

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT  
ACCESS AUDIT AND TRANSITION PLAN  
PARKS AND FACILITIES**

**CITY OF SHAWNEE, KANSAS**

**FINAL REPORT: SUMMARY  
AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**JANUARY 31, 2023**

**CITY COUNCIL**

**Michelle Distler**, Mayor  
**Tammy Thomas**, Ward I Councilmember  
**Tony Gillette**, Ward I Councilmember  
**Eric Jenkins**, Ward II Councilmember  
**Dr. Mike Kemmling**, Ward II Councilmember  
**Kurt Knappen**, Ward III Councilmember  
**Angela Stiens**, Ward III Councilmember  
**Jill Chalfie**, Ward III Councilmember  
**Jacklynn Walters**, Ward III Councilmember



**PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**Eric Ammerman**, Ward I Representative  
**Elaine Copp**, Ward I Representative  
**Neal Sawyer**, Ward II Representative  
**DeAnn Gould-Lancaster**, Ward III Representative  
**Rebecca Bailey**, Ward III Representative  
**Peter Jarchow**, Ward III Representative  
**Douglas Waltman**, Ward III Representative  
**Kathy Maxwell**, At-Large Representative

**CITY OF SHAWNEE, KS PROJECT TEAM**

**Tonya Lecuru**, Parks and Recreation Director  
**Caitlin Gard**, ADA Coordinator and Deputy City Manager  
**Sean Keenan**, Recreation Superintendent  
**Brett McCubbin**, Manager of Parks and Facilities  
**Brian Dailey**, Facility Program Manager

**WT GROUP ACCESSIBILITY PRACTICE  
PROJECT TEAM**

**John N. McGovern, JD**  
Principal-in-Charge

**Tatum Storey**  
Project Manager

**Shelley A. Zuniga, CTRS, CASp, ADA  
Coordinator**  
Senior Project Manager

**Aaron Hirthe**  
Accessibility Specialist

**Jason Hickman**  
Accessibility Specialist



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction and the ADA Mandates</b>	<b>page 5</b>
<b>Guide to this Report</b>	<b>page 12</b>
<b>Common Issues</b>	<b>page 13</b>
<b>Program Access Test</b>	<b>page 19</b>
➤ <b>Playgrounds</b>	<b>page 21</b>
➤ <b>Lake/Water Access</b>	<b>page 22</b>
➤ <b>Trails</b>	<b>page 22</b>
➤ <b>Ball Fields</b>	<b>page 23</b>
➤ <b>Athletic Fields</b>	<b>page 24</b>
➤ <b>Picnic Areas and Picnic Shelters</b>	<b>page 24</b>
➤ <b>Sand Volleyball Courts</b>	<b>page 25</b>
<b>Transition Plan</b>	<b>page 26</b>
<b>Community Engagement</b>	<b>page 27</b>
<b>Funding Access Retrofits</b>	<b>page 28</b>
<b>Implementation Strategies</b>	<b>page 30</b>
<b>Unfinished Business</b>	<b>page 31</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>page 31</b>

## **INTRODUCTION AND THE ADA MANDATES**

The accessibility of City of Shawnee facilities and parks is mandated by federal requirements. This report is a summary of our findings and recommendations to make City sites more accessible to people with disabilities. The detail, and recommendations, are in the site reports. We also recommend actions the City can take to meet the federal and state requirements and incorporate smart practices.

The City cannot implement all Transition Plan recommendations at once; no local government can do so. We suggest a phased approach to retrofits. It is important that staff gain a good understanding of the findings and recommendations. We suggest a step-by-step approach, as described in this report.

We start though by reviewing the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and how those apply to facilities and parks. This portion also identifies some tasks that remain to be completed by the City.

