

Speaker 1 ([00:04:40](#)):

Yep, I'm ready. Sherry,

Speaker 2 ([00:04:44](#)):

You ready?

Speaker 3 ([00:04:44](#)):

I just need one minute just so I can get the zoom meeting up.

Speaker 2 ([00:05:07](#)):

Okay. Welcome everyone to the June 3rd, 2025 C commission meeting and we will stop by having Sherry read the rules of the meeting.

Speaker 3 ([00:05:27](#)):

Good evening everyone. If you would please silence your cell phones to minimize distractions during the meeting. The primary format for accessing or participating in this meeting is in person at City Hall. Virtual access to view or participate in the meeting cannot be guaranteed. The chat function will not be monitored. If you have any trouble, the meeting can be viewed on the city's YouTube channel and cable channel 25. When the mayor calls for public comment, please approach the podium to indicate you wish to speak. Virtual participants should use the raise hand function. When prompted, select join as panelist. There will be a brief delay as your role changes. Once your name is called, please unmute and turn on your camera to provide your comments. All comments will be limited to three minutes. Please state your name and zip code before speaking. The city reserves the right to turn videos off or mute participants. Thank you Vice Mayor.

Speaker 2 ([00:06:20](#)):

Thank you. The first item on the agenda is to approve the agenda. The city commission reserves the right to amend, supplement, reorder the agenda during the meeting, so a motion

Speaker 4 ([00:06:31](#)):

Move to approve the agenda.

Speaker 5 ([00:06:32](#)):

Second

Speaker 2 ([00:06:33](#)):

Motion by Commissioner Littlejohn, second by Commissioner Lawson. All those in favor say aye. Aye. He said it. Did he say aye?

Speaker 5 ([00:06:43](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:43](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 2 ([00:06:45](#)):

Thank you. Mary Dev was line. Okay. We have full proclamations tonight in recognitions and the first one is the recognition of the hundredth anniversary of the side chapter of the Delta Sigma Theta Society and I think Maya Cross is here. Maybe

Speaker 3 ([00:07:03](#)):

Let me look and see if she's online. I don't think she was attending virtually, but I want to check.

Speaker 2 ([00:07:21](#)):

Well,

Speaker 3 ([00:07:22](#)):

I don't see any am Maya is on, so let me move her.

Speaker 2 ([00:07:25](#)):

She is online. Yep,

Speaker 3 ([00:07:26](#)):

She is. Let

Speaker 2 ([00:07:26](#)):

Me, okay, excellent.

Speaker 3 ([00:07:27](#)):

Promoted to panelist.

Speaker 2 ([00:07:41](#)):

Okay. Maya, if you're available to say a few words,

Speaker 6 ([00:07:46](#)):

McKayla Holmes is speaking on my behalf. She should be in person.

Speaker 2 ([00:07:52](#)):

Who was the name again?

Speaker 6 ([00:07:54](#)):

McKayla

Speaker 4 ([00:07:55](#)):

Holmes.

Speaker 2 ([00:07:57](#)):

Okay. Is there a McKayla Holmes in the room? Well, she's not here at the moment. While we will move that proclamation to the end, we have three others. We'll do that. We'll come back to you Maya, and then McKayla you said. Okay, we'll check on that. We'll come back to that. So the second proclamation then is

to proclaim June 4th, 2025 is United Way of Car Valley Day of Giving. And Kathy Smith and Julie Ling, you're all Thanks Sha being here.

Speaker 7 ([00:08:36](#)):

Thank you. And thank you. I'm Kathy Smith. The zip code is 6 6 0 4 9 and my colleague Judy Riling, I'm Judy Riling and I have the same zip code. Just want to show our appreciation for recognizing the work that United Way does all year long and with our day of Giving tomorrow where we will be highlighting many of our community partners in the good work that they do in Douglas County. So thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:09:03](#)):

Great. Well, it's always a big day and I'm glad it wasn't your day because the rain would've slowed you down, but tomorrow will be much better, but big day for United Way of Car Valley. So I'll read the proclamation. Whereas the United Way of Car Valley creates and cultivates an unbreakable network of support for healthy and resilient communities and whereas United Way is committed to the success of the whole family in all its forms, recognizing that success of one individual in the family is inextricably linked to the success of everyone. And whereas United Way invests and manages millions of dollars to help ensure that regardless of the zip code, every family and individual has access to the resources to live, learn, and thrive. And whereas United Way thinks and acts strategically about volunteering to increase the capacity of the local nonprofit community to serve our neighbors in need.

([00:09:56](#)):

And whereas United Way convenes conversations among donors, partners, and stakeholders to create a common understanding of our greatest challenges and to generate better, more inclusive and achievable solutions. And whereas this work is not possible without donor support and individuals across Lawrence that have the ability to invest in this work on United Way of Car Valley's 2025 Day of Giving. Now, therefore, I, Brad Finkel, I vice mayor of the city of Lawrence, to hereby proclaim June 4th, 2025 as the United Way of Car Valley Day of Giving and good luck tomorrow. Hope you raise a lot of money.

Speaker 7 ([00:10:37](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:10:38](#)):

That'll be great. You too. Okay, next proclamation is to proclaim June 6th, 2025 as National Gun Violence Awareness Day. And let's see Ms. Brook from the Douglas County Moms Demand Action.

Speaker 8 ([00:10:59](#)):

Lana Carter Brooks 6 6 0 4 9. Good evening. My name is Lana Carter Brook and I'm a volunteer with the Kansas Chapter of Moms Demand to Action for Gun Sense in America, a grassroots volunteer led organization that seeks to reduce gun violence in the United States through a combination of advocacy, education and community engagement. I'm here alongside other volunteers, actually only one today, but from Lawrence Douglas County to express solidarity with victims and survivors of gun suicides, homicides, and unintentional shootings. Every day in the United States, more than 120 people are killed by a gun. Well over half of those are suicides and in Kansas the figure is almost 70%. According to the Annals of Internal Medicine, the presence of a gun in the home triples the risk of death by suicide. Most people who attempt suicide a gun survive and most who survive once do not die by suicide later.

([00:12:01](#)):

Meanwhile, homicides cause more than 40% of gun deaths in America and almost 30% in Kansas. Unarmed people often get caught in the crossfire like Pendleton. The 15-year-old whose 2013 death in

Chicago inspired the wear orange movement. We have all seen that even here in Lawrence, altercations have escalated because to homicide, because of the presence of a gun. Domestic violence is also a driving force in gun homicide. According to the American Journal of Public Health, a gun in the home increases the risk of murder by an intimate partner by 500%. In Kansas, as in the rest of the United States, guns are now the leading cause of death for children and teens. Each year more than 2,600 American kids are killed by someone else with a gun. For children under 13, these deaths are usually connected to domestic violence or the unsafe storage of firearms by adults in the home.

(00:13:02):

Of course, gun violence can alter the course of a person's life without ending it. Every day in the US some 200 people suffer debilitating or even irreparable injuries at a cost not just of medical treatment, but of earning potential that can't be recovered. Also affected are the families, friends and loved ones of those killed and injured who themselves become mourners and sometimes caregivers and witnesses to shootings who might relive their trauma for years. We aim to make our communities safer by supporting policies like background checks on all gun sales and red flag laws to keep guns away from people who are a threat to themselves and others. We also support programs like Be Smart, which educates gun owning adults to keep their weapons unloaded and locked up with ammunition stored separately. But our work begins by supporting victims and survivors in observing National Gun Violence Awareness Day by Wearing orange on Friday, June 6th. We honor them and we dedicate our efforts to them.

Speaker 2 (00:14:10):

Thank you for those words. I'll read the proclamation. Every day 120 Americans are killed by gun violence. More than 200 Americans are shot and wounded. There's an average of nearly 18,000 gun homicides every year, and Americans are 26 times more likely to die of gun homicide than people in other high income countries. Whereas Kansas has the 22nd highest rate of gun deaths in the United States with 473 gun deaths every year, a rate of 16.2 deaths for a hundred thousand people and cost the state \$5.7 billion each year of which 95.1 million is paid by the taxpayers. And whereas gun violence prevention is more important ever as we witness an increase in firearm suicides, homicides, and non-fatal shootings across the country and in our community. Whereas in January, 2013, 15-year-old Hydro Pendleton was tragically shot and killed and her classmates chose the color orange to honor her and raise awareness of gun violence across the United States.

(00:15:13):

And whereas we will wear orange on June 6th, 2025 to raise awareness of gun violence and pay tribute to Hydro Pendleton and other victims and survivors of gun violence as well as the loved ones of those affected. And whereas we renew our commitment to reduce gun violence and pledge to do all we can to keep firearms out of the hands of people who should not have access to them and encourage responsible gun ownership to keep our families and communities safe. Now therefore, I Brad Finkel, I vice mayor of the City of Lawrence to hear by Proclaim Friday, June 6th, 2025 as National Gun Violence Awareness Day and encourage all citizens to support their local community efforts to prevent the tragic effects of gun violence and to honor and value human life. Thank you. Okay, looks like a group's coming in and next proclamation is to proclaim the month of June as LG BT Qia A plus pride month. And looks like we have a whole group which Shania, who's speaking first?

