



City of Lawton

City Council

Minutes

Lawton City Hall
212 SW 9th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma
73501-3944

Monday, November 3, 2025

4:00 PM

Lawton City Hall
Wayne Gilley Auditorium

Meeting Called to Order with Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

"Official action can be taken only on items which appear on the agenda. The Council may adopt, approve, ratify, deny, defer, recommend, or continue any agenda item. The Council may also propose and enact floor amendments to any matter presented before them. When more information is needed to act on an item, the Council may refer the matter to the City Manager or the City Attorney. The Council may also refer items to standing committees of the Council or a board, commission, or authority for additional study. Under certain circumstances, items are deferred to a specific later date or stricken from the agenda entirely."

Meeting called to order by Mayor Stanley Booker with invocation led by Allan Hampton followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call

Present:

Councilman - Ward 1 Lane Hooton
Councilman - Ward 2 Taron Epps
Councilwoman - Ward 3 Linda Chapman
Councilman - Ward 4 George Gill
Councilman - Ward 5 Allan Hampton
Councilman - Ward 6 Bob Weger
Councilman - Ward 8 Randy Warren

Absent:

Councilwoman - Ward 7 Sherene L Williams

Also Present:

Stanley Booker, Mayor
John Ratliff, City Manager
Jari Askins, Interim City Attorney
Donalynn Blazek-Scherler, City Clerk

Prior to proceeding with the business items, Mayor Booker made an announcement and asked the Council and audience to join him in welcoming Jari Askins as the City's Interim City Attorney. Mayor Booker acknowledged Ms. Askins' appointment and invited her to address the Council.

Ms. Askins thanked Mayor Booker and the members of the City Council for the opportunity to serve. She stated that it was her first day in the role and expressed appreciation for the special meeting, noting it allowed her to begin working with the Council immediately. Ms. Askins stated that she looks forward to working with the Mayor, City Council, and City staff under the leadership of the City Manager, and that she is committed to contributing in any way she can to support the continued growth of the City of Lawton.

Business Items

1. Receive a briefing on the current status of the Capital Improvements Program, including an overview of completed projects, projects under construction, funded projects pending initiation, tentatively scheduled projects under consideration for the next round of funding, and any remaining projects that were included in Resolution 24-278.

Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager, presented the briefing and stated that the meeting was intentionally structured to focus exclusively on the Capital Improvement Program. He explained that this dedicated discussion was intended to provide the City Council and the public with a comprehensive update ahead of the regular City Council meeting, during which the Council would be asked to consider action on the next round of CIP funding. Burk noted that this approach represented a new step toward greater transparency and long-range planning for the City's capital investments.

Burk reviewed a summary of major completed CIP projects since 2015, emphasizing that the list reflected the most visible and recognizable accomplishments rather than every project funded during that period. He highlighted projects such as the Public Safety Facility, City Hall buildout, Fire Station No. 8, the Aquatic Center, and the I-44 Pedestrian Bridge. Burk stated that the City has invested more than \$400 million in CIP funding since 2015 and that these investments have played a significant role in strengthening infrastructure and improving quality of life across the community. He emphasized the City's continued commitment to making Lawton a community of choice where families can thrive.

Burk then outlined projects currently under construction or actively in progress. These included Phase I of the McMahon Auditorium renovation and expansion, the Police Department technology upgrade approved in the prior year, replacement of the Lawton Fire Department alarm system, and the Goodyear Boulevard and U.S. Highway 62 interchange project, which remains in the design and right-of-way acquisition phase. He also discussed ongoing efforts related to the LATS transfer center maintenance facility site selection, park upgrades, the Department of Motor Vehicles initiative tied to the Safe Neighborhoods and Kids First programs, Ellsworth Lake Dam repairs, wastewater treatment plant improvements, development of alternative groundwater sources, and

the 11th Street Bridge project, which he indicated is expected to be completed within the coming months.

Burk reviewed projects with approved funding that have not yet begun construction. He referenced the recent refinancing of a prior 2024 note, explaining that the City secured a significantly lower interest rate, resulting in savings of several million dollars in financing costs. As part of that funding, four projects were added, including the 107 in 2025 street improvement program, museum repair and renovation, Lawton Public Library ceiling renovations, and the Animal Welfare Adoption Center. He noted that updates on several of these projects would be presented later in the meeting.

Burk explained that the remaining projects listed in Resolution 24-278 were organized to show both one-time projects and projects funded annually. He stated that underlined items represented projects typically budgeted and cash-flowed on an annual basis. Funding allocations were prorated across a fourteen-year window through 2040 to support long-term financial forecasting and budget stability. Burk emphasized that this structure allows the City Council to prioritize projects based on current needs and community impact.

Burk then presented the staff-recommended project list proposed for the next round of CIP funding, noting that a resolution reflecting this list would be presented for Council consideration at the regular meeting the following day. Projects included the Lawton Sports Complex, Elmer Thomas Park upgrades, McMahon Ballparks, stormwater improvements, remaining funding for the LATS transfer center, municipal golf course upgrades, airport improvements, park and cemetery upgrades, the Discovery Zone, and the FISTA construction loan previously supported during the budget process. He stated that the total proposed funding was just under \$85 million and that the Council would be asked to approve funding up to that amount, subject to any modifications the Council wished to make.

Burk explained that if the Council desired to adjust project priorities or funding levels, staff could revise the proposed list accordingly. He stated that placing this item early on the agenda was intentional, as it established context for subsequent presentations by staff, architects, and engineers regarding specific projects. He emphasized that this approach provided the Council with an opportunity to review project scopes and ask questions prior to taking action on funding and also provided transparency for the public regarding how CIP decisions are made.

Mayor Booker thanked Burk for the presentation and commented that the City has a significant number of projects underway as a result of the PROPEL program and citizen support. The Mayor requested clarification regarding previously approved funding amounts for certain projects and whether additional funding might be required.

Burk explained that the museum repair and renovation project was funded at \$6 million as part of the CIP, but that challenges encountered during planning may result in a request to supplement that funding. He also stated that the Lawton Public Library

ceiling renovation project was funded at \$2 million, but that staff would recommend addressing HVAC replacement issues as part of the project, which could require an additional \$300,000 to \$500,000. Burk confirmed that both projects were included in the previously approved note at those funding levels.

Mayor Booker asked where additional funding would come from if supplemental funds were approved. Burk responded that staff would need to shorten or reprioritize the proposed project list, noting that this could involve deferring or reducing funding for other projects, such as cemetery upgrades, depending on Council priorities.

Ratliff asked for confirmation of funding amounts for other projects, including the Animal Welfare Adoption Center and street improvements. Burk confirmed that the Animal Welfare Adoption Center was funded at approximately \$5.5 million, including \$500,000 from a special fund, and that street improvements were funded at \$17 million.

With no further questions, Mayor Booker thanked Burk for the briefing.

2. Receive report and consider approving plans and specifications for Project EN2304-Animal Welfare Building, and authorizing staff to advertise for bids.

Mike Jones, Engineering Director, addressed the Council and stated that staff was excited to bring several capital projects forward for consideration. He noted that the Engineering Department team was present, along with architectural and engineering consultants and staff from the Animal Welfare Division and the Library. Jones stated that the Engineering Department had recently completed several projects and was prepared to begin new work, pending Council approval. He introduced the Animal Welfare Building project and invited Jamie Prashaw, Associate Principal with GH2 Architects, to present the design.

Ms. Prashaw introduced herself and explained that she leads GH2 Architects' Animal Division, which specializes in facilities designed specifically for animal welfare operations, including animal shelters. She presented the completed design for the Animal Welfare Building and reminded the Council that the project involves renovating the former fire station, which has been vacated following relocation to a new facility, and constructing an addition on the west side of the building to create a modern animal shelter.

Prashaw reviewed the overall site plan, explaining that the existing fire station structure will house adoptable animal areas, including cats, dogs, and exotic animals. She described the new public-facing elements of the facility, including a welcoming lobby and reception desk, and noted that the design incorporates subtle thematic elements referencing the building's former use as a fire station. She explained that multiple fenced play and evaluation yards will be located north of the building to allow staff to assess animal behavior, sociability, and compatibility, including opportunities for meet-and-greet interactions with potential adopters and existing household pets.

Prashaw described additional outdoor exercise yards behind the building for dogs

housed within the shelter, as well as a fully secured staff parking area designed to enhance employee safety during early morning and late-night hours. She stated that new visitor parking will be located south of the building, along with a dedicated intake entrance for surrendered animals and animals brought in by the public. She also described a sally port on the west side of the building, designed with dual garage doors to allow animal control officers to safely transfer animals directly into the facility.

Prashaw reviewed the interior floor plan and intake process, explaining that animals will be examined, vaccinated, bathed as needed, and screened for communicable diseases before entering the general population. She stated that the new facility significantly expands capacity, increasing from approximately 120 animals at the existing shelter to a total of 356 animals. She explained that designated isolation and stray animal areas are included for animals showing signs of illness and that the design aligns with fear-free animal welfare principles, which reduce stress and improve outcomes through thoughtful facility design and handling practices. She noted that shelter staff have already embraced fear-free operational practices.

Prashaw also described the inclusion of an on-site surgery suite equipped with two surgical tables, allowing minor procedures and wound care to be performed within the facility rather than off-site, improving efficiency and outcomes for animals in care. She concluded by presenting renderings of key spaces, including the intake room, small dog holding area, reception lobby, cat adoption area, isolation spaces, and surgery suite.

Mayor Booker commented that the project appeared well designed and would represent a significant improvement for animal welfare services in the community.

Gill commented that while the project experienced challenges earlier in the process, staff and the architectural team worked collaboratively to refine the design, resulting in cost savings and a strong final product. Gill stated that he was pleased with the outcome and moved to approve the plans and specifications.

Motion by George Gill, Second by Allan Hampton, to approve plans and specifications for Project EN2304-Animal Welfare Building, and authorizing staff to advertise for bids.

Mayor Booker asked for clarification regarding project costs and funding.