### **What are the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) General Mandates?**

The [Americans with Disabilities Act](#) (ADA) is a comprehensive federal civil rights law. It prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability. It became effective on January 26, 1992, and has been amended by Congress only once, by a statute adopted in 2008. The ADA has three principal chapters or titles. Title II applies to City of Shawnee and the approximately 89,000 other units of state and local government across the country, and it requires the City to make parks, facilities, policies, communications, and programs, accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. Other portions of the ADA prohibit discrimination by employers (title I), as well as businesses and nonprofits (title III).

The subject of this report is parks and facilities. We focus primarily on public facing spaces. As with any law though, there is some overlap. A space used principally by City employees that might be visited by a member of the public is not solely an employee space, and must have a level of accessibility for that visitor if he or she has a disability. The City may also have relationships with nonprofits or other entities, and when an entity uses or benefits from the use of City property or resources, the entity is strictly prohibited from discrimination on the basis of disability.

The ADA is to be broadly interpreted. In this section of the final report, we will define terms as they are defined by the ADA. In the remainder of this section, we will review:

- the ADA administrative requirements for cities;
- the ways in which the ADA applies to new design and construction;
- the ADA requirements for existing facilities;
- the ADA Transition Plan requirement;
- the ADA requirements for public facing policies;
- the ADA requirements for City programs, and
- the ADA requirements for City communications.

Finally, this section concludes with a review of the limitations on the accessibility requirements, including technical infeasibility and the concepts of undue burden.

## What Are the ADA Administrative Requirements?

The US Department of Justice (DOJ) published the title II implementing regulation in 1991, and it became effective on January 26, 1992. It has been amended once, and those changes became effective March 15, 2011. The DOJ title II regulation is [here](#).

The City faces many administrative requirements under title II of the ADA. In this section of the report, we will describe and review five key administrative requirements.

**35.106 Notice Requirement:** The City must make its citizens aware of the “...protections against discrimination assured them...” by the ADA. In doing so, the City must provide information about how parks, facilities, programs, policies, and communications are affected by the ADA. ***We recommend the City do so in a way that is inviting and appealing, and consistent with the way in which the City communicates with members of other protected classes.***

**35.107(a) Designation of Responsible Employee:** The City must appoint at least one employee “...to coordinate its efforts to comply with and carry out...” its obligations under the ADA. Known as the ADA Coordinator, this employee is responsible for investigating complaints regarding noncompliance, and coordination of overall ADA implementation. There is a City of Shawnee ADA Coordinator in the City Manager’s Office, ***and we urge Parks and Recreation to complement that role by assigning this responsibility to a Department employee, for Parks and Recreation functions.***

**35.107(b) Complaint Procedure:** The City must have a process by which disputes regarding accessibility at sites, effective communications, and inclusion in programs and services can result in “...prompt and effective resolution...”. DOJ refers to this as a “grievance procedure”. We do recommend that the City change the way it refers to this process. Naming the process a complaint process or grievance process gives it the appearance of an adversarial process. It need not be, and in fact, many believe that a more positive approach yields “prompt and effective resolution” in a much more customer-friendly way. ***We suggest the City consider renaming the process to Access and Inclusion Solutions Process, or some other appropriate name that is inviting, not adversarial.***

**35.130(b)(7) Make Reasonable Modifications:** The City must make reasonable modifications that enable access to programs and facilities, when so requested by a person with a disability, unless doing so creates an undue burden. The statute and the DOJ title II regulation identify many actions or devices that are a reasonable modification. In addition, court decisions and DOJ settlement agreements help further define the term and the limits on the concept of reasonable modification. The DOJ ADA website is a good source of information on this subject at [www.ada.gov](http://www.ada.gov).

**35.150(a)(3) Writing Requirement:** The City, whenever it denies a request for a reasonable modification, must create a writing. This is a mandate once it is determined by City staff that a request would create an undue burden. Importantly, the writing is to be signed by “...the head of the entity or his or her designee...”. In making this decision, the entity is to consider “...all resources available for use in the funding and operation of the service, program, or activity...”. We recommend that the City Council delegate this authority to the City Manager, to be delegated to department heads as felt to be in the best interests of the City.