Speaker 9 (00:16:26):

Hello Commissioners.

(00:16:28):

Hello, my name is Shania Lopez Cabrera, the director of Lawrence Pride, and I have our board and the community behind me. I would like to thank you all for once again to clearing June as pride month in Lawrence. Truly, this year has been difficult for our community. Our trans members especially have been

subjected to hateful rhetoric, physical violence, and an onslaught of legislative attacks from our state and federal government. Even at the local level, many in our community are worried that the rights that they have fought for will be stripped away throughout the month. Lgbtqia plus people and allies will celebrate the diversity of our community. Fabulously, of course. I mean look at the people behind me and most importantly, visibly because pride is a protest against the voices and systems that wish to drive us back into hiding and even to destroy us as young queer Kansan. I hope to one day move to Lawrence because I had heard that it was a place where I could be myself. I know I'm not alone in this experience and I just ask as you that you let yourself continue to be guided by our city's values, especially that of courage as you navigate what's ahead for our community. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:17:43](#)):

Thank you. Thank you so much. Maybe remind when the parade is it's coming up.

Speaker 9 ([00:17:51](#)):

Yes. June 7th, 11:00 AM in downtown Lawrence and a huge party in the park from 12 to eight afterward.

Speaker 2 ([00:17:58](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 9 ([00:17:59](#)):

After party at the Granada eight.

Speaker 2 ([00:18:01](#)):

Okay. Full day. Okay. I'll read the proclamation. Where's the month of June? Holds historical significance rooted in the Stonewall in riot of 1969, often recognized as the catalyst for the modern American LGBTQIA plus liberation movement. And whereas individually and collectively members of Lawrence and Douglas Counties, lgbtqia plus community contribute greatly to neighborhood revitalization, economic vitality, arts and culture, and the social fabric of our city, county, state, and country. And whereas LGBTQIA plus pride is defined as the positive stance against discrimination and violence towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and or LGBTQIA plus individuals and to promote their self-determination, personal identity, and equal rights, as well as increase the visibility as a community and celebrates sexual diversity and gender variance. And whereas Lawrence and Douglas County prides itself on inclusiveness as one of the first counties in the region to have a domestic partnership registry and protects its residents from discrimination and harassment based on actual perceived race, color, sex, religion, disability, age, marital status, place of both families with children, sexual orientation or natural national origin.

([00:19:23](#)):

And we are committed to continue social progress and the cause of human rights celebrating the great diversity of our community, and whereas the city of Lawrence remains committed to protecting the civil rights of all members of the LGBTQIA plus community. Now, therefore, I, Brad Finkel, I vice mayor of the city of Lawrence, do hereby proclaim June, 2025 as lgbtqia plus pride month in the city of Lawrence and encourage all residents to join an ending prejudice everywhere it may exist, respecting the rights of all people and to celebrate the diversity and richness of our city and country. Thank you so much. Okay. Thank you. Okay. We had one other recognition. Did McKayla show McKayla's here? Okay, there you're all. Okay. The hundredth anniversary of Delta Sigma Felt Society Inc. The side chapter.

Speaker 6 ([00:20:30](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 2 ([00:20:30](#)):

Hello.

Speaker 6 ([00:20:31](#)):

Hello. First, I just want to thank the city of Lawrence for recognizing our centennial celebration. I am accepting this recognition on behalf of Maya Cross, our president, the side chapter, just a little bit of history.

([00:20:49](#)):

The SAI chapter was charted at the University of Kansas on June 5th, 1925 and has the distinction of being the oldest chapter of Delta Sigma Theta in Kansas. The charter members are Moad Young, Arman, flora Bell Barber, Lucille Rogers, ard, Danielle Mason, miles Green, Ruth, Greg, Mildred Ingram, Mary Bennett, Jackson, Marie Jackson Johnson, Ruth Johnson, Edward Southward, Peterson, and Anna Rogers. We are a 2025 reactivation line. It was reactivated by 10 members, starting with Anaya, Dewey, Mikayla Holmes, precious Mwangi, Dakota, Harris, Naomi Richardson, Richardson, sorry, Leslie Kofi, Charlie and sorry, Kerrigan Foster. That's good work. Maya Cross and Mia Collins. Sorry, it takes me a while to get all of it. So yes, that is all I have for you, and we just want to thank you again.

Speaker 2 ([00:22:09](#)):

Excellent. Well thank you for that and good memory there, by the way. Excellent. And yeah, a hundred years is a big deal, so congratulations on that. I'll read the proclamation. Where's the side chapter of the Delta Sigma? Theta Sorority, Inc. Was chartered on the campus of the University of Kansas on June 5th, 1925 in Lawrence, Kansas, making it the first chapter of the Delta Sigma Theta sorority in the state of Kansas. And whereas 12 phenomenal charter members committed to sisterhood, scholarship service, promoting academic excellence, providing assistance to those in need, and addressing the social issues of the time. And whereas their vision and dedication, both a chapter that would reflect the major programs of the sorority that are based upon the five point programmatic thrust, economic development, educational development, international awareness and involvement, physical and mental health and political awareness and involvement. Whereas the City of Lawrence is honored to recognize and celebrate the contributions of the side chapter of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. As past and current members reunite to the chapter's anniversary celebrating 100 years at the University of Kansas. Now therefore, I, Brad Finkel die Vice Mayor of the Sea of Lawrence, along with my fellow commissioners to hereby recognize the 100th anniversary of the side chapter of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc. And urge all and members and alumni and supporters to commemorate this historic milestone with pride, reflection, and renew commitment to the values upon which this chapter was founded. Thank you so much. Thank you.

([00:23:47](#)):

Okay. Thank you everyone there for the proclamations and we can let folks go out if you don't want to stay for the next part. The next part is the consent agenda. Items on the consent agenda are considered under one motion and approve by one motion. Members of the governing body may remove items for separate discussion if desired, members of the public may remove items identified as quasi-judicial for separate discussion. If desired, members of the public will be limited to three minutes. Full comment. And I think Commissioner Lawson, among others, we're going to pull resolution six a c, six A C six B and C seven E, correct? Is that correct? And that would be the Vision zero transportation plan, the resolution 7,600 related to the amendments related to the Kansas Open Meeting Act. And then C seven E is related to the Baer Street Block Party. Any other items to be pulled? See none for Mayor Devo either. We will look for a motion on the, oh, I don't think there's any quasi-judicial. Confirm that.

Speaker 4 ([00:25:04](#)):

No, I don't believe so.

Speaker 2 ([00:25:04](#)):

Okay. I look for a motion on the rest of the consent agenda.

Speaker 5 ([00:25:08](#)):

Move to approve the consent agenda with the exceptions of C six A, C six B, and

Speaker 2 ([00:25:15](#)):

C 70.

Speaker 4 ([00:25:16](#)):

Second,

Speaker 2 ([00:25:17](#)):

It's a motion by Commissioner Lawson, a second by Commissioner Littlejohn. All those in favor say aye.
Aye. Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:25:23](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 2 ([00:25:24](#)):

Aye. Passes four to zero and we'll take those in order. C six A is the Vision zero. Transportation Safety Action Plan And Commissioner Lawson?

Speaker 5 ([00:25:35](#)):

Yeah, that was, you can go ahead. That was brought up by one of our community members, so go ahead.
Thank you.

Speaker 10 ([00:25:41](#)):

Oh, I'm just here.

Speaker 5 ([00:25:42](#)):

Oh, to answer a question

Speaker 10 ([00:25:43](#)):

Staff if you have questions.

Speaker 5 ([00:25:44](#)):

Okay, there you go. Yeah, I was so surprised you're up there. Hi David.

Speaker 11 ([00:25:49](#)):

Hello, David Baston Commissioners, as you consider the Vision Zero transportation Safety Action Plan and adopt resolution 75 98. I urge you to recognize this critical safety initiative intersect with three pressing challenges Lawrence has face. I did notice that, and this is related to funding. I did notice that the Department of Homeland Security had Lawrence and Douglas County listed as a sanctuary jurisdiction designation. And then we have some potential conflicts between our DEI policies and federal law. And then I've mentioned before the Ordinance 1 0 1 21, which basically from the way I see it discriminates against students and housing. And I did send a letter in that's at the end of this packet. So if anybody at the public wants to read that or you guys want to read that in this in detail, I'd urge you to do that. And my concern is just not only this crucial program that we have here could lose federal funding, but we have a lot of other programs that are in jeopardy of losing that funding too. And if something's not done, are you guys willing to tell the community that they're basically going to have to come up with these extra money in taxes? I mean, it's got to get paid for somewhere or drop the programs. So just a heads up on that too, so we don't lose this funding and other funding to look at those. Appreciate your time. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:28:00](#)):

Okay, bring back the commissioners. Have any questions for staff or No? Okay. Since it's been pulled, would anyone else like to make a public comment on the Vision Zero transportation plan?

