

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS® OF LAWRENCE/DOUGLAS COUNTY

President Melinda Henderson Mr. Bob Schumm, Mayor Members of the City Commission City Hall • Lawrence, KS 66044

November 13, 2012

President-Elect **David Burress**

RE. REGULAR AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: RECEIVE STAFF REPORT REGARDING THE PROPOSED RECREATION CENTER

Vice President
Milton Scott

Dear Mayor Schumm and City Commissioners:

Secretary
Caleb Morse

The League of Women Voters of Lawrence/Douglas County has concerns that several important questions regarding the proposed City Recreation Center in the Baldwin Creek Park tract have not been adequately answered in public materials that have been provided. We urge you to obtain full answers to the questions listed below before you make a final decision on this project.

Treasurer Marjorie Cole

Directors
Margaret Arnold

1. Pending granting of all approval processes and ...waiving all city related fees... and approval of industrial revenue bonds for the project..." then KU will purchase the tract of land.

Bonnie Dunham

<u>Question:</u> Does this include both the 19 acre and the 90 acre tracts? If it does include both, for what will the 19 acre tract be used?

James Dunn

2. KU will then build its own facilities for KU teams for track & field, softball, and soccer.

Sally Hayden

Question: What is the construction time line? Does KU build its own facilities first?

Cille King

3. KU Endowment will build the following facilities and then transfer the responsibility for these specific physical improvements to the City: "The City Recreation Center of 181,000 sq.

Ruth Lichtwardt

Question: Who determines the design standards? Does the City have final authority over the design and construction standards? Does this include those for the City Recreation Center (the 181,000 s.f. structure) plus all interior roads, access road to west, onsite utilities (sewer, water, etc.) and "all professional fees and services associated with improvements, and landscaping"?

ft., [plus] 8 lighted tennis courts, [plus] walking trails of five miles, [plus] all interior roads,

[plus the] access road to west, [plus] onsite utilities (sewer, water, etc.)," and "all professional fees and services associated with improvements, and landscaping..." all according to City

agreements. All professional work will be done by KU selections and under their control.

Marlene Merrill

4. KU will transfer the responsibility for specific physical improvements to the City including "all interior roads, access road to west, onsite utilities and ...services associated with improvements and landscaping." In other words, maintenance of the interior roads.

<u>Question:</u> Will all of these interior roads for which the City will be responsible for maintenance be built to public street standards? Or will they be considered driveways? Note: if they are owned by the City, they are city right-of-way. We urge you to require that all accessways which the city must maintain be built to public street standards and not to lesser standards, such as for driveways.



Page 2

5. KU Endowment will own the parking spaces.

<u>Question</u>: Will the city have use of these parking spaces at all times? KU will cover the liability for parking spaces. City will pay a "proportional share." How will this be determined? Will there be an upper cost limit?

6. "Kansas Athletics will not have a need for use of the parking lots or private drives within the development during the winter season..."

<u>Question</u>: Why not? This means that snow removal, etc. is a City responsibility. Does this mean that the City gets use of these facilities only in the wintertime?

7. Water will be purchased from City for "rest rooms and competition fields..." City will pay for water for general landscaping "of all facilities at this location." KUEA will maintain the "lawns and landscaping around the recreation center and tennis courts at no cost to the City."

<u>Question</u>: How are you going to make these distinctions? Will there be meters for KU only? (We detect this and similar situations as sources of conflict.)

Question: How will you resolve maintenance cost, use disputes and other disagreements?

8. KU says it will build the trails.

Question: Will the City continue to own Baldwin Creek Park?

<u>Question</u>: Does the City have final approval of Baldwin Creek Park changes before their development; i.e., the trails? (We are asking that the trails be for walking only, not multi-use, and that they not be paved, but rather, have a natural surface.)

9. Construction, including the City Rec Center, will be managed by Bliss Sports. Bids can be monitored by the City, but there is no mention of the City having a veto option.

Question: Can the City refuse to allow certain construction bids and/or companies to be approved?

10. The City can hire a "construction monitor."

<u>Question</u>: What powers/options would he have? Would he have any veto power? Will the city have any enforcement or veto power? Will all construction have to meet City codes and standards? How will you enforce this?

These questions are based on the most recent communications provided by the KU Endowment Association. We trust that you will get satisfactory answers to these and other questions before you make any positive final decisions on this joint development. We very much appreciate your dedication and service to the citizens of Lawrence. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Melinda Henderson, President

League of Women Voters of Lawrence/Douglas County

November 12, 2012

City Commission City Hall 6 E. 6th Street Lawrence, KS 66044

SUBJECT: Sports Village & Green Initiatives?



Dear Commissioners,

MadreLawrence appreciates the careful consideration the City has given in their negotiations with KU and its affiliates with regards to the Sports Village project.

One topic we have not seen considered yet involves the addition of green initiatives to the project. We have always been proud to know that one of the city commission goals involves that the environment & sustainability factors into decision-making. Incorporating green initiatives into the sports village plan would provide operational cost savings & continue our city's journey into becoming a more sustainable city.

While we are aware these initiatives might add to the preliminary construction costs of the project, they would work to greatly reduce the city's operating costs, such as fuel & utility costs, that we all know will continue going up. Surely that provides a great incentive for the city to investigate creative measures. Perhaps if we add enough of these green initiatives, we might even bring the net loss of the project closer to zero, thereby strengthening the economic development component of this project, something everyone wants to see happen.