We also recommend that the writings produced by Parks and Recreation and other departments be kept together for ease of access and analysis. These will have great risk management value and will help greatly in forecasting the types of requests the City will receive.

### **What Are the ADA Requirements for New Design and Construction?**

Many of the ADA requirements are open to some interpretation regarding compliance. There is, however, one clear requirement: all City new design and construction must comply with the federal [2010 Standards for Accessible Design](#) and any State of Kansas requirements that are more stringent from an access perspective. The DOJ regulation at section 35.151 establishes this requirement, and permits a variance only when it is “structurally impracticable” to fully comply with the Standards.

Experts estimate that design and construction for ADA compliance adds not more than 1% to the facility cost. For the City, it is critical that all designers and contractors understand this mandate and comply with this mandate. Plan review and effective project management by City staff assure that plans and ongoing construction are compliant. The investment of human resources towards this goal is much less costly than removing barriers after the construction of a park or facility.

New design and construction includes alterations and additions, therefore alterations and additions must adhere to the 2010 Standards. The DOJ title II regulation, at 35.151(b)(4), establishes a requirement that when alterations or additions occur at an existing City facility, that a “path of travel” is required to connect the accessible elements of the existing facility with accessible elements in the altered area or addition.

In preparing the regulation, DOJ recognized the inequity of a result whereby the accessibility portion of an alteration or addition, the path of travel, could require more fiscal resources than the alteration or addition. The regulation therefore introduces the concept of disproportionality, which permits the City to limit path of travel costs to 20% of the cost of a project.

Three clarifications are necessary regarding the concept of disproportionality.

First, the City may elect to apply the concept of disproportionality; it is not required to do so. If the City wishes to make the cap 30% of the cost of the alteration or addition, it may do so. The ADA sets the floor, not the ceiling.

Second, the City must apply the path of travel concept when the alteration or addition is to a primary function area. A primary function area is “...a major activity for which the facility is intended.” Examples in the title II regulation include “...the dining area of a cafeteria, the meeting rooms in a conference center, as well as offices and other work areas in which the activities of the public entity using the facility are carried out.” We would add other examples, pertinent to Parks and Recreation facilities. These include:

- Playground surfaces and playground components at City playgrounds; and
- Spectator seating and player seating at City softball and baseball fields.

Third, some work at an alteration or addition is simply maintenance and the cost of that work may be deducted from the determination of the cost of the alteration or addition, thereby affecting the amount necessary to meet the 20% disproportionality test. At some sites, these non-alteration costs are very small. In a world where every City penny counts, it is appropriate to properly apply the concept of disproportionality.

Access requirements for new design and construction are important in the context of the City of Shawnee Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). It is critical that CIP project designers and contractors meet or exceed federal and state requirements.

### **What Are the ADA Requirements for Existing Facilities?**

The title II requirements for existing facilities begin with a requirement that the **programs** within those facilities and sites are what is to be made accessible. DOJ title II at 35.149 clearly states that "...no qualified individual with a disability shall, because a public entity's facilities are inaccessible to or unusable by individuals with disabilities, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any public entity."

The term "program" is to be broadly interpreted. For the City, a program is the opportunity made available to the public. Sidewalks are a program. Pools are a program. Making public comment at a City Council meeting is a program. Sports fields are a program. Playgrounds are a program. Parking is a program. Having picnic tables in a park is a program. Staffing and conducting recreation activities during the summer or afterschool is a program.

Think broadly here, and understand that a program is not just an organized activity for which one registers and participates. In applying 35.149, it is a violation of the ADA if a City program cannot be accessed by a person with a disability because the facility in which the program is located is inaccessible.

Title II at 35.150 discusses the parameters for making existing facilities accessible. It requires the City to view that program "...in its entirety..." at 35.150(a). This means that all of the locations of a program, e.g., every City playground, must be viewed before determining which will be made accessible and which will be left as is until next altered or replaced. This latter statement is made clear at 35.150(a)(1), where the City is told by DOJ that these requirements do not "...necessarily require a public entity to make each of its existing facilities accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities..."