Speaker 12 ([00:28:20](#)):

Hi, I am Chris Flowers. I did not prepare for this, but I saw zero. If this is about reaching zero fatalities from car crashes like they do in Europe, I think it should be up to the public because to reach zero car crashes we'd have to lower speed limits. But we've also had the, it comes out every four years I think, where we'd list our priorities and then one that's always at the top is, gosh, I forget the word now, but getting traffic through as not as fast as possible but in a timely manner. So those two things kind of, I think they conflict with each other, so I think I would like to see the city, I don't know, engage more with the public and everyone, not just certain groups, but like everyone, and find out how many car crashes are we willing to have to get where we want to go on time because I'm not willing to go zero car crashes if it means we have to go 20 miles all the time. I'm willing to risk my life for happiness. So thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:29:50](#)):

Thank you. Chris. Seeing no public comment in the room, any public comment online?

Speaker 3 ([00:29:58](#)):

No.

Speaker 2 ([00:29:59](#)):

Okay. Bring that back to us and comments?

Speaker 5 ([00:30:07](#)):

No, I'll make a

Speaker 2 ([00:30:09](#)):

Motion. I would just say, Chris, you should read the plan. It talks about a lot of those things and trying to find that right balance, so appreciate the work the committee did on that and the public participation they did put into it. It's an ambitious plan. Of course it goes through now to 2050, so we have a long way to go, but yes, open full motion. Yes,

Speaker 5 ([00:30:30](#)):

I moved to approve the Vision Zero Transportation Safety Action Plan and adopt resolution number 7 5 9
8

Speaker 4 ([00:30:38](#)):

Second

Speaker 2 ([00:30:39](#)):

Motion by Commissioner Lawson, second by Commissioner Littlejohn. All those in favor say aye. Aye.
Aye. Aye. Passes 4, 2, 0. Now we'll move to C six B, which is the resolution about the meeting order and
Commissioner Lawson, you pulled that item

Speaker 5 ([00:30:59](#)):

Again. David had asked that I pull that.

Speaker 11 ([00:31:05](#)):

Hello David Bassett again. Yeah, I just wanted to express my concern regarding this decision as outlined in resolution 7,600 to discontinue streaming the city commission meetings on the city's YouTube channel. Instead solely rely on Zoom webinars for real-time public access rather than complying with this requirement by including general public comment and the YouTube live streaming, and I think it's on city that Channel 25 also the city has chosen to eliminate the live stream on this accessible platform. The decision raises serious questions about city's commitment to ensuring residents can stay informed about the decisions that are discussed during the meetings and periodic concerns voiced by other citizens. I know this was moved to the end public comment, general public comments were moved to the end over a year ago and then not live streamed and I think this is all, sorry.

([00:32:45](#)):

Let's see. I just request some clarification on the following points. Again, I sent a letter to you guys at the end of this packet if you guys want to read it in full. And also if any of the public wants to read it, you can scroll down to the end of the packet. Given that the Zoom webinar allows real-time viewing of the entire meeting, including general public comment, will the city ensure that the full meeting, including this segment is included in the recordings posted on YouTube the following day or whenever it becomes available, excluding general public comment from recordings would further limit the public's ability to stay informed about the community's concerns raised during these meetings contrary to the intent of KOMA? Yeah, and this was all basically because of Senate Bill 70, which I advocated for. Just consider those things please. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:34:07](#)):

Thank you David, and we did get your letter there. Any questions before we open it to public comment?
Just go ahead and public comment. We'll go ahead and let people do

Speaker 13 ([00:34:17](#)):

That.

Speaker 14 ([00:34:20](#)):

So David's last concern is my chief concern. The only reason to do this is so that you can curate the record and the three of you probably didn't dream this up. It was one of these idiots over here and it's a

sad thing that Craig can't be here to take responsibility for his behavior and for the actions that he's doing against public comment. But let's go over the death rows that you guys have gone through to try to limit the speech of the public. Ms. Larson, you've ridiculed public by claiming that they were wrong when the chief just lied to you. Then you and City Commission candidate Shipley back here made up some lies about how you felt threatened by me walking out with you asking questions. I noticed that I'm still here tonight after two weeks ago sitting down there asking you questions as you actually left the building, maybe Mr.

(00:35:12):

Finkel could give the school district a little advice about their trespassing policies because it's obvious the city doesn't want to go there, but you first cut down consent. If we all remember way back and let's talk about why citizens can't hold consent items, and I believe that was when commission candidate Shipley was the mayor, they had to limit the citizen's ability to pull consent items because I stood at this podium and said, well, why don't I just pull all the consent items and talk with the whole night, just the insinuation that I might do that. And boom, we have rule changes. You guys are nuts. Then you had to move public comment to the end like that was going to stop anything. Now you just forced us to be here for the whole meeting so that we can talk about other things. That was just dumb.

(00:36:06):

You guys have gone through all these motions to limit to shut people down, even Amber and her little stage show running off the day and trying to get sympathy from the newspapers over here that carry water for you guys and carry your lies, which is why we have to bring our own cameras so that we can prove your lies in the end. And that's happened repeatedly. It's pathetic then in some idea that you had that everything up here was performative everything. And I've heard this from you guys, that it's all performative, especially from these knuckleheads, that it's just performative that I'm just up here for a paycheck, that I'm just doing this for money. God, you guys, and if you're going to blame YouTube's policies about why you have to do this because you're afraid of what might be seen, let me refresh you in case city staff has misled you about YouTube's policies, the only reason you would need to censor content is if your whole goal is to make money. Because if you notice, I upload picture videos every day with the word bitch. Shit, fuck, fuck you motherfucker. And all those words, and I'm still there.

Speaker 3 (00:37:21):

Time.

Speaker 15 (00:37:30):

Good evening all John Martin. 66. Oh 46. I came that night not really prepared and I'm on painkillers, so this may not be as clear as I like. So I rise in opposition to the city removing the live broadcast from the YouTube channel, and let me remind you or kind of inform you of why the city's profess vision is the city of Lawrence supporting an mistakenly vibrant community with an innovative, equitable, transparent, and responsible local governments broadcasting live city meetings including public comment is a transparent process and any step away from that removes trust in your local government. The values that the city of Lawrence professes, you're committed to character, competence, courage, collaboration, and commitment. Character always matters in elected leaders. And when you remove trust from that equation, character becomes in question and that removes your ability to govern effectively. Competence. Again, trust. You have to trust in your elected officials.

(00:38:47):

If you want the trust of the community. Courage, it takes courage to sit in that chair. I've been in that chair, I know it's not easy. I know that it's never easy facing an angry public, but I think it's something you need to do to deal with three minutes at a time. Collaboration. Again, collaboration takes trust, and when you remove transparency from the equation, trust goes out the window. And with everything we

have going on in Lawrence, especially with the budget and the tax rates and stuff, we've got to be able to trust our local government. Otherwise things are going to get worse. So commitment, I would ask you guys to recommit to being transparent in your local government in the job you're doing. Again, I respect the job you're doing. I respect the chair, but I think we can do better and I would ask that you would not remove public comments from the live broadcasts and you would continue to do live broadcasts on YouTube. So thank you all.

Speaker 13 ([00:39:47](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 16 ([00:39:52](#)):

I came from Texas to come visit with you guys and gals. I'm a vet, a veteran, and what made me come up here, I was in Wichita training with Eddie Gallagher on a kill house long time, a long time ago I was a cop with a military, did my stuff, but one thing as a veteran that I know, I've served two tours. I'm a Jewish veteran and I bring that up for a reason. This town should have that American flag loud and proud. Y'all, you should honor people's their words, whatever they're saying and just acknowledge it. One thing that bothers me, and I've seen y'all do it, I pulled your oath of office every one of you and y'all signed it. Littlejohn did something. I guess that's you, right? Mark Littlejohn is that you? We pulled up your oath of office and on there it says something about perjury.

([00:40:43](#)):

You're supposed to do something with the constitution, supposed to honor the nstitute of the Kansas constitution. You guys and gals have not. Absolutely have not. You have abused people's rights here. You have absolutely arrested them, trespassed them because your feelings. I was in Thailand and it was a kingdom. Let me tell you about Thailand. You drop a bill with the king's picture on it and you step on it, you go to jail. They jail journalists for thinking and possibly intimating something's going down on somebody in terms of their words, their thoughts. They were thinking in advance. This is what they said negatively you guys, this is in America. This is a red communist state and this just pisses me off. I come up here 500 miles to say, you guys got to clean your act up. I watch you guys, you've aggrieved this man right here, Justin spies because of what their words, because their viewpoints dd from yours.