Prashaw explained that GH2 Architects was directed to design the facility as a \$5 million building, with total project funding of approximately \$5.5 million to account for professional fees and previously purchased equipment. She further stated that the City's in-house cost estimator projects the construction cost to come in just under \$5 million.

VOTE ON MOTION: AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

Mayor Booker thanked staff, consultants, and presenters for their work and noted that

the project would now proceed to the bidding phase.

3. Receive report and consider approving plans and specifications for Project EN2201-Library Ceiling Renovation, and authorizing staff to advertise for bids.

Mike Jones, Engineering Director, introduced the item and stated that this was the next capital project being presented for Council consideration. He noted that Tiffany Dennis with Guernsey Architects was present as the project architect, along with Scott Vaughn, project manager working on behalf of the City's Engineering Department, and Kristin Herr, representing the Lawton Public Library, to address any questions.

Tiffany Dennis, Director of Architecture and Interior Design with Guernsey Architects, addressed the Council and stated that it had been a pleasure working with the Library and the City of Lawton on the project. She explained that the library building is more than fifty years old and remains heavily used by residents of all ages. She stated that the focus of the project is the replacement and modernization of the existing ceiling system, which consists of an aging copper ceiling, outdated light fixtures, diffusers, and deteriorated duct work that has resulted in staining and reduced efficiency.

Dennis explained that the project scope includes removal of the existing ceiling, replacement of duct work and lighting, updates to the fire alarm system, and installation of a fire suppression system. She described the proposed open-ceiling concept, which incorporates acoustical ceiling clouds to manage sound, improve lighting uniformity, and enhance thermal comfort throughout the space. She noted that the building's original structural grid and brick columns were carefully considered in the design, with column collars used to conceal the tops of the brick columns while allowing visibility of exposed duct work, cable trays, and building systems above the ceiling clouds.

Dennis stated that all abandoned wiring, obsolete duct work, and outdated materials would be removed. New duct work would be installed from the VAV boxes outward, along with new lighting fixtures selected to provide a clean, modern aesthetic. She explained that exposed areas above the ceiling clouds would be painted a uniform color for visual consistency. Dennis stated that the project budget is \$2 million and that current estimates place the project at approximately that amount.

Mayor Booker asked whether the \$2 million request matched the amount already allocated in the Capital Improvement Program. Staff confirmed that it did.

Warren asked for clarification regarding whether the \$2 million funding had already been approved and financed. Ratliff confirmed that the funding had been approved and borrowed.

Warren then asked about HVAC needs and whether additional funding would be required. Dennis explained that the project does not include replacement of the main HVAC units. She stated that the scope of the study and design was limited to the ceiling, lighting, and associated duct work. She noted that bid alternates were included

for potential replacement of VAV boxes and minor related improvements if bids come in favorably, but that full HVAC replacement was not part of the project.

At the Mayor's request, Scott Vaughn provided additional clarification. Vaughn explained that the original study conducted several years earlier focused specifically on the ceiling system, lighting, and duct work, and that the \$2 million budget was established based on that scope. He stated that including full HVAC replacement would require additional design work, separate funding, and would delay the project. Vaughn confirmed that the project, as designed, can proceed within the approved funding.

Hampton asked whether future HVAC replacement would require demolition of work completed under the ceiling project. Vaughn responded that replacement of HVAC units in the future would not affect the proposed work, as the current scope addresses duct work downstream from the VAV boxes.

Hampton also asked whether funds would be requested to temporarily relocate library operations during construction.

Dennis explained that the Library intends to secure temporary space independently and that phasing construction would increase cost and extend the project timeline. Construction is expected to take approximately 180 days, plus procurement lead time.

Warren then provided extensive comments expressing concern about proceeding with ceiling repairs without a broader strategic evaluation of the library's long-term future. He stated:

"I do not oppose progress, I champion it. And I don't oppose the Library I support it. I would simply like to ask the Council to pause—just pause—before we commit taxpayer dollars to a decision that could define our city's future for the next half-century.

Our Municipal Library, built in 1973, has served us faithfully for 52 years. But let's be honest: this building has exceeded its 50-year accounting life. The roof, the ceiling, the HVAC system, the electrical infrastructure—all of these critical systems are operating at roughly half the efficiency of modern standards. They're not just old; they're obsolete. Everything in the building.

The staff has asked us to approve repairs to the ceiling and HVAC systems. I don't question their sincerity or their dedication to serving our community. But I do question whether a quick patch—a 5 to 10-year band-aid—is the right use of public funds when we stand at a crossroads that demands strategic thinking.

We have three paths forward, and Council, we owe it to the people who have given us the funds and who elected us to examine all three with open eyes:

First, we can patch the current building—fix the ceiling, replace some HVAC units, and limp along for another 5 to 10 years with a facility that will still consume energy like a 1973 Lincoln Continental, still constrain our ability to serve modern library users, and still

require another round of expensive decisions before this decade is out.

Second, we can modernize in place—invest substantial capital in replacing major systems, reconfiguring the interior, bringing the building up to code. This gives us 25 to 35 years of useful life, but it still locks us into a 1970s shell with all its inherent limitations.

Or third, we can think bigger. We can ask ourselves: what if we leveraged the millions this city and the FISTA has already invested in renovating and updating Central Plaza.

Let me paint you a picture of what's possible.

Central Plaza has a brand-new roof. State-of-the-art facade work. Modern systems. We've already made that investment. Why would we spend more money duplicating those upgrades at the old library when we could use what we've already built? I know the thought was to move the library over to the plaza while the work was being done. Well, why not move it and leave it?

The numbers tell the story: a modern building envelope provides 30 to 50 percent energy savings compared to 1970s construction. We're talking about reducing annual utility costs by \$1 per square foot—year after year after year. That's not speculation; that's documented by the U.S. Department of Energy and proven in library renovations across Oklahoma and Texas.

But the real opportunity here goes beyond dollars and cents. FYSI (FISTA Youth And Science Museum) will sit right there in Central Plaza—a facility dedicated to STEM education, to inspiring youthful minds, to hands-on learning. Imagine combining that with our library services. Imagine a child moving seamlessly from story time to a robotics workshop. Imagine a teenager researching a science project in our digital resources and then building that project in a makerspace down the hall.

This isn't some far-fetched dream. This is what modern 21st-century learning looks like. This is what Kids First really means—creating a safe, inspiring, accessible environment where reading and science come together, where families can spend an afternoon exploring ideas instead of just checking out books.

Operational Efficiency: When we co-locate services, we get to share a lot of those services. That's money that could go towards programs, towards digital collections, towards the services that our citizens actually use.

Downtown Revitalization: And let's not forget the bigger picture: our downtown. We've invested in FISTA. We've invested in Plaza redevelopment. A modern library-STEM learning campus doesn't just serve families—it becomes an anchor, a destination that brings people downtown, that supports local businesses, that shows the world Lawton is serious about its future.

Council, I want to address the elephant in the room. In-person library visits have declined 25 to 35 percent nationwide since 2019. That's not a Lawton problem; that's a reality of our digital age. Meanwhile, digital checkouts and online services continue record growth.

Does that mean we don't need libraries? Absolutely not. But it does mean we need to be smart about what a library should be in 2025 and beyond. We need flexible spaces for collaboration and learning, not just endless stacks of books. We need maker spaces where kids can create. We need study areas where students can work together. We need meeting rooms where community organizations can gather.

The 1973 building was designed for a world where 60 percent of the floor space was dedicated to book stacks. Modern libraries allocate 25 to 35 percent for stacks because we've learned that libraries are about people and programs, not just printed volumes.

Here's something the patch-and-repair approach ignores entirely: funding leverage.

A joint library-STEM learning campus makes us competitive for grants and endowments we could never access with a stand-alone library. We're talking about:

- The Institute of Museum and Library Services Accelerating Promising Practices program
- National Science Foundation Informal STEM Education grants
- State Library Construction funding
- Corporate endowments from Boeing, Google, Gates Foundation, Oklahoma Community Foundation

Philanthropic organizations want to fund innovative, cross-disciplinary projects that serve multiple generations and demonstrate measurable impact. A literacy-STEM hub checks every box. A new ceiling in an old building checks none.

Mayor, you've spoken eloquently about Lawton's commitment to Passion for Progress and Kids First. Tonight, I'm asking this Council to prove those aren't just slogans—they're our governing principles.

Kids First means creating spaces where children and families feel safe, inspired, and empowered to learn. It means thinking about what our students will need not just next year, but in 2040, in 2060.

Passion for Progress means having the courage to question conventional wisdom. It means looking at a repair estimate and asking: "Is this the smartest use of public funds, or are we just doing what's easiest?"

Kids First provides the purpose. Passion for Progress provides the momentum. Together, they define why Lawton should build smarter, safer, and stronger—for the next generation.

I'm not asking this Council to make a final decision tonight. I'm asking you to make an informed one.

The motion I would like to make is straight forward:

Direct the City Manager to defer any major maintenance or repairs and replacements at the Main Library until such time as a committee formed by the Mayor has had an opportunity to look at all the opportunities and options available and brings back to this council within 120 days a recommended path forward.

120 days. That's all we're asking. Four months to examine:

- Life-cycle costs
- Community impact assessments
- Grant and funding opportunities
- Energy savings projections
- Operational efficiencies

These are all things that should have been done before there was every any discussion about fixing the ceiling. And it's not just at the library. It's at everything that we do. We piecemeal every single project that we've done. And that's why we've gotten to where we're at and we're having to dig out with PROPEL 2040 and build new buildings like the police and some of the other facilities. When you continually just patch, you continually have to patch.

Let's compare apples to apples. Let's quantify the benefits. Let's explore every possibility.

Council, we expect our personal vehicles to last 10 to 15 years. Are we really going to make a public investment that gives us only 5 to 10 years of useful life on a building?

Our children and grandchildren will judge us by the decisions we make tonight. They'll ask whether we had vision or whether we just kicked the can down the road. They'll ask whether we spent their tax dollars wisely or whether we took the easy path.

