 2017
 - There was the impression that the naming of an entire facility should be treated differently than naming a portion of that facility
 - Comments included the thought that naming an entire facility should require a large dollar amount to make sure that it’s fair to the taxpayers
 - Comments also included questions on what if staff gains a \$100,000 sponsorship and then the City Commission denies that contract
 - It was suggested to look at Wheeling, West Virginia as a guide

VI. Concerns/Board Member Items of Interest

- Board members had questions on participating in the selection of public art for the police station

- Board members also suggested that staff look into functioning of the restrooms at Lyons
- M. Hull requested to receive a bullet point list of recreation items rather than the upcoming happenings, similar to the items listed for parks

VII. Other

Next Board Meeting – 5:30 p.m. Monday, October 14

Meeting adjourned.