([00:41:44](#)):

There's case law that's substantiates everything. I know there's a lawsuit coming and that's ridiculous. You know guys have perjured yourselves, 100% every one of you. You're using the 10 badges back here to enforce your will. Oh, it's our building, it's our words. No, it's the people of this city that own this place. You're there because of them and you forgot about it and I think you have, but one of the things that just really just pisses me off, I interviewed a bunch of the ladies and gals with the numbers on their arms. Jewish people from the camps and what you are doing and what you have done is reminiscent of the brown shirts of 1930s. They stripped the Jews rights exactly like you're doing to the citizens of this town. You're limiting their speech. You're doing everything to stop hurting your feelings, girl a pair. Y'all get real. Get a little bit of moxie behind you. Be proud that you got elected under a flag. You guys and gals got up there because of what you want to be good for the community, an agenda and what have you. I just came back from, I wanted to say, Hey, time, thank you. I'm here because these guys have been abridged and have been hurt.

Speaker 13 ([00:42:59](#)):

Thank you

Speaker 17 ([00:43:08](#)):

John M 6, 6 0 4, 9. I can't begin to do honor to the prior speakers on this issue, but I'm a taxpayer citizen here and from my perspective, you have consistently made it more difficult for citizens to speak their words. You've maneuvered things to be late in the evening. The county puts us up almost the second thing on the agenda. You've made it more difficult to watch in terms of real time. So I'm not proud of the changes you have made and I certainly agree with the prior speakers. I think you should change the rules that you've instituted on this issue. Thank you.

Speaker 13 ([00:43:47](#)):

Thank

Speaker 17 ([00:43:47](#)):

You.

Speaker 18 ([00:43:54](#)):

Christina McKenna. 6 6 0 4 6. First I'm here to say thank you. Reading the official pride proclamation is a big deal. Celebrating voices is a big deal. A few of the other proclamations they ask you for courage. This though 7,600, that's cowardice. We must celebrate our winds as we struggle through the mounting pile of crap that's being loaded on us every single day. However, I'm here right now to hold your feet to the fire like we're supposed to do with our leadership. You're supposed to represent the people of this city, the people who choose to call Lawrence their home. Yet you're trying to create silence. Again, I've been here before talking to a different set of faces. Some of 'em are the same. Back when we had to remind you the bathroom usage isn't supposed to matter and then we have a unisex one at home. You created a safe haven that was important too, back when public comment was actually part of the meeting.

([00:44:52](#)):

So you put us to the very end to try to not inconvenience yourselves. You have to listen to a lot of us for hours stating what we want from our democratically chosen leadership. And sadly, you've been listening less and less to our voices. You talk about throwing money at programs. You know what? Just get out there and talk to us. We can tell you exactly what we're looking for in our leadership. We only get three minutes, three lousy minutes for each of us to come up here and tell you our hearts. That is not enough. So you push us to make it easier on you. Well, you won the round of moving it to the end. Then you decided not to broadcast the public comment to silence us more, and now you're trying to stop live streaming. Not only is this a blow to the shred of transparency that we get from you, but you're also going to be silencing the accessibility, the people who are differently able than us.

([00:45:47](#)):

The accessibility voices in our community that is discrimination. Call it what you want to give us reasons that you want to and flavor it however you want to. It's discrimination and shame on you for bringing that back into the leadership positions in another way. I thought you'd learn before that we and Lawrence really don't like that. So for Lawrence, where I'm proud and honored to be part of you, apparently we're going to have to attend every single meeting to keep our leadership accountable. We'll push the transparency back into uncomfortable levels like we've done before. We know exactly what is being attempted and we are not here for that. We are here to hold you accountable and to tell you what we need from you. We, the people put you in your seats. So quick question, how much of our money does it save to end the transparency of live streaming compared to other options we actually support?

Speaker 13 ([00:46:42](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 19 ([00:46:47](#)):

Hey, you guys doing

Speaker 13 ([00:46:48](#)):

Good?

Speaker 19 ([00:46:50](#)):

Yeah. Y'all just sit there mute. I said how you guys doing?

Speaker 2 ([00:46:56](#)):

I said good.

Speaker 19 ([00:46:57](#)):

Oh, okay. I didn't hear you. You're going to have to speak up. I got hearing problems veteran shit. Something I don't think you guys really seem to care about. Seems like you got a transparency problem around here. Is that true? How many times you got to hear to people speak before you do something or you're just going to sit on your asses and just laugh, smirk, pretend like you're paying attention. I am a visitor here and it only took me 10 minutes of driving around this town to realize that there's something seriously wrong with this city. Just about every single government building out there renovated, knew this, knew that you're putting an extension on the sheriff's department. You got the police department going to a new building and this and that, and you got these restaurants that have great food that are struggling to pay their damn taxes. Where's all this money going?

([00:48:06](#)):

Spoke to a tyrant right here. Spoke to this tyrant right here for three minutes and already within three minutes found an unconstitutional order that your city has against soliciting. Do you guys know anything about free speech, accountability, transparency? What kind of fucking circus are you all running up here? I'm sitting here trying to be compassionate with you, let you know what's going on and y'all just sitting there with blank fucking stairs on your face. Do you know that there's a row of houses behind the sheriff's department, nice little cute houses, all manicured good. The owners love them. You know what? They don't fucking love the fact that they can't park in front of their fucking houses because these cops and your sheriffs are taking up all the goddamn parking spaces there with their private cars. Do you know anything about that? No, you don't because you don't fucking care about the people in your city. It's that fucking simple. Adios. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:49:45](#)):

Any other public? Oh, it looks like someone's coming in.

Speaker 20 ([00:49:53](#)):

Hello? Well, hearing everybody's public comments was very, very aggressive. Everybody needs to work on everything. And actually I came up here asking for some type of understanding on the no camping band that's ski for is August 15th.

Speaker 2 ([00:50:20](#)):

We're talking about the public,

Speaker 20 ([00:50:22](#)):

This

Speaker 2 ([00:50:22](#)):

One ordinance first. We'll have open public comment later, but if it's related to the

Speaker 20 ([00:50:27](#)):

Yes,

Speaker 2 ([00:50:28](#)):

Yes. Okay.

Speaker 20 ([00:50:28](#)):

Yes it is.

Speaker 2 ([00:50:29](#)):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 20 ([00:50:31](#)):

Well, that right there, the whole public comment if you take this, what am I trying to say? Transparency. Like this said, yes, that's really important to us, to the whole community, to everybody. I mean there's a lot of misunderstandings. There are a lot of, I feel very, I don't know, confused about everybody's aggression towards the city and the city. Aggression towards you guys. I am. Well, we all have to be on the same page. There's no other way that any of this can work. We all have to be together. I don't know how that's going to work or how that's going to happen, but hope we can figure it out because after hearing everybody's comments, I'm what happened to Lawrence? I'm just saying. That's all I have to say.

Speaker 13 ([00:51:46](#)):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 21 ([00:51:56](#)):

David Collins, 6 6 0 4 9. I just wanted to come up and say that I support what was said by the gentleman with his arm in his sling. I don't know his name, but I think that transparency is an important thing. The one aspect of this particular resolution that I'm concerned about is whether I just don't know the answer because I haven't been able to find it in news reports, is whether stopping the live streaming of the meeting will make it difficult for people to know what's happening in the meeting in order to make a relevant public comment at the end of the meeting or whenever you have. Does that prevent people from being able to witness what's happening when it's happening? That's my earlier comment. Thank you. Thank you

Speaker 22 ([00:53:10](#)):

Howard.

([00:53:14](#)):

Hi, Howard Callahan. I've worked in homeless social work for a long, long time. That's relevant in this context because if anybody that knows anything about the history of disability rights or liberation movements knows that the space for advocacy is not guaranteed. Anybody that's dealt with or a repressive regime or organization knows that they will try to isolate and silence you. And I realized that there are

times that folks could make an argument that this platform might be being used inappropriately, but when it comes to the ability for people to self-advocate in a manner that their voices are heard by both their electeds and the community that has a stake in the kinds of decisions that are made. Once that's gone, we won't hear it. We won't know. We'll lose the ability to actually notice that the canary and the coal mine stop singing. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 23 ([00:54:37](#)):

Hi, I am Meryl S 6 6 0 4 9. I'd like to ask to you to oppose resolution 7 6 0 0 and maintain the live stream and also maintain and bring back the live stream of the public comments. I feel like it's important for people to participate in their government and the rules that are being made and I think not live streaming the city commission meetings and also what's currently happening now, not showing the public comments is taking away the people's capacity to participate in their government and be represented by their government and the rules that are being made. Thank you.

Speaker 12 ([00:55:32](#)):

Hi, I'm Chris Flowers. I'd just like to start off saying why have we not had public input about how our meetings are run? We've been talking about this for what, three years at least. Why have you not done? How important is public comment or what order should the meeting be ran in? You've never done public input to get the public's actual feelings about this subject. Also, you all claim you're doing it to stop the few bad apples. But I'm going to say right now all your changes have not stopped Doctor speeds or Lauren's accountability from showing up or myself, I don't know if I'm one of 'em, but look at tonight there's more. Look, there's more people with cameras recording. If you go through with this, you're not stopping them, you're increasing them. You're stopping the people you claim you're doing it for the rest of the people, but that's who you're stopping.

