

Bobbie Walthall

Subject: RE: regular agenda items 6

From: Patricia Sinclair
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 12:32 PM
To: Bobbie Walthall
Subject: regular agenda items 6

To: City Commissioners
From: Patricia Sinclair
Re: Opposition to regular agenda item 6
Date: June 7, 2016

.Please do NOT pass this item to change the frequency and content of staff meetings. Mr. Markus apparently feels that the current schedule places an undue burden on staff, I feel that this is getting rushed through.

I believe that our current schedule was developed under former Mayor Jeremy Farmer, with the beginning time moved up approximately an hour and a time limit to the meeting (as well as a count-down clock). Many protested that this early start did not allow commuters or those with needs at home after work or school to attend. I personally sat through a police department presentation last year with a seemingly unending talk by the architect and others and then we were all told to keep our comments very short as time was running out. Since the minutes were so many months behind in being transcribed, I never saw the minutes when the time was changed.

Also, one can do a lot of research and show up to comment, including questions, and be dismissed with a couple of words, as happened in Baldwin Creek Trail. Park staff never got back to me, despite two requests. Other things like the water slide received an enormous amount of meeting time.

I feel that the amount of time from the posting of the agenda to the time for submission of comments is too short and do not feel that it is inappropriate for staff to post critical new pieces of information on the day of the meeting and after the deadline for public comment.

I don't recall seeing such huge agendas in the past. Perhaps we could take care of some normal/routine needs before having huge new projects and many special use ideas.

I would call for the agenda to be released much earlier to the public -- that is, if you want the public to be involved, and it appears that you don't.

The minutes are a joke. Who can refer to such written documents to see what happened?

If this is all too stressful for staff, then they should try working in the private sector where people stay late and take work home.

We would like to see the needs of present citizens addressed (such as the fence just constructed next door to me and their rotting trees, to which staff responded but failed to enforce or even explain the rules) rather than continual building for future citizens and their needs.

By the way, how is it that the matter of fireworks was not included in a future agenda and merely announced extra shifts in the paper? I wrote comments that were ignored, and was one of the ones most involved in getting the ban. Instead, it was shuffled off to some sub-committee or something, meetings cancelled, and now it's too late to explore important other ways. We let the sellers tell us how they don't sell to Lawrence residents because they have to start too late, how they are local people, yet don't live in Lawrence, what laws are somewhere else, and one said that we should just go to Overland Park for the day. The agenda had no legal resources, state or local laws, or other reasons for the ban. Fireworks are more than a one-day problem in Lawrence.

Please check your records, because we have already begun fireworks season, on the Friday before KU graduation. The dispatcher told me that there had been calls around town.

Bobbie Walthall

To: mike amyx
Subject: RE: Change of city commission meetings

From: mike amyx [<mailto:mikeamyx515@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 11:50 AM
To: Bobbie Walthall
Subject: Fwd: Change of city commission meetings

Hi Bobbie,
Would you forward this e-mail to the rest of the commission.
Thanks,
Mike

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Alderson, Betty J." <adkab@ku.edu>
Date: June 6, 2016 at 9:27:08 PM CDT
To: "mikeamyx515@hotmail.com" <mikeamyx515@hotmail.com>
Subject: Change of city commission meetings

Dear Mayor Amyx,

I read with some concern the article about cutting out public opportunities to attend city commission meetings that was in the Journal World this morning. I had seen the item listed in the commission agenda last week and assumed that it would be a topic of discussion at the meeting June 7. According to the paper I understand that an ordinance has already been prepared for acceptance tomorrow night.

In my opinion, any time the public is omitted from early considerations of public items it becomes possible for the public to feel that they are not important to the commission for you will make the decisions for us. I no longer attend meetings as often as I once did but I have known that I could attend every week. It is time consuming to be a commissioner; however, I think that anyone who runs for such an office knows that from the very beginning. I do believe that the suggestion of more study sessions is a good one provided that the public can attend those meetings with the understanding that it is a study session for the commissioners.

This should not be undertaken with such speed. Give the members of the public time for input that might prove helpful to the commissioners when they make this decision.

Thanks Mike for your consideration of my concern, please share this with the other commissioners.

Betty Alderson