I've heard some say, "We need to move fast. The library needs repairs." And yes, it does. But friends, we've operated this building for 52 years. 120 days of thoughtful study won't bring the roof crashing down. What might crash down is our credibility if we rush in to fix minor repairs when major repairs is what's really needed.

The Central Plaza facility isn't going anywhere. FYSI is in the planning stages and as we speak it would be ready for collaborating when designing and building phases begin if that is the final decision. The grant opportunities are available now. This is the perfect time—the only time—to make this decision with our eyes wide open.

Here's what it comes down to: Do we want to repair an outdated building, or do we want to create a 21st-century learning environment that serves multiple generations, saves taxpayer money, revitalizes downtown, and positions Lawton as a forward-thinking

community?

Do we want to spend limited capital dollars on systems that will be obsolete before they're paid off, or do we want to leverage existing investments and create something extraordinary?

Do we want to tell our children that we did what was convenient, or that we did what was right?

Mayor, Council Members:

I know some of you may feel pressure to approve the repairs tonight. I know staff has worked hard on these plans. I know there's an institutional desire to move forward. But I'm asking you— as a fellow servant of this community, as someone who cares deeply about Lawton's future—to take a breath. To ask for more information. To demand the comprehensive analysis that a decision of this magnitude deserves.

Because we're only talking about a ceiling, right? That's what it seems like. But we're really talking about the future because this isn't the last repair that needs to be done.

Vote yes on the study. Give the Committee 120 days to bring us real data.

In 1973, when our current library was built, personal computers didn't exist. The internet was years away. Digital books were science fiction. The leaders who built that facility did the best they could with what they had.

Now it's our turn. We know things they didn't. We have options they didn't. We have an opportunity to create something that reflects not just where libraries have been, but where they're going.

Let's not squander that opportunity with a hasty decision. Let's not settle for adequate when we could achieve excellent. Let's not patch when we could transform.

I urge you to support the motion for a comprehensive study. Let's give ourselves and this community the gift of thoughtful, strategic planning.

Our children are watching. Our grandchildren will inherit what we build—or what we fail to build—today.

Let's make them proud.

Mayor Booker restated the motion for clarity, confirming that the intent was to place a moratorium on the maintenance expenses unless they're absolutely necessary during this time of a committee to be appointed by the mayor and report back in 120 days with a mission to be the best library plan for the community and for the future.

Warren confirmed the Mayor's understanding.

Motion by Randy Warren, Second by George Gill to place a moratorium on the maintenance expenses unless they're absolutely necessary during this time of a committee to be appointed by the mayor and report back in 120 days with a mission to be the best library plan for the community and for the future.

Mayor Booker proposed a friendly amendment to appoint Council member Warren as Chairman of the committee. Council member Warren accepted the amendment, and the seconder Gill agreed.

Hampton stated that while facility maintenance is critical, a 120-day evaluation period was reasonable given the age of the library and the potential need for broader system upgrades, including HVAC. He stated that he had toured the facility and visited with Councilman Gill and library staff and believed further analysis was appropriate.

Kristin Herr, Library Director, attempted to comment but was told by Mayor Booker there was a motion and a second and the Council would be voting.

VOTE ON MOTION: AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

Mayor Booker stated that he would work with the appointed Chairman to establish the committee and that committee membership would be brought back to the City Council for consideration at an upcoming meeting.

4. Receive a presentation from the Lawton Youth Sports Trust Authority (LYSA) and Eastern Sports Management (ESM) regarding the Lawton Fort Sill Sports Park Economic Impact Analysis, including the proposed facility design and a request for formal approval of the Scope of Work, either as a phased approach or as a full project, and take action as deemed necessary.

Brian Henry, Lawton Youth Sports Trust Authority Chairman, provided opening remarks and introduced Brian Cann of Eastern Sports Management, who presented design concepts and economic impact data. He also introduced Will Miller, General Manager of Play Lawton, who oversees youth sports programming.

Henry reviewed prior Capital Improvement Program assumptions from 2019 and explained that initial cost estimates were based on limited market comparisons available at that time. He noted that after Eastern Sports Management was engaged in 2022, a third-party feasibility and economic impact study determined that the originally envisioned 85,000-square-foot facility would be insufficient. The revised design now includes approximately 141,000 square feet, eight hard courts, and an indoor turf field to support tournament play and expanded programming.

Comparisons were provided with peer cities including Norman, Enid, and Edmond,

highlighting recent investments in sports facilities and recreational infrastructure.

Youth sports participation data was presented, showing significant growth since Play Lawton assumed operations. Participation increased from 2,158 youth in 2022 to 3,379 participants by the 2024–2025 season, representing an 89 percent increase. Team participation also increased substantially across fall and winter seasons, despite reliance on borrowed facilities.

Brian Cann of Eastern Sports Management presented site renderings and described the overall layout, including a 141,000-square-foot indoor facility, approximately 600 parking spaces adjacent to the building, additional parking near the fields, ten outdoor multi-purpose turf fields, restroom buildings, concessions, and traffic circulation improvements. The design allows for flexible field configurations to support multiple sports and higher-level competition.

Henry reviewed economic impact projections, which were based on conservative assumptions of 35 tournaments annually. The analysis projected approximately \$10 million in annual economic impact for an indoor-only facility and approximately \$18.5 million annually for a combined indoor and outdoor facility. Over a 20-year period, the projected economic impact ranged from \$275 million to nearly \$500 million, depending on project scope.

Funding sources were discussed, including a \$3 million commitment from the McMahon Foundation. Grant applications to the Defense Community Infrastructure Program were noted as unsuccessful. Council members discussed potential naming rights, private donations, and phased funding strategies.

Mayor Booker stated that he appreciated the comparison to Enid and noted that he had personally toured Enid's soccer complex with the Mayor of Enid. He noted that he texted the Mayor of Enid. He remarked that he was struck by how much of that facility had been funded through local private donations, rather than grants or city funds.

He expressed strong support for the overall youth sports vision and stated that he believes Lawton's goal should be to become the premier youth sports program in Oklahoma, noting that sports must be a key component of the City's Kids First initiative. He acknowledged that funding remains the primary challenge and thanked staff for presenting the project in phases.

Mayor Booker asked whether staff had explored naming rights or similar private funding mechanisms for fields or facilities to help offset costs.

Henry responded that early discussions with Eastern Sports Management have included the use of naming rights for courts and fields to help offset operational costs. He noted that other communities have benefited from significant private investment, often from families who made large contributions after seeing tangible progress.

Henry stated that soliciting private donations before visible construction would likely be difficult, explaining that potential donors typically want to see the project underway before committing funds. He added that once the building is constructed, additional funding opportunities for outdoor fields may become more viable.

Henry further explained that the City is well beyond basic “patchwork” on existing athletic fields, citing ongoing sprinkler failures, lighting deficiencies, and structural issues. He noted that additional items later in the meeting would address retaining walls and other field-related infrastructure needs.

Mayor Booker recalled that City Council had previously taken action to reserve approximately \$9.5 million in ARPA funds for the sports complex, but that those funds were later redirected to industrial park infrastructure due to federal spending timelines. He expressed concern that those funds were originally intended for the sports complex and questioned whether they should still be applied to this project.

Ratliff confirmed that approximately \$3.3 million of ARPA funds were used for an industrial waterline project and \$6.7 million were applied to the aquatic center. He explained that only the portion used for industrial infrastructure may be eligible for repayment through the TIF mechanism.

Mayor Booker stated that Council should revisit how those funds were allocated and determine whether any portion could still be applied to the sports complex, particularly as part of project phasing.

Warren asked Henry to explain upcoming issues related to soccer field availability.

Henry stated that the LYSA has been in discussions with the Lawton Soccer Club, which has expressed interest in transferring its programming to Play Lawton beginning in August 2026. He explained that the Soccer Club currently operates under multiple long-term leases, including Ahlschlager Park and property leased from the Commissioners of the Land Office.

He stated that Ahlschlager Park’s lease expires in June 2026 and that the site is located within a floodplain, making maintenance costly. He further explained that the lease on the Lee Boulevard property includes a no-cost exit window in September 2027, meaning the City must plan for potential displacement of soccer programming.

Henry stated that maintaining the current soccer facilities would cost approximately \$4,000 to \$5,000 per month more than current revenue, primarily due to maintenance and flood-related expenses.

Warren asked how many fields would need to be outside in order to provide enough room for tournaments that take place at Big Green.

Will Miller explained that current tournament operations utilize three full-size fields and

four U12 fields, and that recent tournaments hosted up to 78 teams, with approximately half coming from out of town.

He estimated that to adequately host tournaments and replace existing facilities, the City would need a minimum of six full-size multipurpose fields.

Warren asked what the cost would be to construct those six fields and if the indoor fields could be used.

Henry responded that constructing six full-size fields would cost approximately \$20–25 million, depending on site conditions and phasing. He stated that two fields could potentially be built over existing sites for approximately \$5 million, reducing grading costs.

Warren asked and Henry confirmed that if Council approves the \$40 million Phase One building, and if previously discussed ARPA funds could be located or repurposed, it may be possible to build the building and two fields within the existing funding envelope.

He added that additional field capacity could potentially be achieved through coordination with nearby facilities, including MacArthur High School, which could bring the total usable field count to six through shared-use agreements.

Warren stated that the City must act now to prevent loss of existing soccer programming and emphasized that the sports complex is unique among CIP projects because it generates significant economic impact. He stated that regional tournaments drive hotel stays, restaurant spending, and sales tax revenue in a way that other infrastructure projects do not.

Motion by Randy Warren, Second by Bob Weger to approve \$40 million for Phase One of the youth sports complex building and direct staff to investigate the status and availability of previously allocated ARPA funds.

Mayor Stan Booker stated that he wanted to begin the discussion by reframing the projected economic impact in terms that are easier to understand. He explained that he took the projected economic impact graphic presented to Council and entered the figures into an artificial intelligence tool to compare the projected impact to job creation.