([00:56:39](#)):

And if I'm being honest, I think that's how it's intended. You act like you don't like the wild cards, but it's the normal people. You don't like it when a bunch of them come and talk for an hour. That's what you're trying to stop and you're using the wild ones as your cover. That's what I think. And also future predictions about what's going to happen. I think someone will start streaming it themselves and you might think it's going to be maybe Lauren's accountability, maybe someone else, maybe it's one of the social media people we already have, and I've heard some of them on Facebook. They can be pretty quick to ban people. So just think about that. If one of them starts streaming and then on the YouTube now comments are turned off, they might turn comments on. So you want to talk about toxic, that's going to be much more toxic than what you have now. Also, if you do go through this, are you going to put public comment back at the beginning since you moved it to the end because well, we can't stream it unless we move it to the end or whatever. So I just want to point that out.

([00:58:00](#)):

Oh, performative. Yeah. All politics is performative. You all are as performative as we are when you are running for office. Oh yeah. And minimum wage, rent control, sanctuary, city, all this stuff. We can't find loopholes around that. But my god, transparency in government, that's what we are going to fight and find the loophole for. I say get rid of our city manager. Seriously. Amen. Yes, thank you. Go ahead

Speaker 24 ([00:58:42](#)):

Patrick Ross. 6 6 0 4 0 9. I'd echo a lot of the comments said earlier. I would also question when public comment would be held if that change was made, I question why the change is being made. So I'd like the city to explicitly state why they're doing it. And if there's an issue with YouTube, let's see what happens. First would be my suggestion. If there is a problem, then we'll change it. If not, then let's just kind of keep it the way it is. It seems to work well. Although I would say some of the changes we made in the last

year, I disagree with, I also just flat out believe that if we don't live broadcast the meetings less people would engage. Because even I knowing how to navigate the portal website, it's still kind of confusing and finicky. And so it's just, if the whole goal is to have politics that represent the people, the citizens of Lawrence, I flat out disagree with this decision helping with that.

(00:59:37):

I would also question the reasons behind it and would echo some of the sentiments issued earlier. If the issue is mostly because of public comment, I would say between the options presented to us, I would say that the best course of action would be to retain the live broadcast on YouTube and to keep public comment separate from that if that is the main issue. Because Lawrence Times are doing a great job putting that up online. And in fact, the last meeting I checked earlier today, there were more views on Lawrence Times' public comment broadcast than there were of the actual meeting, which is kind of both sad and also impressive. Yeah, so that would be sort of my first suggestion on the issue and just don't agree with it. I agree. We should live broadcast everything we do here because it's all representative of the people of Lawrence and truth and transparency and collaboration is the goal of these meetings and governance in general. And on the issue of veterans, I would just highlight my stepfather, spoke earlier, he's a local veteran, bronze star and Purple Heart recipient if that leads to any help with making this decision. And he even graduated from the University of Kansas and Kansas State University. So he knows and understands both sides of the issue. So I would echo his viewpoint on this issue. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Speaker 2 (01:01:09):

See no one else in the room online.

Speaker 3 (01:01:13):

We do have a few. Steven Watts.

Speaker 25 (01:01:29):

Hi. Thank you. I have to conclude off the top of my head what? Because there's no leadership Lawrence types here tonight that all of this is a waste of everybody's time. I understand something has to happen with the passage of this legislation and it's clear what needs to happen. That is public comment needs to be placed back into the entire meeting and it be live streamed and broadcast. I don't know what you're hiding from or what people are hiding from. At the same time, it's also past time to allow the public to have access to the consent agenda items and be able to pull those.

(01:02:21):

What is performative is these meetings, you guys, I mean it's just coming to the place where you rubber stamp, rubber stamp, rubber stamp. These meetings belong to the people. They are the people's meeting first and foremost. It's not to make life simple for the executive team and the rest of the town staff. I understand there are problematics in there. In fact, we need to expand to four meetings per month, bare minimum one a week when it was cut down to three, that was back then. Now we face financial exigency. Now we face homelessness issues beyond belief. We face all kinds of stuff. We need more meetings. They need to be broadcast live. Right now, going back with this, I'm struggling. I'm having to move back between the zoom meeting and the YouTube meeting in order to see who an HE double toothpick is talking also written into this resolution is wiggle room of they'll post the video the next day or when practicable. That means they'll do it whenever the fuck they get around to it if they feel like it on those days. Excuse my French. It's kind like why I can't believe it. I mean I'm sitting here watching a Zoom meeting, but I can't see anything, so I have to switch over to YouTube. And I thought we had kind of repaired that. So at any rate, please understand these meetings belong to the people. What is the problem with streaming it live? Okay, that's all I have to say for the moment. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([01:04:03](#)):

Thank you

Speaker 3 ([01:04:21](#)):

Adriana Williams.

Speaker 13 ([01:04:38](#)):

Go ahead. Yeah.

Speaker 26 ([01:04:41](#)):

Hello, Adriana Williams, 6 6 0 4 9. Please continue to let comments like mine in the live streaming on YouTube and not just at the end of the meeting. For freedom speech sake, I will show my public comment as a valid truth and as an example of what you'll be censoring by not live broadcasting everything that's in the meeting so it is relevant to the present comments. The LGBTQIA plus movement emboldened by Mayor Michael Diver's proclamation of June as LGBTQIA month leave many astray from God's natural Order. Genesis 1 27 declares so God created man in his own image, male and female created he them. This divine binary rooted in biology is subverted by identities and attractions that are not natural, but often born of pain. Studies like those from the American Psychological Association reveal up to 60% of transgender individuals report past abuse, neglect, or mental health struggles shaping their identities.

([01:05:52](#)):

These are not innate, but wounds from a falling world yet endeavor's, proclamation celebrates this confusion, ignoring the harm. For example, transgender interventions cause irreversible damage as 2021. Archives of Sexual Behavior Study estimates 10 to 30% of trans individuals transition regretting permanent changes. Kool, who shared her testimony in the public who transitioned at 12 with puberty blockers, testosterone and mes. Mes transitioned at 17. Her dysphoria stemmed from trauma and societal pressures not a need to alter her body. She now warns of these harms facing medical and social fallout. We must object to this proclamation. June should not be pride month glorifying sin, but a time to heal deep wounds from abuse and trauma. The gospel and conservative values work. A 2018 Journal of Christian Psychology study found 70% of trauma survivors who embraced biblical counseling and traditional family values reported significant healing compared to 40% with secular therapy. Faith in Christ restores brokenness. John 10, 10 promises I'm come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly through faith in God's only begotten son, Jesus Christ. Jesus heals through repentance from our own non-biblical ways. Jesus heals. I call you to write Mayor Dever urging him to rescind this proclamation. I do urge you to rescind it, mayor Dever and help our community to seek Christ's healing offered to all. Let June be a month of gospel restoration time, not prize.

Speaker 2 ([01:07:43](#)):

Okay, thank you. Your time's up, bill,

Speaker 1 ([01:07:45](#)):

Was

Speaker 2 ([01:07:46](#)):

That any other comment?

Speaker 3 ([01:07:53](#)):

Check in. That's all the comments.

Speaker 2 ([01:07:56](#)):

Okay, I'll bring it back to the commission for discussion, comment, motions.

Speaker 4 ([01:08:09](#)):

Any comment I want to check with the mayor,

Speaker 2 ([01:08:14](#)):

Mayor Devo, any comments you want to make or to start?

Speaker 27 ([01:08:20](#)):

I'll let you talk and I'll join in if I need to. I'm being remote. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([01:08:26](#)):

I guess I'll just say a couple things. I mean I think there was the question about the Zoom participation. If you're watching on YouTube, you can't participate in the meeting. You have to be on the Zoom feed to participate in the meeting. So getting people onto the Zoom meeting allows that participation. This is the model that the county uses to not stream it, but use the Zoom webinar version. And they've been doing that for a while now. And of course we've not been streaming live public comment for quite a while now either. And obviously I think as Patrick pointed out, often there's some more views on people who show it in other places, but I think that what we want to encourage is the Zoom participation and if someone wants to watch it live as opposed to watching it the next day or later that night, obviously they can join the Zoom meeting.

([01:09:33](#)):

We do that on the county commission all the time. So my only concern really is the concern that I think Steve has pointed out a few times and that we need to make sure our Zoom is working well so that people participating by Zoom can follow that. But I think we can continue to work on that and get that fixed. So I see this as a continuation of what we have been doing and I understand that people have been objecting to it since we made the change, but I see this as a continuation of that, of what we have been doing. And I'm fine with that mode of participation through the Zoom and being here in presence. And I guess I would add that there's a lot of cities that either don't have public comment or don't allow Zoom at all or don't allow live streaming at all. They make everyone show up and post. And I certainly don't support changing any of those things. I want public comment, I want people to be able to come on Zoom and participate that way. And I want people do not have to be here to participate, but if they want to be here to participate, that's great too. So I think all three of those are good ways to participate.

([01:10:55](#)):

Other comments?

