

## **General Government Committee**

May 6, 2014

### **Summary and Motions**

Chair Kay called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM. All Committee members were present except Akers and Lawless. Henson also attended but was not part of the quorum.

#### **1. Approval of Summary for the March 4, 2014**

Motion by Clarke to approve the summary. Seconded by Scutchfield. Motion passed without dissent.

#### **2. Neighborhood Parks Task Force**

Henson introduced the issue. Chris Cooperrider and Sergeant Andrew Daugherty presented the recommendations of the Neighborhood Parks Task Force report. Cooperrider stated that the goal of the task force was to develop strategies to make Lexington's neighborhood parks safe while improving the quality of life. Cooperrider and Daugherty discussed the proposed Barring Policy; the plan for Opportunity Parks; a new position to establish the SAFE Parks program; and the SAFE pilot program.

Daugherty stated that the concept of the Barring Policy is to allow police officers to bar individuals for persistent inappropriate behavior or illegal activities. Cooperrider stated it was similar to the barring policy used by the Lexington Housing Authority and the Public Library.

Daugherty discussed the logistics of the barring policy. He stated that the policy was approved by the Division of Police, Department of Law, the CAO, the Parks Advisory Board and the Fayette County Attorney's Office. Cooperrider stated that the Task Force requested that the Council adopt a resolution establishing and implementing the barring policy.

Myers questioned the implementation and need for the barring policy. Myers stated that the Housing Authority barring policy was substantially different than the barring policy being considered for Parks.

Cooperrider stated that signage would be erected in each park informing the public about the barring policy.

In response to a question from Myers, Daugherty described the procedures that Police will use to enforce the Barring Policy. In response to a question from Myers, Cooperrider stated that if an individual is barred they are barred from all parks.

In response to questions from Myers, Cooperrider described the appeals process component of the Barring Policy and described the Parks "Physical and Verbal Altercation Policy" presently being used.

In response to a question from Lane, Evelyn Bologna stated that 8 cases from the Physical and Verbal Altercation Policy had come to her office this year.

Lane suggested that Police should concentrate their efforts where crime has occurred. He also suggested that Parks erect the signs in just a few parks initially.

Beard stated that he didn't think the barring policy could be implemented effectively. In response to a question from Beard, Daugherty described how Police will investigate complaints

Henson stated that she was supportive of the barring policy because a few people can disrupt use of the parks for others.

In response to a question from Ford, Daugherty discussed the Library barring policy.

Clarke stated that he was supportive of the barring policy.

Myers discussed the difference between the barring policies at the Library and in Parks. He stated that this should be handled by Police as criminal offenses. In response to a question from Myers, Evelyn Bologna discussed the current Parks altercation policy.

Cooperrider stated that they want to bring this before Council to get input before they move forward with implementation.

Myers asked how other cities handle similar problems. He requested that staff research this question before it is implemented.

Gorton stated that the Parks Advisory Board vetted this policy. She stated that the overall intent is to deal with persistent violations of rules. She stated that it is the consequence of bad behavior. She stated that this will give Parks & Police one more tool to make the parks safer.

Kay stated some people may already feel barred from their neighborhood parks because they don't feel safe there now. He stated that this tool has the potential to make parks safer and more attractive to citizens.

Myers stated that an active park will make the park safe.

Motion to approve the barring policy. Moved by Scutchfield, seconded by Lane. Motion passed on a 6-2 vote (Kay, Scutchfield, Gorton, Ford, Clarke & Lane-Yes; Beard & Myers-No).

Cooperrider discussed the Opportunity Parks proposal. He stated that an opportunity park is one with a void or need that experienced criminal behavior or perceived as being unsafe and presents an opportunity to enhance more positive activity and strengthen the

surrounding community. He stated that the process involves communication, infrastructure and usage. He stated that working with Councilmembers and neighborhood leaders Parks will help identify opportunity parks, existing, proposed amenities, potential solutions and facilitate partnerships with service providers to increase programming within opportunity parks.

In response to a question from Myers, Cooperrider stated that facilities/amenities in Opportunity Parks will be identified in the annual budget proposal to assist Parks in prioritizing their budget requests.

Reed Small discussed the SAFE Parks proposal. He stated that SAFE Parks is a program to create more family friendly parks by increasing leisure service programming opportunities in underutilized neighborhood and community parks.

Small stated that the implementation of SAFE involves a new service delivery model which uses a 3<sup>rd</sup> party service party and partnering with community leaders. It uses scholarships in lieu of rental fees and targets neighborhood programming needs.

Small stated that Fit 4 Mom is an example of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party offering a new mom and baby exercise program in Veterans Park. He stated that Green Acres and Wolf Run are examples of potential Opportunity Parks.

Henson stated that she was in favor of funding the new proposed position to support the Opportunity Park programs. It would allow Parks to work with neighborhoods to improve programming in parks.

In response to a question from Lane, Cooperrider stated that Parks has \$ 1.3 million budgeted for infrastructure needs in the FY 15 Mayor's Proposed Budget.