Mayor Booker stated that while a projected half-billion dollars over 20 years sounds significant, he wanted to better understand what that means in practical terms. He explained that, according to the analysis, completing the entire project would be equivalent to approximately 186 full-time jobs paying \$100,000 annually, while completing the indoor portion only would be equivalent to approximately 102 full-time \$100,000 jobs annually. He stated that he found this comparison helpful and informative for understanding the magnitude of the project.

Henry referenced comparisons frequently made to the City of Chickasha, noting that he has repeatedly heard that city mentioned throughout discussions of the project. He stated that Chickasha has a population of approximately 17,000 people, yet has added three new hotels, a Chick-fil-A, a Starbucks, and other commercial development. He stated that, in his view, those developments are not solely the result of population size, but rather the result of intentional investment in amenities that draw visitors. He jokingly referred to this comparison as “Chickasha envy,” while emphasizing respect for the neighboring community.

Mayor Booker then requested a five-minute recess, stating that additional information needed to be reviewed before proceeding to a vote. With no objection from Council, the meeting was recessed.

Council recessed briefly.

Return to Session

After reconvening, Mayor Booker stated that he wanted to read into the record an email he had sent to the Mayor of Enid, David Mason, requesting information regarding the amount of private donations used to fund Enid’s soccer complex. Mayor Booker stated that he had not yet received a response.

Mayor Booker further stated that he had been provided with clarification regarding ARPA funding, noting that:

\$3.3 million of ARPA funds were used for an industrial waterline project, and

\$6.7 million were used for the aquatic center.

He stated that only the \$3.3 million portion may be eligible for reimbursement through the TIF mechanism, and that staff would need to further evaluate how those funds might be addressed going forward.

Mayor Booker then stated that there was a motion on the floor that warranted clarification and asked whether the maker wished to amend it.

Motion by Randy Warren, Second by Bob Weger to approve \$40 million for the youth sports complex building and direct staff to identify and pursue any additional available funding, including funding from prior Capital Improvement Program allocations or other available sources, and to bring those options back to Council for consideration.

Hampton stated that he supported investments that benefit children and the future of the community. He remarked that projects such as this could influence whether younger residents, including his own son, might choose to return to or remain in Lawton because of improved quality-of-life amenities.

Hampton stated that while he believed the project was a “wonderful idea” and expressed enthusiasm for its potential, he wanted to raise a note of caution. He explained that projecting economic outcomes involves risk and stated that he wanted to ensure that the projected half-billion-dollar economic impact was based on realistic expectations rather than speculation.

He stated that he has heard from constituents who support investments in aquatics, road infrastructure, and other quality-of-life projects, but who also want assurance that those investments will produce measurable benefits for the City. Hampton stated that he believes such investments can lead to increased revenue, improved quality of life, and long-term growth, but emphasized the importance of careful consideration and accountability.

He concluded by stating that his comments were offered on behalf of constituents in Ward 5, and that he appreciated the opportunity to discuss the matter.

VOTE ON MOTION: AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

5. Receive a Presentation on the PROPEL 2040 Museum of the Great Plains Capital Improvement Project and provide direction to staff as necessary.

Mike Jones, Engineering Director, introduced Item Five, stating that the next project for Council consideration was the Museum of the Great Plains repairs and renovations, a project estimated at approximately \$6 million with a projected 12-month construction duration. He stated that JD Clark, project architect, would provide the presentation and that museum staff were present to answer questions.

JD Clark, Project Architect, stated that the project had previously been presented to Council approximately one and a half years earlier and that the purpose of the presentation was to review why the project is necessary, summarize identified issues, and provide an update on project status.

Clark stated that the project is currently 95 percent complete in terms of construction documents, with plans to finalize the 95 percent set during the current week and complete final construction documents by the end of November. He described the presentation as a formal update on progress.

Clark explained that the exterior envelope of the building is failing, stating that the roof and exterior walls are leaking extensively. He attributed the issues to a combination of improper and outdated construction techniques, compounded by hail damage from a storm that occurred several years prior, which significantly worsened existing conditions.

Clark identified the primary issues as roof failures resulting from hail damage, clerestory windows leaking due to improper installation, and a stucco system installed in the 1990s using methods no longer accepted because they allow water infiltration. He

stated that birds were nesting in the stucco due to holes created by hail and deteriorated materials, and that water infiltration had caused mold growth on exterior surfaces.

Clark further stated that extensive interior damage has occurred, including damaged flooring, ceilings, and soffits, and that in some areas ceiling tiles have become so saturated that they have fallen. He emphasized that these conditions present not only a health concern, but a serious operational risk to the museum.

Clark explained that museums must maintain strict temperature and humidity controls to protect artifacts, and that ongoing air and water infiltration prevents proper environmental regulation, placing irreplaceable artifacts at risk of permanent damage.

He also noted that portions of the mechanical system were not installed according to original design, with missing components that prevent proper climate control even if the building were airtight. He stated that the HVAC systems have exceeded their life expectancy and that multiple systems have failed in recent months.

Clark stated that the proposed scope includes complete removal of exterior finishes down to the studs, replacement with new exterior systems consistent with those used at McMahon Auditorium, the Aquatic Center, and Elmer Thomas Park, installation of a new roofing system designed for long-term municipal use, allowing future hail damage to be addressed by replacing membranes rather than entire roof systems, repair and replacement of damaged interior finishes, including new carpet, ceiling tiles, and sheetrock, mechanical system upgrades to meet current standards, and added insulation to improve energy efficiency.

He emphasized that the project is not an expansion or enhancement, but a comprehensive repair effort intended to significantly extend the life of the building rather than applying short-term fixes.

Ratliff interjected to clarify that the June 2023 hailstorm insurance claim remains unresolved after approximately two and a half years. He stated that the City has retained a forensic roofing expert to assist with the claim, and that any insurance proceeds recovered would be used to reimburse the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Clark stated that the total estimated project cost, including architectural and engineering fees and contingency, is \$6 million. He emphasized the importance of maintaining contingency funds due to the likelihood of discovering additional hidden damage once demolition begins, particularly given the extent of water infiltration.

Clark stated that to perform the work safely, efficiently, and cost-effectively, the museum would need to close for the duration of construction. He explained that the roof and exterior systems must be removed quickly and comprehensively, and that HVAC systems would be temporarily unavailable during roof replacement.

He stated that temporary protection measures would be installed during construction to limit additional damage, but that protecting artifacts in place is not ideal due to risks from weather, construction activity, and security concerns. He acknowledged that moving and storage costs were not included in the original \$6 million budget, stating this was an oversight due to uncertainty regarding the cost of relocating a museum collection. He also noted that the museum would need to shut down to finish the project in the quickest and most cost effective way. He also noted the need to move some of the artifacts in the museum that was not included in his initial budgeting.

Mayor Booker asked if there was an estimated cost for the moving expense.

Clark stated that the museum staff would have that information and would present it next.

Gill stated that he and the Mayor had toured the facility and confirmed that significant work is necessary. He expressed no objection to the \$6 million repair cost but stated concern that artifact relocation costs had not been scoped or budgeted. He emphasized the need to explore whether any of the relocation work could be performed in-house to reduce costs.

Epps stated strong support for the museum, calling it a community asset, and asked whether the 12-month timeline meant the museum would be closed for the full duration. Clark confirmed that it would. Epps also asked about economic impact, which Clark stated museum staff would address in a subsequent presentation.

Warren asked about the building's square footage, which Clark stated was approximately 58,828 square feet. Warren stated that the project illustrates why attaching new construction to aging structures should be avoided, noting that such decisions can create long-term maintenance challenges. He compared the \$6–7.8 million repair cost to the potential cost of constructing a new facility, noting that museum construction typically ranges from \$400–\$600 per square foot.

Ronda Norrell, Museum of the Great Plains Trust Authority Chairperson, presented operating data, stating that the museum employs nine full-time and five part-time staff, with payroll nearing \$500,000 annually. She outlined annual revenue sources, including City support of \$570,000, admissions, memberships, gift shop sales, and facility rentals. She stated that closure would result in lost revenue and an operating deficit of approximately \$250,000 after expense reductions.

Bart McClenny, Museum of the Great Plains, stated the Museum had obtained two moving estimates to date. McClenny reported one estimate from MMD Services (Dallas) in the amount of approximately \$1.28 million, and explained the asterisk on that estimate reflected MMD being on-site about two weeks of each month, with Museum staff assisting significantly. McClenny further stated that Crozier and US Art were expected to provide turnkey estimates, meaning the moving company would bring

professional staff to perform the packing, with Museum staff assisting but the movers doing the bulk of the work. McClenny stated the Crozier estimate would be approximately \$1.54 million, and he anticipated US Art would be similar to Crozier. McClenny also advised that JK Moving Services had been recommended by JD Clark and the Museum was awaiting an estimate from JK, which had not yet been received. McClenny summarized that the Museum had two estimates in hand and was waiting on two additional estimates, and then asked if Council had any questions.

Warren asked whether the estimates included a storage facility.

McClenny responded the current plan was to use space at FISTA that would be made available. McClenny stated the plan would be to pack up everything at the Museum, move it to the mall, where it would mostly remain packed, and the quoted prices included returning the items to the Museum at the end of the project.

Mayor Booker questioned if there would be a storage fee.

Norrell stated the Museum would be paying some amount while at FISTA and Mayor Booker asked whether that was in the presented budget.

Norrell stated it would be an additional cost and Mayor Booker asked where the funding would come from. Norrell stated the museum would have to figure it out.

Mayor Booker stated there was already a "\$1.28 million surprise" and stated he understood there were "about \$250,000" of other numbers on top of that, and asked whether there would be storage fees in addition to that.

Norrell stated the storage fees should be approximately \$4.50 to \$5.70 per square foot, and that some items would be offset to help pay for it.

Mayor Booker asked whether that would be a one-time fee.

Norrell responded it would be a yearly fee.

Blazek-Scherler stated she had received clarification that it would not be a storage fee charged, but rather utilities.

Hampton stated he assumed that when everything was unpacked and returned, there would need to be a strategy in how displays were reassembled, and asked whether that was part of the cost, or whether the movers would bring everything back and Museum staff would put the Museum back together using salaried employees.