Speaker 27 ([01:10:58](#)):

Vice Mayor?

Speaker 2 ([01:11:00](#)):

Yes, mayor Devo.

Speaker 27 ([01:11:02](#)):

I just wrote down a couple of questions and I want to make sure we get answers to them if possible. The first question is how will this decrease our transparency to the public?

Speaker 2 ([01:11:17](#)):

I missed the question. What'd you say? How will

Speaker 27 ([01:11:20](#)):

This decrease our transparency relative to our public and or our elected?

Speaker 2 ([01:11:31](#)):

You're asking how you'll decrease it?

Speaker 27 ([01:11:33](#)):

Yeah, sorry. The connection's really not very good right

Speaker 2 ([01:11:36](#)):

Now.

Speaker 27 ([01:11:36](#)):

Yeah, I'm going to turn off my video, see if this helps. Hold on. Okay. Yeah. So how will this decrease our transparency relative to people's ability to access our meetings? I think you've highlighted that, but is there really any decrease in transparency at all?

Speaker 2 ([01:11:58](#)):

It's only the mode of, I mean, those can answer the mode of how you do it, either Zoom versus YouTube. If you're not going to be here present, you have to choose a medium and that medium, if you choose Zoom, you can have that access or if you choose YouTube, that's the only access we're taking away. Is that your question?

Speaker 27 ([01:12:21](#)):

Right on. Yeah. So it's only to YouTube if you want to live stream via YouTube, but we can still live stream via Zoom like I am doing right now, correct?

Speaker 2 ([01:12:32](#)):

Correct.

Speaker 27 ([01:12:33](#)):

Okay. And then, so I saw some confusion from some of the public commenters and I want to make sure we understand why we're doing this. We're specifically requested because there was a suit filed and therefore we are asked to act and therefore we are choosing between either live streaming all of it or live streaming it the way it was. And since we can't do it piecemeal, we're going to have to do away with it under this current proposal, correct?

Speaker 2 ([01:13:08](#)):

Yeah. You said suit, but I think you meant statute. There's a new statute that requires,

Speaker 27 ([01:13:12](#)):

Sorry,

Speaker 2 ([01:13:13](#)):

The new statute that requires,

Speaker 27 ([01:13:15](#)):

Sorry. Yeah. Okay. So does that mean that some people want to keep it as is? We can't, we cannot maintain the status quo. Correct?

Speaker 2 ([01:13:28](#)):

Correct. There has to be some change.

Speaker 27 ([01:13:30](#)):

Yeah. Okay. And so the last question was, so with the reason for having city commission meetings, I think some people brought this up. Can we focus on, and can we elaborate on the reason for having weekly city commission meetings and their purpose so that the public can understand that?

Speaker 2 ([01:13:57](#)):

You asking for my opinion or you want to give your opinion?

Speaker 27 ([01:13:59](#)):

No, no. I'd like the other commissioner's opinion on this because people brought it up and I feel like, I mean it's important for many reasons, but I think public comment is fundamental and I think I want to maintain that as part of our meetings. But I believe to, I want to make sure I understand everyone's opinion. That is, we all agree that that's important, but that fundamentally we are doing the city's business during our public meetings. Correct. And I want to make sure that's my understanding and I just want to make sure if there's others that disagree that I'd like to understand that

Speaker 2 ([01:14:34](#)):

I

Speaker 4 ([01:14:34](#)):

Don't disagree with that.

Speaker 2 ([01:14:36](#)):

Yeah, I mean, I would agree that obviously those resolutions to pass those bills to pay those decisions and policy to make, and that's the primary purpose of the meeting. I mean, that's the primary purpose of the meeting to do those things.

Speaker 27 ([01:14:56](#)):

Yeah. I think you mentioned other municipalities don't even have general public comment at all, and I do not want to do away with that in any way, shape or form, but I want to make sure that we are not limiting the ability of the public to comment in any way in approving this, correct?

Speaker 2 ([01:15:18](#)):

Yeah, I mean certainly those several, quite a few cities that don't allow general public comment. Places like Wichita only allow it once a month. Those that do it on the fourth week of the month, they don't allow general public comment regularly. And so no, I certainly believe we should have general public comment every week and every week that we have a meeting and have that ability and continue that ability.

Speaker 27 (01:15:45):

Okay, very good. Alright, thanks. I just wanted to get anybody else's input on that too, because those are the things I wrote down being outside the room, so I wanted to make sure we talked about 'em. Thanks.

Speaker 4 (01:15:56):

Yeah, I would second that. I mean, I definitely want general public comment to be a part of the meeting every week and yeah, I don't want that to go away.

Speaker 5 (01:16:10):

Yeah,

Speaker 27 (01:16:11):

Awesome.

Speaker 5 (01:16:12):

Public comment is definitely something that I would never see one to go away. So options here, based on what I understand of the statute change is that we either live stream at all or we don't live stream any of it. Is that correct, Tony?

Speaker 28 (01:16:29):

It's correct that we are responding to the change in state law. We will be live streaming on YouTube. It is just, we are selecting YouTube to be the manner in which we are live streaming during the meetings.

Speaker 2 (01:16:44):

Zoom. Say that again. You meant Zoom.

Speaker 28 (01:16:46):

I meant

Speaker 2 (01:16:47):

Selecting Zoom as the, yeah, we're selecting Zoom.

Speaker 3 (01:16:50):

Sorry.

Speaker 2 (01:16:50):

Okay. Yeah. Okay.

Speaker 3 (01:16:53):

Because Zoom is where we're already live streaming the entire meeting

Speaker 2 ([01:16:57](#)):

And we need the zoom to have people interact. They can't interact through YouTube.

Speaker 3 ([01:17:01](#)):

That's correct.

Speaker 5 ([01:17:02](#)):

Correct. Got it.

Speaker 2 ([01:17:07](#)):

Comments? If not, I look for motion.

Speaker 4 ([01:17:14](#)):

Which one are we

Speaker 2 ([01:17:15](#)):

On? CB

Speaker 4 ([01:17:18](#)):

I move to adopt resolution number seven. Six. Zero. Zero.

Speaker 2 ([01:17:25](#)):

So a second.

Speaker 27 ([01:17:29](#)):

I will second it.

Speaker 2 ([01:17:30](#)):

Okay. Moved by Commissioner Littlejohn. Seconded by Mayor Devo. All those in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 27 ([01:17:37](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 2 ([01:17:37](#)):

Opposed? Nay. Nay Passes. 3, 2, 1. Okay, that brings us to C seven E and I think you

Speaker 5 ([01:17:51](#)):

Pulled that. Yeah, I did. And this was again, somebody had asked me from the community to pull it.

Speaker 10 ([01:17:58](#)):

Thank you. Commissioners Vice Mayor, this is about street closures specifically. This one is about the Barker anniversary block party. That's great. I think everyone supports it and obviously they had their

signatures. This was approved back on May 20th and with I think two other street closures. The problem is that, again, the maps are not being supplied to the public, so the public doesn't know what is going to be closed. So I not a commissioner are being asked about whether they can get into their home, whether they can drive on their street. That's not great If the map was supplied to the public that would tell you that. Number one, you care whether the neighborhood knows what's about to happen. And it would also tell the public that you care about the taxpayers assets being closed or not closed, and the people around them being known. Now later, I will talk to you about the Sandbar Block Party, which is a totally other conversation that again, for years I've been asking and Commissioner Larson agreed with me that the maps should be supplied specifically that the sidewalks not be closed. So again, I want to remind you that the maps exist at Parks and Rec. They have to be supplied for the closure and that those should be put in the packet so the neighbors know what will be closed. No one should have to call Parks and Rec or ask for a freedom of information request to know when their street is closed. So I just would like you to ask Parks and Rec to supply that information on the agenda so that people like me don't have to come up and ask. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([01:19:50](#)):

Do we have questions for

Speaker 5 ([01:19:51](#)):

Staff? I guess would ask staff if that could be done, when that could be done. Looks like Roger's on.

Speaker 29 ([01:20:02](#)):

I can,

Speaker 25 ([01:20:03](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 29 ([01:20:04](#)):

Oh, mayor, I guess Vice mayor. I speak to that and maybe ask Roger I guess about the availability of maps, but that's something we could consider doing, but we would ask for direction from the full city commission to do that first.

Speaker 2 ([01:20:22](#)):

Roger, you have any comments?