Some ideas that could be incorporated into construction:

- Green power using wind & solar energy
- Xeriscaping that would demand less water usage
- Rain garden & parking lot infrastructure to naturally absorb storm water drainage
- Natural light that would help reduce demand for daytime indoor lighting of buildings
- LEED equivalent certification

The new Dillon's building at 19th & Louisiana is able to use their green initiatives as a marketing tool, as well as proudly trumpeting their energy efficiency cost savings. Our city could be doing the same thing, as it certainly is something we could be proud of as a Gateway to our fair city.

We are confident that the Sustainability Coordinator and the Sustainability Advisory Board would be able to help flesh out these ideas, and have even more ideas to offer as well. We encourage the city commissioners to ask for their help & guidance in these issues. Thanks so much for your time & consideration.

Respectfully,

Leslie Soden MadreLawrence ~ Embrace Change

Christopher Johnson

4615 Royal Birkdale Court Lawrence, Kansas 66049

12 November 2012

City Commissioners City of Lawrence Kansas

Dear City Commissioners,

I very much support creating a space that affords the opportunity for Lawrence citizens to have increased access to physical activity close to their work and home on the west side of town. However, I have a significant concern with the proposed plan. In the current Rock Chalk Plan there is a 7,000 sq ft space reserved for Lawrence Memorial Hospital. According to the plan they submitted to their Board, LMH is planning to put in not only diet and exercise coaching, but also personal training and sports performance, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech pathology services. All of those duplicate services being offered by numerous medical and health related offices in the private sector - all within 2 miles of the newly proposed location. LMH also estimates that they will realize \$527,000.00 of revenue the first year, with substantial increases in years following. The only way they can realize these revenues, much less increases, is if they put two of the three private physical therapy practices out of business, not to mention the health practices on Wakarusa and 18th streets, in that span of time. And with their extremely deep pockets and no tax liabilities, they will be unfairly advantaged in that fight for that market.

All of the information regarding the hospital's proposal can be found on page 6A of September 20, 2012's Journal World. In that article you will note that the Hospital Board questioned the duplication of services at that time, and likely put plans on a small hold. However, LMH, like KU, often forgets agreements and pushes boundaries (playing the role of the 900 pound gorilla) after the fact. If the hospital is permitted to be in this space (especially considering that no other partnership have even been explored, and even if the appearance of bids is done, it would not be an even playing field considering the LMH Foundation), I believe that the services they are permitted to provide and bill for in that space should be extremely clearly outlined and enforced. Even at that, you just limit the businesses they will displace.

Another view is that since all the services that LMH proposes to offer are already readily available in this town in close proximity by other sources. Lawrence will be much better represented by producing an atmosphere of health and wellness, and should have nothing related to rehabilitation or illness anywhere near this location.

Please protect our private sector and eliminate the hospital's involvement in this project.

I plan to come to the meeting tomorrow and speak, but I wanted you to each have my thoughts prior to that event. Thank you for your attention, and for your great service to our city.

Sincerely,

Christopher Johnson

Kirk McClure 707 Tennessee Street Lawrence, Kansas 66044

November 11, 2012

Mayor Bob Schumm

Commissioner Aron E. Comwell aroncromwell@gmail.com

Commissioner Michael Dever

Commissioner Hugh Carter

Commissioner Mike Amyx

Schummfoods@gmail.com

mdever@sunflower.com
hughcarter@sunflower.com
mikeamyx515@hotmail.com

Re: Analysis of Sports Complex Proposals

Mayor and Commissioners,

The City Commission is considering whether it should invest in an expansive sports complex to attract regional sports events to Lawrence or to invest in a smaller sports facility to serve the people within the community.

A great many questions are part of this decision, but one stands out. If you invest in the expansive sports complex by partnering with the KU Endowment and the KU Athletic Association, will the sports complex attract enough business to make it a viable investment?

Market Analysis

The City engaged Conventions Sports & Leisure (CSL) to project the level of demand that a sports complex would attract to Lawrence. This report was addressed to the earlier proposal that was to be located west of the South Lawrence Trafficway (SLT). The current proposal is east of the SLT, but the new location does not substantially change the proposal for market demand purposes. The CSL report suggests two conclusions:

1. A large sports complex will not generate sufficient demand to make the investment viable.

CS&L report projects the Lawrence sports complex to attract 294,000 attendees annually. While there is a tangible economic benefit from this level of sports complex usage, the CSL report indicates that the level of spending from these attendees is very modest. Most spend no more than \$12.50 on a visit, and very few stay more than one day. Even those who stay overnight spend only \$80. As such, the economic benefit is small, and this benefit will not offset the high operating costs of this sports complex.

2. The projected level of demand in the CSL report may be very optimistic.

The numbers of attendees and tournaments projected by CSL are greater than the annual draw at the Fieldhouse USA in Frisco, Texas. It seems highly unlikely that Lawrence can outperform the complex in Frisco, Texas because the Lawrence complex will serve a smaller and less rich metropolitan area. Given the size of the Kansas City area and the performance of other facilities, the projected demand for the Lawrence Sports Complex seems highly optimistic.

An alternative exists

The City can build a recreation center on land west of Lawrence Free State High School with its baseball and football fields plus its gym and the City's attached indoor pool. A recreation center built near these existing facilities could serve the citizens' needs. This alternative site would not require any major new infrastructure; the site already has the necessary services. The location would develop its own synergy through coordination of events with the facilities at the High School.

Recommendation:

The City should carefully examine the relative costs, benefits and risks of the larger sports complex versus the smaller alternative. The proposal adjacent to the Free State High School may be a less costly, less risky, and nearly as beneficial an option which can better serve the needs of the residents of Northwest Lawrence.

Yours truly,

Kirk McClure