Norrell responded, "Yes," indicating Museum staff would reassemble the Museum on salaried employees, and confirmed that was the plan/cost assumption. Norrell stated that part of what the Museum viewed as an opportunity during shutdown was to use time to do additional work.

Norrell referenced the collection shown and stated it was extensive and cataloged, and the Museum hoped to enhance it by doing online cataloging, online displays, and using time to digitize items.

Hampton stated that would be a good time to do that and asked whether there would be any added cost other than salary to get the Museum “back together” when the packers brought everything back, stating he was trying to understand what the City was paying for.

Norrell stated there would be some cost, but staff would be on hand to do much of the reassembly and the movers would bring items back, and the intent was to enhance the space. Norrell stated it would largely be in-house.

Gil stated Council would need a number in order to make a motion, and said they were trying to put a number together. Gil stated Council would need an estimate on utilities and asked what the utility cost at FISTA would be, whether it was “\$1,000 or \$10,000,” and stated Council wanted to help the Museum but needed figures.

Norrell stated they were looking at \$1.6 million added to the budget to help with the move and that they would like to get that down. Norrell stated utilities were estimated at about \$50,000–\$58,000, and stated that placed the total closer to \$1.7 million.

Mayor Booker asked for an explanation of how the charges would work.

Dr. Krista Ratliff, President and CEO of FISTA, stated there would be no rent charged, and utilities would be an estimated \$4.50–\$5.00 per square foot, depending on the amount of space needed. Dr. Ratliff stated the space needed to be climate controlled to protect artifacts and the utility fee would be a direct pass-through cost with no gross revenue.

Mayor Booker began calculating and asked “\$5 times how many feet?” and asked what the earliest calculations were.

Jason Poudrier, Arts and Humanities Division, stated the early calculation was 13,000 square feet.

Poudrier stated the utilities could range \$65,000 to \$80,000, and added that another consideration was that many artifacts were on storage racks and the racks could stay, and it may be cheaper to buy additional racks. Poudrier stated an additional \$80,000 could be needed for storage racks on top of moving costs in order to move artifacts completely out.

Poudrier referenced additional slides and noted the Museum had large and significant holdings (including reference to a partial mammoth and catalogs/archives), and explained that although many items were boxed, they were boxed to move from shelf to

display shelf, not for repeated transport. Poudrier stated each item would need to be individually wrapped by professionals, which was part of the cost, and larger items required specialized handling and storage planning. Poudrier stated Crozier and similar professionals were equipped to move these items.

McClenny stated the Museum was a repository for the Bureau of Reclamation and that the Bureau had requested its collection be removed from the site due to renovation conditions. He stated the discussion had progressed toward removing the entire collection to FISTA.

Poudrier stated that the request being presented was, in addition to the \$6 million budgeted for renovations, approximately \$1.8 million to ensure artifacts were properly protected. He compared it to renovating a house and protecting valuables by moving them into storage rather than leaving them during construction.

Mayor Booker thanked Poudrier and stated the challenge was that the additional amount was about a 23% increase over what had been budgeted, creating a significant issue. Mayor Booker stated he wished the City had a policy ensuring scope and complete information were included up front, and stated it was difficult to budget without complete information.

Chapman stated they expected insurance money from the hailstorm claim in the amount of approximately \$500,000 to \$1,000,000, which could be applied to what Council was discussing.

Warren stated he had a policy that could be brought to Council at a future meeting.

Warren stated he had the same concerns about cost additions and said it appeared that once money was identified, more requests followed, and Council needed a way to prevent that from happening and to create a process ensuring what ultimately got funded was appropriate.

Warren raised an idea for consideration: potentially moving some items only once by moving them to FISTA and making them part of FISTA, and only moving part of the collection back, leaving some storage and hands-on items there. Mayor Booker stated he was "just throwing it out there."

Norrell stated that at the start of the project, the team did not understand what it would cost to fully move out of the facility, and that packing collections and archives in a preservation-appropriate way was not something most people could do. She stated it was a shock when the first bid came in, and after returning to the architect with the cost, it was discovered the moving scope was not included in the budget/bidding. Norrell stated it was concerning, but also stated that if the building continued to decline, the City would lose more.

Mayor Booker stated he did not believe anyone was disputing the need to address the

decline.

Hooton referred back to the “band-aid” concept, stating the costs continued to increase as more issues were discovered. He asked whether the team could reach a firm understanding of the total cost—whether it was \$7 million or \$10 million.

Norrell stated the architect had done more investigation and had developed ideas to reduce closure time by allowing moving/packing while some work began, so the closure period would be less and revenue could be restored sooner, but noted that costs could not be fully confirmed until work began. She then asked Clark to address construction sequencing.

Clark stated they had evaluated different approaches to the roof system and demolition due to the fact that packing archives could take four to six months. Clark stated the plan was to begin certain demo and repairs while packing occurred, including temporary repair methods intended to prevent further water infiltration, and to provide temporary air conditioning as needed. Clark stated they were trying to mitigate an 18-month closure by modifying construction methods. Clark stated they had repeatedly returned to the drawing board to keep the project on budget and reduce costs, and emphasized that the moving scope was an area not accounted for early in the project. Clark stated he had not expected the cost of moving a museum to be \$1.6 million and personally would have assumed \$200,000–\$300,000, noting he does not move museums for a living.

Mayor Booker stated that, as he understood it, Council was being asked to approve the \$6 million plus an additional \$1.8 million for the move/storage/utilities, and asked if that was correct.

Norrell responded, “Pretty close.”

Mayor Booker stated that after discussing it, Council did not have much choice and asked for a motion to approve \$7.8 million.

Motion by George Gill, Second by Lane Hooton, to approve \$7.8 million.

Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager, provided clarification that anything added to the budget would be supplemental funding in the next round of financing; the \$6 million was already on the books for the project. Burk stated Council would be approving additional supplemental/contingency funding allocated toward the same project. Burk stated if the full amount was not spent, that was acceptable. Burk stated Council could provide direction at the meeting and it would be included in the note being considered the next day.

Hampton directed a question to Ratliff regarding whether insurance proceeds, once received, could be applied toward the additional \$1.8 million.

Ratliff stated there was flexibility, and if CIP money was used to repair the roof, he believed it was possible to apply insurance proceeds. When asked for a timeline, Ratliff stated the City was two and a half years into the claim process, the insurance company had contested it throughout, and he was hesitant to provide a timeline, though he believed they were getting closer.

Gill stated he would like to amend the motion to provide that whatever money was received back from insurance would go toward this particular project rather than reimbursing the CIP. As the seconder, Hooton agreed.

Mayor Booker acknowledged the amendment.

Warren asked how many square feet at FISTA would be needed, and Norrell responded 13,000.

Epps asked whether any state or federal funding or grants had been sought for the project, stating it seemed like the project could qualify.

Norrell asked whether Epps was asking about the moving component or another portion of the project.

Epps clarified he meant any part, particularly the construction work, and whether grant processes could be started to offset costs.

Norrell stated the museum was somewhat behind in pursuing grants, but they were looking at grant funding to enhance other projects already in place so that other monies could be freed for things such as restoring certain equipment and enhancing displays when the Museum reopened.

Mayor Booker restated the motion for clarity as approval of \$7.8 million and proceeding with bids, confirming bids would occur after the end of November. Gill confirmed.

Mayor Booker further stated insurance proceeds would go back to pay back costs, and asked if he had that right. Gill confirmed generally, and then clarified the intent was to reimburse the move portion rather than the CIP.

Mayor Booker stated if CIP money was being borrowed to do the move, then the distinction would be a "moot point," and a discussion followed regarding the source of the \$1.8 million.

Mayor Booker clarified: the \$6 million was budgeted in the CIP and the additional \$1.8 million would come from contingency in the CIP, to be reimbursed by insurance proceeds as much as possible.

Mayor Booker asked whether that captured what was needed.

Burk asked whether the \$1.8 million included storage costs associated with the artifacts.

Mayor Booker stated the \$1.8 million included the items beyond the original budget number, including moving, utilities, storage-related needs, and some equipment.

Mayor Booker asked whether the motion allowed the City to proceed.

Burk confirmed.

Motion by George Gill, Second by Lane Hooton, to Motion to approve \$7.8 million and proceeding with bid and use the insurance money to reimburse the \$1.8 million. AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

6. Receive a Presentation Regarding Phase III of Park Improvements as Part of the PROPEL 2040 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and provide direction to staff as necessary.

Larry Parks, Community Enrichment Director, stated he was excited to present the City's Phase 3 park improvements project as part of the PROPEL 2040 CIP, and to receive any guidance or direction Council deemed necessary. He stated Phase 3 would continue the City's commitment to improvements and long-term sustainability of Lawton's public parks and recreation spaces. Parks explained that, in addition to the City's PROPEL 2040 investment—described as a \$2 million investment—the Lawton Community Enrichment Department had recently been awarded a \$738,406 Healthy Kids Initiative grant through Play and Park Structures to help offset costs and expand play opportunities for children of all ages and abilities. He stated the grant funds could be used through February 27, 2026. He advised that, with Council's approval, the grant opportunity would maximize total investment in the City's park system and ensure successful project completion.

Parks stated the Phase 3 park improvement project was already aligned with Council's vision under PROPEL 2040 CIP, which he described as reinvesting in public spaces that support recreation, connectivity, and the overall quality of life for Lawton residents. He said he was excited to present the improvements. He noted the Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation would come forward in a few minutes, but he would begin by walking through the slides and agenda, and said the presentation should be fairly quick.

Parks provided a quick update and advised that the completion date shown as October 2025 had moved into November. He stated that in prior rounds of park improvements, the work was completed in November, and he was confident the City would meet the November goal for completion of these nine parks.