Speaker 30 ([01:20:24](#)):

Right. Well, we do have an online process now, and so they are submitted online and we just have to download them and make it a part of the packet. But again, it's being reviewed by police, fire, transit, a lot of different individuals in the city. And right now, this one came in late and I know you did approve it last week, and then he realized that there were a lot of events going on Saturday, so he asked to move it to Friday, and that's why we're having the repeal and replace segment. But it is up to you what you want. We try to provide as much as we can, and there are some questions that come up late in the game when we're reviewing these things and I try to do my due diligence and try to get everything put together in a timely fashion for the people to have everything they need to be as safe and secure as possible. We do require them to get signatures of those folks across around the neighborhood to let them know what's going on and that they approve of it. And this gentleman has done that, and I think Taylor is on the line as well. If you have any questions of him as well,

Speaker 29 ([01:21:43](#)):

Vice mayor, I might just add, I would just remind the commission that on these resolutions, the commission's not voting on the map. You're not voting on the street closures or the boundaries. You're voting whether or not to allow the Salem possession of alcohol in the public right of way. And staff works with the applicants and with, as Roger said, several different stakeholders or folks who have an interest in it in the event both from the neighborhood or impacted properties as well as our own staff. And so I think that would be the concern from the staff perspective is do we get to a public meeting and now we're revising maps on the fly? That could cause some challenges potentially for us.

Speaker 27 ([01:22:29](#)):

Yeah. Can I speak to that?

Speaker 2 ([01:22:32](#)):

Sure.

Speaker 27 ([01:22:33](#)):

Yeah. Thanks Brandon. I think it's important to understand our role in this process and if there is some sort of lack of communication between us and the public on these maps, then I would apologize. But I feel like the transparency is important, but we need to maintain city commission role and we need to understand what our role is. And I don't want to be reviewing maps relative to the sale and possession of alcohol. I think that's outside of our realm. I think we need to be judging whether or not it's suitable based on the recommendation from our staff.

Speaker 2 ([01:23:13](#)):

Okay. Well thank you for that. We'll go ahead and make sure there's no other public comment on that particular item in the room on, oh, David.

Speaker 11 ([01:23:31](#)):

Well, I didn't plan on speaking to this at all, but I don't think you actually addressed Courtney's question. You just kind of jumped around it. All she's saying is can you provide some maps to the people that live there? How hard is that to print some maps off, take 'em over there and mail 'em, whatever. Yeah, I know it wasn't part of that plan or whatever you guys scrambled around, but we didn't answer that particular question. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([01:24:01](#)):

Okay. Any public comment online?

Speaker 3 ([01:24:07](#)):

There is not.

Speaker 2 ([01:24:08](#)):

Okay. Now I'll bring it back to us. For additional comment.

Speaker 5 ([01:24:13](#)):

I would like a question. I would ask whether or not, and I realize what our role is in this, however, if there is a link on the Parks and Rec website for this particular item, if you could at least provide the link that somebody could click on and get a map

Speaker 30 (01:24:35):

Commissioner. We don't post the events of other folks on the website. I mean the only place we have it is the portal when they apply for a right of way map

Speaker 1 (01:24:48):

Or

Speaker 30 (01:24:48):

Right of way permit. Pardon me. And I don't know, to me that's more of the software if we allow those other things to go out. I mean, we'll take it at your direction in terms of what you want us to put out there. Now, like I said, there are things that happen that we have to do last minute changes of things like emergency street closures and those types of things for broken water mains and stuff that may pop up. And again, I would hate to put something out there that isn't right. But to Courtney's point, I think it is important that we let people know when we're closing streets. And I have tried to share on Facebook a lot of the events that we have, like the St. Patrick's Day parade, that's always a big event that goes down mass, that closes mass and over the bridge or at least one side of the bridge. And I want to make sure that individuals in the community know this. And so we try to share from their post. So it's not looking like the city is actually in charge of the event because then there gets to be questions and then we're sponsoring a lot of these events that we may not be. We're just allowing them through your approval to do something in the street.

Speaker 29 (01:26:14):

And Vice Mayor, I just might add, I think I appreciate Roger's concerns, but I know we do, at least last I knew we had a right of way permit map that's available on the city's website. So we can look at some of our processes and see if we can make that information available publicly in a more streamlined way, more accessible way.

Speaker 5 (01:26:37):

I think that would be great because how does a neighborhood know where they should or be with a can of beer?

Speaker 29 (01:26:43):

Exactly. No, now that I understand the concern a little bit better, I can think of some ways we might be able to address that without kind of scope creep here at the commission meeting.

Speaker 4 (01:26:54):

Yeah, I did think of, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to jump in. Yeah, I think as to what Commissioner Larson was talking about, it was more of a notification thing to be involved with the process, even though it's not our process and it's the party's process that holds the event, but to hold them accountable for going in and doing it. Right.

Speaker 2 (01:27:13):

And I guess the only other thing I'd add is I know obviously in planning and zoning and other places, we often just publish the application along with as part of the packet, so that might be a possibility too, something that explains the event, what they're asking for,

Speaker 1 ([01:27:30](#)):

And

Speaker 2 ([01:27:31](#)):

That also puts out some information again, just generally, Hey, this is what we're celebrating, this is what we're planning to do. And obviously that's a public record that they've submitted to us, so that might be something to consider as well.

Speaker 29 ([01:27:44](#)):

Yeah, we can consider that. I think there's quite a bit of work that goes on then after the application, so I just wouldn't want to put inaccurate or dated info out there.

Speaker 2 ([01:27:56](#)):

Yeah, I guess that's,

Speaker 29 ([01:27:57](#)):

Yeah, we'll take a look at our processes and see if we can come up with a good solution.

Speaker 2 ([01:28:01](#)):

Okay. Appreciate that.

Speaker 29 ([01:28:03](#)):

Yeah, thank you.

Speaker 2 ([01:28:03](#)):

Thank you for bringing that up. Okay, is there a motion on this?

Speaker 5 ([01:28:12](#)):

Yeah, I'll move to repeal resolution number 7 9 5 7 and adopt resolution number 7 6 0. One

Speaker 4 ([01:28:22](#)):

Second.

Speaker 2 ([01:28:23](#)):

So motion by Commissioner Lawson, a second by Commissioner Littlejohn. All those in favor say aye.
Aye. Aye.

Speaker 27 ([01:28:29](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 2 ([01:28:30](#)):

Passes four to zero. That moves us to the regular agenda item, which is to consider renewing the Catalyst program and Industrial Development Expansion City program for three years.

Speaker 29 (01:28:41):

Alright. Vice Mayor hearing commissioners, this is my item, so I'll kick it off here. I did not prepare much of a presentation tonight. This is a pretty straightforward recommendation from staff for a three year renewal of the Catalyst program. The Catalyst program was originally approved or authorized in 2017, and the most recent authorization actually sunset this past April as we've gone through a pretty significant staffing transition in our economic development office. I've taken that on. This was on my work plan and I'm unfortunately just now getting it to the commission, so I apologize for the last month and a half or so, two months that we've had a lapse in this policy.

(01:29:34):

A little bit of background about the Catalyst program. It is a development industrial development incentive program that provides a predictable package of development incentives for new build projects as well as expansion projects. The program is available to, in its current configuration, all general industrial zone land around the community, public or privately owned, and for development projects that meet certain criteria for building size and for capital investment, which are laid out in the policy, which are in the program guidelines, which are linked in the agenda report. The program in our view, has been helpful activating our publicly owned industrial properties in particular, including Lawrence Fincher Park and East Hills Business Park. But we've also seen some privately owned properties do in particular expansions under this program as well. So it has helped to not just retain some of our thriving industry here, but help them to actually grow here, which then not only creates I think additional jobs and income in the community, but in our particular interests with the city, helps to expand our industrial tax base.

(01:30:54):

As you're aware, industrial tax is collected at 25% as opposed to a residential tax, which is 11.5% of assessed valuation. So those industrial properties along with commercial properties are pretty critical for our tax base here locally. Some of the projects, like I said, the program was originally authorized in 2017, so we're at a point now where some of the projects are getting close to rolling off of the abatement period, and that means that those properties now, these pretty large scale industrial properties such as the Van Trust properties are, we're getting ready in the next two years to realize the full property tax collection on those properties. That's notable because this is a common type of development incentive program for industrial spec buildings or even tenant-based buildings, and it creates a snowball effect or sort of a positive compounding effect where we are realizing the full valuation of some of those initial properties while also then being able to incentivize the next generation of industrial development. So we're excited to see it working as intended and as designed. And with that, I would recommend an additional three year extension of the program and would welcome any questions that the commissioners might have.

Speaker 13 (01:32:24):

Okay, thank you. Brandon, any

Speaker 2 (01:32:26):

Questions for Brandon?

Speaker 4 (01:32:29):

Yeah, I just had a question regarding how much space do we have left to

Speaker 29 (01:32:35):

Yes, good question. We do have a few larger parcels in East Hills Business Park and Lawrence Fincher Park, two in particular that are pretty premium along the 23rd street or old K 10 frontage. And then we've got a number of smaller parcels in both of those, the industrial park and the business park. We also have industrial property around the city and other areas. And in particular, I think we can look at Catalyst program as we do our North Lawrence corridor study, which is a large expansion expansive region from downtown clear up to the airport. We've got IG property at the airport as well, or property that could potentially maybe be rezoned for IG to incentivize some industrial development in those along that corridor too, which is notable because we've got rail and air and interstate and state highways all intersecting those different modes of transportation, which I think can be pretty interesting when you think about that on a regional logistics basis.

Speaker 4 ([01:33:45](#)):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 29 ([01:33:47](#)):

Any other questions?