Myers complimented Parks about the Opportunity Parks program. He discussed how Parks could work with neighborhoods throughout the community to improve Parks programming.

In response to a question from Myers, Cooperrider discussed the park improvement facility plans. He stated that input includes observation from Parks staff, and comments from constituents and Councilmembers.

Gorton stated that the program offers a great opportunity to improve parks programming. She discussed the need for a parks capital plan and a Parks Foundation to support facility needs.

Scutchfield stated that she was supportive of the program as it would include neighborhoods in improving parks programming and facilities.

Kay stated that it was a positive step using parks to improve neighborhoods.

### **3. Wireless Devices Policies**

Aldona Valicenti presented the wireless devices policy. She stated that the purpose of the policy is to promote the responsible use of wireless communication devices and to provide guidance for procurement, security and use of such devices.

She stated that once a user requests a wireless device, Computer Services will make a recommendation of appropriate plan and will work with the employee to choose a carrier. The device will be shipped to Computer Service and inventoried. The appropriate division will be billed for the cost of the device and plan. That division will also be responsible for monitoring usage.

She stated that Lexington utilizes five (5) providers, including: AT&T, Verizon, Sprint, T-Mobile and Cricket. She stated that Cricket was recently acquired by AT&T.

Valicenti stated that the employee will sign a user agreement; complex passwords will be mandatory; losses will be reported to Computer Services immediately so the device can be wiped; employees will use discretion with types of information they access; and employees will return the device to Computer Services if it is no longer required to carry out their duties or if they leave LFUCG.

Valicenti commented on the Bring Your Own Devices (BYOD) Policy. She stated that it should protect both the user and LFUCG; it will allow employees to be connected anywhere; it will increase employee productivity; potentially generate savings for LFUCG; and will clearly define what Computer Services will support and how it will support BYOD.

Valicenti stated that the employee will sign a user agreement; complex passwords will be required; losses will be reported to Computer Services immediately so the device can be wiped; employees will use discretion with types of information they access on the devices; and LFUCG will only request access to the device to implement security controls for LFUCG data.

She stated that the draft should be completed by June; meetings with stakeholders will commence in June; and the policy will be published and implemented by the IT Governance Committee starting August 2014.

In response to a question from Myers, Todd Slatin stated that he anticipated that LFUCG will still use multiple users because some of the user groups have unique needs. Slatin also stated that the user of State price contracts have made the pricing very comparable.

Valicenti stated that all of the providers offer very competitive price and use structures.

### **4. Branding Update**

Scott Shapiro discussed the Blue Horse branding concept. He stated that because we have too many unique logos their use is inefficient and confusing. He said there are no consistent rules regarding the logos. In addition, he said that citizens don't have a clear idea what the City is doing. He stated that the use of one consistent logo will raise the production values of LFUCG's materials. He stated that the blue horse logo has proven to be very successful for VisitLex. He stated that the seal is not eliminated just subordinated.

Shapiro stated that he and Stacey Dimon have met with Councilmembers and have held meetings with 22 division/departments. He stated Bullhorn has prepared draft blue horse ideas. In addition he has begun negotiations with VisitLex on the blue horse use. Shapiro stated that they will continue meeting with divisions/departments as well as with Councilmembers as well as finalizing an agreement with VisitLex.

Shapiro stated that LFUCG will share in the legal expenses of defending the blue horse trademark. Shapiro stated that the plan will be rolled out at little new expense once Council adopts its use.

Shapiro stated that the designer will provide brand design guidelines and templates for power points, newsletters and brochures; letterhead/envelopes/business cards/signage; email signatures; and web site. He also stated the brand support and monitoring will be provided by Government Communications. Dimon will also develop a style guideline book.

Beard questioned the use of the blue horse. He said it wasn't a good representation for Lexington. He suggested that a thoroughbred be used instead.

In response to a question from Beard, Shapiro stated that the use of the blue horse signified creative thinking. He also said that it reflected Lexington's appreciation for the arts & culture.

Ford discussed what the Charter stated about the seal. He stated that he was opposed to subordinating the seal for the blue horse.

Scutchfield stated that she was concerned about the overall cost of the brands campaign. She stated that there will be a lot more expenses involved that has been indicated. She also discussed the value of the logos that Lexington will discard if the plan is adopted.

Gorton stated that she likes the blue horse but asked if the seal could be subordinated rather than the seal being subordinated. She also asked about the use and availability of color copiers because the logo is blue.

In response Shapiro stated that VisitLex uses the blue horse and in an effort to be consistent we should be using the same. He stated that the blue horse says a lot about Lexington. Shapiro also stated that the deliverables will include a black/white version of the blue horse.

Gorton questioned the appropriateness of a black/white version of a blue horse.

In response to a question from Gorton, Shapiro stated that Lexington has paid Bullhorn \$ 17,000 to date on the design and other deliverables.

Kay suggested that Shapiro communicate with the Committee and curtail individual meetings with Councilmembers. Shapiro agreed.

## **5. Items Referred**

On a motion by Gorton, second Scutchfield the “Neighborhood Parks Task Force” item was removed. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:04 PM