Parks explained the department initially identified 32 parks, and this round would complete improvements in 25 parks. He stated the remaining seven parks under the long-term strategic park improvement plan would be addressed through hybrid

improvements. He explained “hybrid” meant the City would have one or two parks per year with complete play unit replacement (as being done now), while other parks would receive targeted improvements in certain areas. He stated most play units were old, but for the final seven parks, some could be improved because parts were still available; those units would be improved accordingly. For other locations, he said the City would return areas to green spaces and create tranquil parks where people could rest and relax. He added that planned work also included improving parking lots, improving trails for bikes and other recreation, planting trees, and other related improvements.

Parks stated the slides then showed the beginning of this round of park improvements. He referenced Ward 1, identifying Stephens Park (1804 Northwest 23rd), and stated the capacity information and grant savings were shown at the bottom. He stated the listed price of \$278,357.74 did not include the grant, and said the grant impact would be shown on the last slide.

Parks referenced Ward 2, identifying Kathy Newcomb Park, and described it as a very large play unit, with grant savings shown on the bottom and an initial cost shown on the slide.

Parks referenced Ward 3, identifying Patriot Park, and stated that what Council saw in the photos was exactly what the public would get.

Parks continued through the remaining parks shown in the presentation, identifying:

East Side Park (described as another large unit),

Harmon Park,

Great Plains,

Sullivan Village,

Putney Park, and

Lee West.

Parks stated that for Lee West, the play unit had already been approved, the unit was installed, and the sidewalk around it was complete. He stated they were waiting on the poured “pour-and-play” surfacing, and once that surfacing was installed, it would complete the build.

Parks stated he included Lee West because staff wanted to do, in conjunction with this work, a splash pad. He referenced prior Council direction, stating Council had asked staff to bring it back, and he believed Council wanted “the Buick and not the Rolls-Royce.” He stated staff could provide that approach now, and that they had the crew on the ground ready to move forward. He described the Lee West play unit as a Thunder-

themed unit based on Thunder Court and the long-term design of that park. He stated there were other plans to “scratch in” a temporary parking lot and do additional work at that site, and indicated those items were covered as part of broader plans, but the splash pad discussion was presented in conjunction with the planned improvements.

Parks stated the main issue ultimately came down to cost. He described the slide layout, stating the top left quadrant reflected the total cost without the grant, the top right quadrant reflected the grant included, and the center/lower center included the Lee West splash pad. He stated the total shown was \$2,248,755.82. He then opened the floor for questions.

Mayor Booker stated the numbers went by quickly, but he calculated the grant equaled about 35%, and asked if that was correct.

Parks confirmed that calculation was correct.

Mayor Booker stated that was amazing and thanked Parks and his staff for extending citizens’ money to get more “bang for the buck.” He thanked Parks for the work and asked for Council comments.

Warren stated he had a quick question regarding a location not in his ward, which he believed was Hampton’s. Warren stated Council had discussed putting a splash pad directly to the east of the parking lot at the municipal pool on 11th, and asked whether that was still being planned.

Parks responded, “Yes, sir,” and stated it was part of the strategic long-term plan.

Motion by None, Second by None, to approve to proceed with Phase III of Park Improvements as presented.

Hampton stated Ward 5 was challenging in some ways due to lower economic families, and he referenced seeing large birthday celebrations already being held at a park in Ward 5. He stated he wanted to say this was a commitment by Parks and his staff to take care of those spaces and expressed appreciation.

VOTE ON MOTION: AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

7. Receive a presentation from C.H. Guernsey & Company regarding the Elmer Thomas Park Amphitheater & Boardwalk Project PR2308 to include proposed project design and scope of work and determine whether to proceed with a phased project approach or full project execution, and take action as deemed necessary.

Mike Jones, Engineering Director, introduced the next project and stated the City was excited to bring it forward and believed most Council members were familiar with it. He

stated the project would turn Elmer Thomas Park into a true landmark property for the City of Lawton and described it as a multifaceted project. Jones stated JD Clark, would present, and Parks and Recreation staff were available for questions.

Clark stated it was an honor to present the project to the Council and that he was excited about it. He acknowledged that the Council was reviewing phased options and stated there were two phased options included. He stated the project could be scaled back and forth to accommodate what the City could afford. Clark stated staff had also begun looking at a couple of options involving additional funding; however, they did not yet have numbers for those funding options, and he did not expect confirmation on them until probably January.

Clark stated parks matter and described Elmer Thomas Park as the City's big Central Park. He stated everyone in the community uses parks—parks are not only for little kids or the elderly—and emphasized that what was being done in the park was for everybody. He stated there was not an element of the project that was geared toward only one type of person; everyone in the park and community would be able to use the improvements. Clark stated the project would improve the health of the community, improve the environment, enhance the community, and create space for people to gather, and stated nature would be improved and made more accessible for all citizens.

Clark stated the area focus was mostly around Lake Helen. He identified several focus areas: a drainage swale on the other side of the two playgrounds; the amphitheater area (a small area between Third Street and the Aquatic Center), noting it was not yet on the map, and they needed Google to update it; and a parking lot area. Clark noted the slide view was somewhat cropped but stated that a lot of work was being done in the park. He stated updates had been made, and some areas had been expanded.

Clark stated staff had the honor of attending the City's Freedom Festival, which resulted in modifications to the plan. He stated they initially looked at the food truck area and, after discussions with Jason and staff, originally planned for 10 food truck spots, but that was not enough. Clark stated the City actually has 40 food trucks at the event with another 10 vendors, and therefore staff developed an alternate plan that included utilizing parts of Third Street, using the existing parking lot for vendor space, and modifying certain elements to accomplish the goals set by the City. He stated those modifications were included in the updated plan. Clark also stated some elements were scaled back to reduce costs and that they changed the way a few items were being built to help manage cost.

Clark identified new features added since the last presentation, including additional boat docks. He stated the boat ramp was moved from the northwest corner of the lake to the southwest corner into a deeper area, so it could be monitored more by the boat house rentals and related operations. He stated, otherwise, the project had mostly stayed the same, but noted there had been some additional development in the northwest corner. He stated that, after receiving survey information, pedestrian bridges in that area became longer, as the wetland area was larger than anticipated; he stated

the bridges had to be extended if they were to remain over the wetland.

Clark stated the project still included a fitness tower but that its height was reduced to save costs related to building height and to avoid requiring fire sprinklers and associated requirements. He then referenced renderings, including an overall rendering and an aerial/nighttime view.

Clark stated significant lighting had been integrated into the project. He stated that, at night, there would be opportunities in multiple areas to change light colors for events, and lighting could be sequenced on the bridge and at the sculpture. He stated that the lighting in the auditorium/amphitheater area could also be color changed. He stated there were additional color-changing elements at the monument sign on Cache Road, describing it as a three-sided sign facing I-44, people coming down Cache Road, and the park. He stated the letters could change colors, allowing festive themes such as red, white, and blue, or any colors desired.

Clark described amphitheater-area design elements, stating it included a terrace amphitheater with natural stone retaining walls to save money, using large limestone blocks. He stated limestone was less expensive than concrete retaining walls and provided a natural feel to the park. He stated the plaza area included non-slip colored coatings because integrated splash-pad features were included to reduce costs. He clarified this was not a full splash pad intended primarily for kids to play in (though they could), but rather included integrated lighting to create atmosphere for events, and misting features on some ends to cool the area and create a cooling effect.

Clark stated a food truck plaza would be located to the side of the amphitheater, with space for approximately 10 food trucks for normal events, and additional space down the street and in the parking lot across the street to accommodate up to 40 food trucks. He stated that during an event, food trucks would line the south side of Third Street so people could move out from the plaza. He stated this would create a hub around the amphitheater as a main element and an event space for destination events. Clark stated the amphitheater seating capacity would be around 6,500 people. He stated there would be a ticket and concession building capable of serving food and allowing catering. He stated there would be restrooms, but the full restroom need would not be met because a restroom building meeting full demand would be three times larger; for large events, the City would bring in off-site facilities such as portable toilets.

Clark described the boat house, noting it could also serve as a VIP area for special events. He stated it would include two restrooms, a small catering kitchen, and a covered area with tables and chairs. He stated two dedicated paved parking lots would be added. He noted that one existing area being considered for food trucks/parking was somewhat paved but not accessible, and stated the project would make it a more usable parking lot.

Clark stated speed humps and crossings would be installed across Third Street and a small side street to delineate pedestrian crossing areas for safety. He noted this was

not fully represented on the slide but stated red, white, and blue markings were being integrated into crosswalks, creating patterned crosswalks as a patriotic nod to Fort Sill and adding color without significant added cost.

Clark stated landscaping screening would be incorporated across the project. He added that multiple utilities in the area would be redone. He stated that when survey work was completed, the road segment between Third Street and the parking lot was determined to be insufficient to handle parking loads and turning radii, and therefore that section would be repaved. He stated this added cost was not originally planned and contributed to project overage. Clark reiterated excitement for the amphitheater portion and the overall project.

Clark proceeded to plaza details, stating the plaza area included integrated color and limestone benches, with some benches also functioning as retaining walls down below. He stated a trellis element would provide shade and planters would be included for plant growth.

Clark described the stage area, stating it included a large stage. He stated staff worked with the McMahon Foundation to discuss operations and ensure the facility would work for the community and events, providing infrastructure without being excessive. He stated a canopy would support rigging and noted the stage/shell would be slightly larger than the Scissortail Park stage and shell—wider and a little bigger. He stated they worked with event staff to size it appropriately. He described a storage building that would house storage equipment and a large electrical room/control “brain” for the amphitheater area. He described a paved lower area that could function as a VIP area where chairs could be placed for smaller performances. He also referenced a nighttime view rendering.

Clark described the ticket building, stating it would look familiar and was intended to create a consistent identity across the park. He stated it looked very similar to the aquatics building because it was mirrored to it. He stated the intent was to create a holistic approach across facilities and that the building would be simple and durable.

Clark then discussed the southwest boardwalk plan. He stated the boardwalk area was reduced somewhat to accommodate the boat ramp and mitigate costs. He described a boat dock associated with the boat ramp that would allow unloading and staging while vehicles were moved. He described a boat rental dock and a large square area on the other end for small performances. He stated the boardwalk perimeter around the cove would be terraced with three levels so people could sit and watch small performances on the dock. He stated seating would be provided around the boat house. He described a ramp behind the boathouse connecting to the pedestrian crossing and an additional boardwalk on the other side.