Speaker 5 ([01:33:49](#)):

I guess I do have why we, is this question tied?

Speaker 2 ([01:33:53](#)):

Yep.

Speaker 29 ([01:33:53](#)):

Question.

Speaker 5 ([01:33:54](#)):

Okay. Why do we only renew it on a three year cycle?

Speaker 29 ([01:33:59](#)):

Yeah, that's a great question. Originally, I thought maybe we should just do a permanent authorization. There's no rhyme or reason. A lot of communities do this just as a fixed kind of permanent package. I would say we're still fairly early on with the Catalyst program, even though it is coming up in this next three years, it'll be a 10 year anniversary. And so we're still kind of evaluating it as we go. It would be great if we could grow out of it and industrial development would come here without the level of incentives that are predictable through this program.

Speaker 5 ([01:34:47](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([01:34:49](#)):

Okay. If there's no other questions, we'll open it to public comment.

Speaker 15 ([01:34:55](#)):

Hello, John Martin. 6 6 0 4 6, sorry. First thing I thought of when I looked at the packet, three big things that are missing from the packet that should be asked of any financial package. What's the implementation

cost, what's the opportunity cost, and what's the RO? I don't see any of that in the packet. So why are we authorizing any taxpayer or tax incentive deferment because we don't have all the information. So if it's already been in place for seven, eight years now, we don't have that data. Why. So that's all. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 31 ([01:35:41](#)):

Good evening, Steve Kelly. 6 6 0 4 7. I'm here speaking on behalf of the Lawrence Chamber in the EDC Mayor Devour far away and members of the commission

([01:35:56](#)):

In April. As Brandon stated, the city passed April of 2017. The city passed the Catalyst program in an effort to stimulate activity primarily at Lawrence Venture Park, which had had set kind of dormant since the transition from the old farmland days. And this was taken with input from a number of folks who were in the industry and who had identified some of the things that could be done to maybe get some activity out there. City staff and others worked on the idea and kind of built the platform that became Catalyst. And in the time, since its inception, it's really been the primary go-to for basically all the companies of any size that have done expansions and or came to Lawrence. As Brandon said, it started, and that's one of the reasons I think that maybe in this initial phases, it was done on the first time.

([01:37:01](#)):

It was a two year period and then it was three year. And each of those times there've been some minor tweaks to it, some additional information was required, some different things were changed. And so it's been a way to kind of build and build on what we learned over time. But the question of whether it should be permanent, I think that's a valid question or something to look at or maybe at least extend the time. But really in that timeframe, since Catalyst came on board, it has been the go-to for companies that were looking to make major investment in the community. If you look at the capital investment, and this is just on the real estate side, it's been over \$70 million that have been done in Catalyst projects and that includes projects in East Hills, projects in Lawrence Venture Park and some outside of those two industrial parks.

([01:37:53](#)):

And so it is been, I think, popular for a couple of reasons. One, it's fairly streamlined compared to a lot of other city processes and it also provides some certainty of what the benefit will be if you do all the things you're supposed to do. And I think that's been something in the past was sometimes a question whether there was a consistency in terms of offers. And this has done that. I think most companies like it because it's fairly clear cut and they know going in what the requirements are, what they'll need to do, how they need to achieve to meet the standards of what the program allows. And as Brandon mentioned, it'd be great to be in a position where you didn't have to have incentive programs. We're not there yet. And I would urge that the commission Reapprove and renew the Catalyst program.

Speaker 2 ([01:38:48](#)):

Thank you. Another public comment on this item, seeing none any online?

Speaker 3 ([01:39:00](#)):

No.

Speaker 2 ([01:39:02](#)):

Bringing it back to the commission.

Speaker 27 ([01:39:07](#)):

Vice Mayor, can I ask a question?

Speaker 2 ([01:39:09](#)):

Oh, sure, go ahead.

Speaker 27 ([01:39:11](#)):

So this implies that a sunset is to occur in July of 2028. So to me, sunset implies the end of the program. Is that what we are anticipating or is that what they're implying? I want to get a clarification on that,

Speaker 29 ([01:39:28](#)):

Brandon. Yeah, mayor Deford, this is Brandon McGuire. We would most likely be bringing it back for an additional authorization. So maybe I misused the word sunset and I appreciate that in the public policy realm, but this authorization would expire on that date July 1st, 2028.

Speaker 27 ([01:39:49](#)):

Excellent. Sometimes we programs have renewing. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Yeah,

Speaker 29 ([01:39:55](#)):

You're right.

Speaker 27 ([01:39:55](#)):

Make sure that wasn't, yeah, thank you.

Speaker 2 ([01:40:02](#)):

Well, I support the expansion of the project. I do think it's been useful. If we get a complaint, it's often that we're not predictable enough, so to have a predictable program that works. And I think it has worked, so I appreciate that. I think Mr. Martin made a good point. We probably could have linked in our economic development report on this that does have that ROI and have the other, I mean you took one table out of it, but maybe next time link the whole report in there that shows the return on those projects. And so I do think it has been successful and so I'll support it. Any other comments?

Speaker 4 ([01:40:43](#)):

Yeah, I would agree. It goes a long way towards the idea of adding more commercial development to the town to go ahead and offset the burden on residential taxpayers, taxpayers. And as we see some of the earlier deals are starting to go ahead and expire in terms of the abatements and then they will be fully on the tax rolls at that point and we'll be able to derive the full amount from 'em and so on. Another aspect of that as well, these are businesses from small to medium sized to large. And I've always said that I would love this town to encourage more small, medium business owners and help them grow their businesses. So this is one tool in the toolbox we can use to do that. And there are others, but I would love for us to continue to grow on our business businesses here in Lawrence. So I'm going to go ahead and support it.

Speaker 5 ([01:41:41](#)):

Yeah, I always had the fortunate to be on the commission at the time. This was all being discussed and formed, and I remember Diane was a big supporter of this and led the way on getting this program together. And it's a good program that actually brings industrial businesses to our community and also with jobs. And those are two big categories that I think if anything, would warrant any level of incentive,

if any at all. And those are the ones that I like to see come and it's working. It's even allowed local companies, three of our local larger employers to add to their facilities as well as expand the employment. And so we'd love to see new industry come in, but if we can also use it to help our existing companies thrive and grow, that's even better. So I'm definitely in support of this.

Speaker 2 ([01:42:43](#)):

Okay. Mayor, ever. Any words?

Speaker 27 ([01:42:46](#)):

Yes, I'm in favor of this. I appreciate the work that was done previously and appreciate the businesses that have spent their time and energy to build and construct in Lawrence. So I'm really excited to see this continue.

Speaker 2 ([01:43:02](#)):

Okay, I look for a motion then. And maybe we change the word sunset to expire there in the motion. Make that motion.

Speaker 1 ([01:43:10](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 5 ([01:43:10](#)):

Well authorize a three-year extension of the Catalyst and Industrial Development Incentive Program to expire on July 1st, 2028.

Speaker 4 ([01:43:20](#)):

Second

Speaker 2 ([01:43:21](#)):

Motion by Commissioner Lawson, second by Commissioner Littlejohn. All those in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 27 ([01:43:26](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 2 ([01:43:27](#)):

Passes 4, 2 0. That concludes the regular agenda. We move on to commission items. Are there any commission items? Just two real quick. And I think Commissioner Littlejohn was there too, but we saw the documentary on the return of the Red Rock

Speaker 1 ([01:43:50](#)):

That

Speaker 2 ([01:43:51](#)):

They put out. And Commissioner Lawson, you have a big part in that reading the A proclamation. And anyway, it was a great, great documentary and they're trying to get it out now. I mean, those were private showings and they're trying to get a distribution of it, so hopefully others can see it sometime in the

future. But stay tuned on that and when it does become available, I hope folks watch it. The other one was, went to the opening of the Cardinal House there by the courthouse, which is a Tim Poon I'll call treatment facility that we supported and the county supported, and of course a lot of private money into it. And just another good step forward in some of our programs. Any other commission items?

Speaker 4 ([01:44:40](#)):

Glad you mentioned Cardinal House. I was thinking about saying something about that. So it was outstanding, Dave for it and a great program and they've done a lot of hard work and I'd like to see more of

Speaker 2 ([01:44:51](#)):

Them. Well, they have the second one coming.

([01:44:53](#)):

It's coming soon. Okay. Future agenda items and I will confirm I'm not going to be here next week. I'm coming on the way to my daughter's wedding. We will not be here next week. Any other comments on the future agenda? Okay, sir. Then calendar items. Any questions or comments on the calendar items? Nope, we're good. Okay. I'm seeing nothing on the calendar items. We will end the live broadcast and then I'll go ahead and read the public comment statement. They will open it up for public comment. The public is allowed to speak on issues or items not scheduled for discussion on the agenda. Comments should be limited to issues and items germane to the business of the governing body. The commission will not discuss or debate these items, nor will the commission make decisions on items presented during this time. Members of the public will be limited to three minutes. Full comments.