Clark stated the northwest boardwalk was primarily boardwalk space intended for enjoying the lake, with several covered areas and jetties for sitting, relaxing, and fishing, with seating at those jetties. He stated small performance/event areas were

also included. He stated the design salvaged as many trees as possible, including three trees by the water and one in the middle, and the boardwalk alignment was designed around them. He stated it is difficult to replace mature trees, so preserving them would help the long-term appearance and make it feel like the features had always been there.

Clark stated the project included significant landscaping and “zero-scaping” (low water/low maintenance), rock beds, and dry creek bed aesthetics, intended to be easy to maintain. He stated the waterfall trail was initially introduced late in the process but has since been developed further. He stated the waterfall trail was combined with an adventure trail concept, allowing people to venture off the main path, walk through trees and plantings, and cross the creek at multiple points to create a fun, somewhat hidden trail for kids and others.

Clark referenced integration with an existing playground that had recently been completed, describing a slope coming down near that area. He stated the plan included integrating two slides with a rock scramble so children could slide down and climb back up over rocks to repeat. He described it as “a little bit risky” in the sense of being adventurous, but not dangerous, and stated kids need some adventure. He stated there would be two waterfalls at the top, approximately 3.5 to 4 feet tall each, with a trail that goes between them over water so visitors could experience that space.

Clark stated the waterfall feature would reuse runoff from the park into the system and supplement additional water from the lake as needed. He stated that during large rain events, water would bypass through the creek and flow to the lake. He stated pumps would feed the waterfall from the lake. He stated existing splash pads would also feed into this system and that a splash pad would be going in. He stated there was a lot going into that small area. He also noted a small meeting area (shown as a little circle on the plan) that could host small events and could potentially be rented for activities such as small wedding ceremonies.

Clark stated that for signage and paving, they integrated textures and different materials based on earlier image references. He stated hills were included between the bike trail and amphitheater area as a buffer between kid/play areas and the boardwalk.

Clark described the pedestrian bridge rendering, stating the bridge included jetties for fishing and relaxation, a main trail covered in trellis, and construction using Corten steel (“C10,” described as rusty steel) as a low-maintenance and cost-effective material. He stated the bridge would include a concrete deck and raised planters that would also function as benches. He stated the design intent emphasized native, low maintenance, low water plants.

Clark described the boathouse's view, stating it matched other park buildings with brick and similar forms. He stated one end would provide boat rentals, and the other end would provide a concession/catering kitchen the City could access. He referenced boat storage and the boat rack/dock.

Clark described the large sculpture, stating in-grade lights would shine up on each blade; the lights would be color changing and would create animation without requiring movement. He stated grading details would be refined so rocks would come up nearly to the top level, avoiding a cliff-like drop-off and grading down to the water.

Clark referenced the Lawton sign element and stated colors were selected but, with color-changing capability, any colors could be used. He stated the letters would be approximately 12 to 15 feet tall. He stated the sign element was constructed on a hill and that approximately 6 feet of earth had been added to raise it to improve visibility from multiple directions.

Clark stated boardwalk details were further refined, including shade structures, alcove seating, walls that become benches, integrated pathways, and wood boardwalk at lower levels. He noted the adjacent natural area included salvaged existing trees. He stated the area could accommodate small performances. He also described using large limestone beams as walls, describing them as cost-effective, requiring foundations and stacking.

Clark stated the observation/fitness tower changed based on Council direction. He stated that some solid walls originally proposed were removed for security reasons. He stated the tower would be made of Corten steel, include perforated panels, and have a viewing platform at the top. He described it as fun and dynamic and potentially an iconic park feature. He stated the tower height would provide strong views. He compared it to the aquatic center slide complex at approximately 20–23 feet, and stated the tower would be 55 feet tall, providing roughly double the height and better views.

Clark stated the conceptual schedule goal was to open for the June Freedom Festival 2027. He stated construction documents were being wrapped up and should be complete at the end of November. He stated permitting and bidding would occur in December, with reviewing and awarding bids in January, and starting construction in February. He stated construction would run approximately 16 months for the full project.

Clark stated the “bad news” was that the total project cost was currently \$39,700,000, consisting of construction costs plus owner’s contingency and testing. He stated cost increases were driven by several items, including: repaving work not originally planned; small pedestrian bridges doubling in length; increased utilities scope; and worse-than-expected soil conditions (initial assumptions based on the aquatic center geotech, but conditions were worse in the project area), resulting in heavier and larger foundations with limited ability to reduce foundation costs. He stated overall costs were approximately \$4 million over what had been presented previously (he believed last January). He stated staff had already pursued cost reductions and had implemented them, noting they were not simply speculative reductions—staff had taken initiative and reduced costs where possible, changed a few things, and reduced some elements; however, further cuts would begin affecting major elements.

Clark stated Council had asked staff to examine phasing options. He stated the overall project cost remained near \$40 million. He stated staff believed the area around the lake provided the biggest bang for the buck and was the easiest way to phase the project. He stated sequencing the lake area first would not interfere with later construction of the amphitheater; however, constructing the amphitheater first would interfere with lake-area work and make it more difficult (though not impossible), which would increase phase two's cost due to construction difficulty.

Clark described Phase 1 scope as including all site work—dredging, demolition, general conditions, bike trail, site utilities, large pedestrian bridge, boardwalk, boat house, sculpture, fitness tower, small bridges, docks, and the waterfall. He stated the construction cost would be \$22.4 million with a contingency of \$2.2 million. He stated the math on the slide was slightly off, and the total should be \$24.6 million. He then described potential deductions to reduce costs: the sculpture was almost \$1 million (including foundation) and could be eliminated; the fitness tower was approximately \$1.7–\$1.8 million; the two small bridges could potentially be eliminated by using sidewalks and a low-water crossing, saving approximately \$400,000, though the path would be longer and would be subject to being underwater during flood events and would require debris cleanup after major rain events; and the monument sign element could also be eliminated for another \$400,000. He stated that with these deductions, Phase 1 could be reduced to approximately \$21 million including contingency.

Mayor Booker stated he believed he understood: the top option was approximately \$24 million, and the red items were included; if deducted, the project could be reduced to \$21 million. Clark confirmed.

Clark reiterated that this was primarily the lake-area work and stated the reason for including certain elements was that if the City was dredging and working on the lake, it was the best time to build the surrounding elements. He stated there were additional items that could be cut, including the waterfall trail, which would be nice but could be pulled back and not done; he stated it was a significant number—about \$1 million—and not listed on deducted alternates, but could be considered. Clark stated there was some flexibility.

Clark described Phase 2 as the amphitheater, parking lot, road improvements, and ticket buildings. He stated construction cost would be around \$15 million. He stated if Phase 2 were delayed, additional engineering fees would be required because construction administration time would effectively double, and other modifications could be needed. He stated that in a worst-case scenario—if Phase 2 were delayed by 10 years—building codes could change, requiring updates and additional engineering. He stated the owner's contingency brought that phase cost to \$17 million. He stated that assuming a 5% annual inflation rate, it could add around \$11 million (as a worst-case; he suggested 5% was conservative and it might be closer to 3%), resulting in a potential total cost of \$28 million if delayed 10 years. He stated he did not know that it would be delayed 10 years, but “stuff happens.”

Mayor Booker stated he understood and appreciated Clark proving the point that the City needed to get started because people voted for the projects and wanted them moving, and costs increase when waiting.

Clark acknowledged and stated he had a couple more slides, including potential funding/grant opportunities being explored. He referenced a strong opportunity through Oklahoma Travel/the Land and Water Conservation Fund, describing it as a 50/50 match for parts of the project, clarifying it would not be a full project 50/50 match but would apply to specific components, subject to qualification and award, and not guaranteed. He stated other options included state public facilities funds and a recreational trail program he described as "80/20," noting he needed to confirm whether the City provided 80 and they provided 20, or vice versa; he stated he believed it was the City providing 20 and that it was favorable, but he would verify. He stated this too would apply to parts of the project, not the entire project. He stated there were wildlife department habitat improvement opportunities related to fishing docks and the pedestrian bridge, possibly covering portions. He stated a challenge with these funding sources was that the City needed a project in hand and identified funding to demonstrate what the City had and what it needed covered. He stated many grants could "stack," meaning the City could combine multiple grant sources rather than choose only one. He also referenced "T-set opportunities" (unclear) and stated staff was exploring other areas.

Clark stated there may be community investment opportunities similar to those discussed for the sports facility, including outreach to see whether the McMahon Foundation or others might help fund portions such as the amphitheater. He stated other facilities could also be explored. He then concluded his presentation and apologized for the length.

Mayor Booker stated his regret was that Clark did not bring the video used at municipal events, because the Mayor believed it put the City in a very good light and made others jealous. Mayor Booker stated the City had been showing the video at events and stated everyone loved it. Mayor Booker then stated Council wanted to do it all but could not. He stated the problem was that the City was needing "20 million or something," and he had seen Dewayne Burk, Deputy City Manager, had \$10 million on his board, and he asked what the plan was.

Burk responded that reaching the 20 million level was possible but would require cutting other items described as "ancillary projects" that had been added. He stated they could get to 20, but it would require cutting some other projects out of the current round of funding. Burk stated most of the ancillary items were smaller amounts that might be worked in over the years depending on funding levels that came in and any growth that outpaced projections, which could create opportunities. Burk stated it ultimately depended on Council's priority; if Council wanted to make this project a priority and push forward with 20, staff would reprioritize the list and adjust accordingly.

Mayor Booker stated staff used more conservative numbers than in the original CIP and

stated comfort with that approach. He also stated that if projections improved, additional funding could become available.

Warren stated he wished the City could do the full \$40 million because it would never be cheaper than it was currently, but he did not see any way to do that. He stated he would be in favor of doing \$20 million and cutting smaller ancillary projects off the bottom of the list for now and saving those for the next round. He stated doing 20 now rather than "14, whatever" would save money, estimating approximately \$600,000, if not more.

Clark stated the City was not guaranteed any grant funding but would try to obtain it. He stated that if Council committed 20, staff might obtain another 10 from another source, allowing more of the project to be completed. He stated staff would scale the project up to whatever could be funded.

Warren stated he believed the project was one of the main projects Council discussed with citizens besides infrastructure. He stated this project and the youth sports project were leading projects when the City conducted outreach at schools, churches, and other venues, and stated the project would affect all citizens. Warren stated he would make a motion to proceed with the 20.

Mayor Booker asked to put the slide back up to ensure everyone was on the same page.

Mayor Booker then referenced the displayed figure and stated it showed 21 at the bottom.

Warren stated he would like to figure out a way to do \$24.4 million because he did not like the cuts. He stated he understood some items could be done later, but stated it was better cost wise to do them now while the project was underway.

Mayor Booker suggested making a motion directing staff to figure out the \$24.4 million option and bring it back to the next meeting.

Mayor Booker then stated that would be his motion: to direct staff to bring back what projects would need to be put off to do the \$24.4 million approach.

Motion by Randy Warren, Second by Allan Hampton, to direct staff to bring back what projects would need to be put off to do the \$24.4 million approach.

Ratliff noted that the projects were already on tomorrow's Council agenda.

Burk stated they were already scheduling a call with the bond attorney and financial advisor in anticipation of changes and that staff would try to work it out in the morning. Burk stated it might require an amendment to the resolution to be presented the next night, but stated it could likely be handled on the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION: AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

8. Receive a report regarding the overall master planning of the McMahon Park ballfields to include specific retaining wall/bleacher seating improvements.

JD CLARK stated a quick proposal had been presented to Council a couple of years ago (then clarified “five years ago”), and staff had been asked to come back out and review it again. Clark stated staff had been told there was \$2 million and asked what could be done for \$2 million.

Burk then stated, “Not anymore.”

Clark clarified that if \$2 million were available, the scope described was what the City could get. He stated this was one of the projects getting cut. Clark described the project as a contingency: if something happened and Council decided to spend \$2 million, then this is what could be done.

Clark described the general disrepair of the current ballfields and proposed scope, stating staff would regrade the area around the middle softball field, redo retaining walls, redo grandstands, salvage and reuse existing shade structures, re-roof and redo soffits and fascias on existing buildings and paint them, remove the asphalt and gravel area and regrade with asphalt millings, and—if necessary—provide ADA parking spaces and concrete. Clark stated staff would flip one field, explaining it was cheaper to flip the field than install a retaining wall and would help facility longevity by reducing travel time between fields and placing fields closer to bathrooms and the concession building. Clark stated ballfields are typically arranged in a cloverfield arrangement and the changes would move toward that arrangement.

Clark stated the estimate was approximately \$1.66 million for construction, plus fees/survey/owner contingency, totaling just under \$2 million.

Mayor Booker stated he did not see an action item and only saw “receiving a report.” He asked for clarification, referencing “McMahon” and stating it was the McMahon softball complex on the list of projects.

Ratliff confirmed it was correct and stated it was only receiving a report and there was no action required.

Mayor Booker stated Council would receive the report and asked for questions.

Warren asked LYSA Chairman Henry whether the field is currently used.

Henry responded that it is currently used.

Warren asked whether the field would still be needed once the youth sports facility is

complete.

Henry responded, "Preferably not," and stated it should be possible to "fill it all" (use the new facility) if the full building is completed.

Warren stated the reason for the question was that they did not want to spend money if the City would not use it. He stated it would be better to program the money for something else, but acknowledged the City may have to use the field for a little while.

No action was taken.

Adjournment

The City of Lawton encourages participation from all of its citizens. If participation at any public meeting is not possible due to a disability, notification to the City Clerk at (580) 581-3305 at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting is encouraged to make the necessary accommodations. The City may waive the 48 hour rule if interpreters for the deaf (signing) is not the necessary accommodation."

Motion by George Gill, Second by Allan Hampton, to Adjourn. AYE: Linda Chapman, George Gill, Allan Hampton, Bob Weger, Randy Warren, Taron Epps, Lane Hooton. NAY: None. Motion Passed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:07 PM.

Park Improvements III

Proposal JUL 25



City of
Lawton

Agenda

- Status of second round improvements
- Proposed units at various parks
- Lee West Splash Pad
- Summary
- Questions



Park Improvement II Status

	Estimated Start Date	Completion
Gooch Acres Park (1)	OCT 2025	OCT 2025
Skyline East Park (4)		Complete
Hunter Hills (6)		Complete
Prairie Park (4)		Complete
35 th Division (5)	SEP 2025	OCT 2025
Willow Creek Park (6)		Complete
Mocine Park (7)	SEP 2025	OCT 2025
Lee West Park (8)	AUG 2025	OCT 2025
Greer Park (KIDsZONE) (3)	MAY 2025	* 11 OCT 2025

Park Issues

There are currently 32 playground sets remaining to be upgraded within the City of Lawton parks. Many of them are in various states of disrepair. Sun fading, cracking plastics, rust, chipped paint, surfacing issues, drainage, graffiti/vandalism are all issues. Some playgrounds also have old metal slides and other components that no longer meet playground safety criteria.

Other issues include:

- Outdated/ worn park signage
- Dilapidated bathrooms or no bathrooms at all
- Lack of shade
- Lack of benches
- Lack or adequate trash collectors

 Mattie Beal Park



Weak Points in backboard from rust. POTENTIAL HAZARD.



Standing Water. Drainage Issues. Probability for dangerous waterborne pathogens. Causing posts and frame to rust. POTENTIAL HAZARD.



Shoe has reached its limit on being repainted. Chipping paint. Safety Surface has eroded. POTENTIAL HAZARD.

 Gray Warr Park



Plastic is brittle and has potential of cracking. Surfacing needs excavated and redone. POTENTIAL HAZARD.



decks have exposed metal and dip is eroded. POTENTIAL HAZARD.



Swing Frame has reached its limit on being repainted.



Graffiti and other vandalism.

 George Lee Park



Tot Seats and Swings are brittle and cracking. POTENTIAL HAZARD.



Slide has mold, fading, water spots, and cracking. POTENTIAL HAZARD.



Swing Frame has reached its limit on being repainted.



4 way bounce is chipped and rusting. plastic horses are brittle. pea gravel is no longer to code for surfacing.

\$278,357.74

Stephens Park

Ward 1

1804 NW 23rd



Small, multi-structure,
shaded. 100-125 capacity

Grant Savings: \$54,154.00



\$333,051.63

Kathy Newcomb Park
Ward 2
1201 NW Ferris

**Large, climbing features, multi
slide. Capacity 125-150**
Grant Savings: \$99,562.50

Patriot Park

Ward 3

2502 NW Bell

Medium, climbing
features.
85-90 capacity

\$386,578.22

Grant Savings: \$116,282.50





\$416,259.22

East Side Park

Ward 4

4300 East Gore Blvd

**Large, multi-structure, wide
age range. Capacity 125-150**



Grant Savings: \$101,119.50

\$381,053.09



Harmon Park

Ward 5

1308 NW Bell

Large, multi-structure, wide
age range. Capacity 125-150

Grant Savings: \$103,006.00

Great Plains Park

Ward 6

1711 NW 67TH

\$165,835.28



Medium, multi structure, climbing features, and slides. 70-75 capacity.

Grant Savings: \$43,470.50



\$466,752.77

Large, multi structure. 130-160 capacity.



Sullivan Village

Ward 7

602 SE 38th

Grant Savings: \$134,278.50



\$322,443.66

Large Size Unit, multi slide,
climbing features. 90-110 capacity.



**Putney Park
Option**

Ward 8
6302 NW Elm

Grant Savings: \$84,532.50



Lee West
Ward 8

\$381,889

Large, multi structure, pour-in-place surface. 180-200 capacity.

APPROVED AND SCHEDULED

Lee West Splash Pad

Ward 8



OKC THUNDER WILL RETURN IN SEPT 2025

Splash pad consist of ten devices and is a flow-thru system. \$160,000.



Park	Improvement	Cost
Stephens Park (1)	Playground	\$278,357.74
Kathy Newcomb Park (2)	Playground	\$333,051.63
Patriot Park (3)	Playground (Option 2)	\$386,578.22
East Side Park (4)	Playground	\$416,259.22
Harmon Park (5)	Playground	\$381,053.09
Great Plains Park (6)	Playground	\$165,835.28
Sullivan Village Park (7)	Playground (Option 2)	\$466,752.77
Putney Park (8)	Playground	\$322,443.66
	Original Total	\$2,750,331.61

Spark Grant Savings		
	Savings	After Grant
Stephens Park (1)	\$56,154.00	\$219,033.95
Kathy Newcomb Park (2)	\$99,562.50	\$233,489.13
Patriot Park (3)	\$116,282.50	\$270,295.72
East Side Park (4)	\$101,119.50	\$315,139.72
Harmon Park (5)	\$103,006.00	\$278,047.09
Great Plains Park (6)	\$43,470.50	\$122,364.78
Sullivan Village Park (7)	\$134,278.50	\$332,474.27
Putney Park (8)	\$84,532.50	\$237,911.16
Totals	Savings- \$738,406.00	We pay- 2,008,755.82

Lee West Splash Pad		
Lee West Park (8)	Splash Pad	\$160,000.00
Park Improvements	Playground Units	\$2,008,755.82

Total Improvement Costs		
Park Units	Splash Pad	Total
\$2,088,755.82	\$160,000.00	We pay- \$2,248,755.82

A man and two children are playing soccer in a grassy field during sunset. The man, wearing a white t-shirt and brown shorts, is in the center, kicking a white ball. A young boy in a white long-sleeved shirt and green shorts is on the left, and a young girl in a pink t-shirt and blue shorts is on the right. The background shows a line of trees and a bright, hazy sky. The word "Questions?" is overlaid in the center of the image.

Questions?