Making a program accessible does not always require making a facility accessible. DOJ explains this concept at title II 35.150(b), where it reviews some of the methods to make a program accessible. The non-structural methods, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Relocating a program from an inaccessible site to a site that is accessible;
- Providing a program at two or more sites, one of which is not accessible and at least one of which is accessible;
- Redesign or acquisition of equipment to make program participation possible;



- Bringing the program to the person with a disability by making home visits;
- Construction of new accessible facilities to house the program; and
- Providing extra staff to facilitate interaction by program beneficiaries.

Elsewhere in title II, the City is required to make changes to rules and policies as well. These nonstructural alternatives may be effective in making a program accessible. However, when nonstructural alternatives are not effective in making the program accessible, 35.150(b) requires the City to make alterations to existing parks, facilities, and assets, and when doing so, to treat the alteration as new work and comply with title II 35.151.

The City must also give the highest priority "...to those methods that offer services, programs, and activities...in the most integrated setting appropriate". This mandate is discussed elsewhere in this report. Additionally, the City must disperse the accessible programs that are to be retrofit. For example, not all accessible playgrounds can be located in one City ward.

The 2011 title II regulation amendments introduced the concept of safe harbor for the City and other states and local governments at 35.150(b)(2). In essence, if the City in designing and constructing an asset, prior to March 15, 2012, complied with the 1991 Standards for Accessible Design, it cannot be penalized if the Standards change at a later date.

An example of safe harbor is the reach range requirement. In the 1991 Standards, reach range could be as high as 54" above the finished floor (aff) if a side approach was used, and only 48" aff if a forward approach was used. In the 2010 Standards, because of confusion about forward reach and side reach, the maximum reach range was simply reduced to 48" aff. The safe harbor concept applies here, and at City facilities designed and constructed before March 15, 2012, where a proper side reach can be used, an operating mechanism can be as high as 54" aff. However, if that hypothetical operating mechanism is at 55" aff, it failed to meet the 1991 Standards and must be retrofit to meet the 2010 Standards maximum of 48" aff.

It is important to note that many City assets, especially parks and recreation assets, were not addressed by the 1991 Standards, and were addressed later in the 2010 Standards. That includes playgrounds, sports fields, sports courts, and pools, to name a few. As such, the concept of safe harbor cannot apply to these assets, and the program access test reviewed earlier in this section applies.

As an example, playgrounds, but not necessarily all playgrounds, must be accessible. See our discussion regarding the transition plan for more detail.

### **What is the ADA Transition Plan Requirement?**

The title II regulation, at 35.150(c) and 35.150(d), make clear the Transition Plan requirements. A transition plan is a phased order of retrofit for all existing parks and facilities. At 35.150(d), the requirements are:

- Describe the deficits at every asset;
- Describe a solution for each deficit, or if it is to be left as is, describe why;

- Specify the year or by what date in which the retrofit will occur; and
- Name the City official responsible for assuring compliance.

No Transition Plan can be effective, however, without cost references or estimates. In developing the Transition Plan, the City has received cost references for planning purposes to enable effective planning for the retrofits that will occur.

A key issue for the City is understanding guidance as to by what date all retrofits must be completed. The title II regulation, at 35.150(c), discussing the time period for compliance, offers this guidance:

“Where structural changes in facilities are undertaken to comply with the obligations established under this section, such changes shall be made within three years of January 26, 1992, but in any event as expeditiously as possible.”

To suggest that this is not helpful guidance to the City is an understatement, for several reasons. First, it would be impossible for the City to have, in 1992, made all of the necessary retrofits by January 26, 1995. In fact, it would be impossible for the City to make all retrofits that are necessary during any three-year period. Second, when the title II regulation was amended by DOJ and made effective March 15, 2011, new compliance dates were not added. Third, when the 2010 Standards were published and included for the first time certain types of recreation assets, there was no change to the completion date of 1995.

The City can draw guidance from the statement above by acknowledging that retrofits will occur as soon as is possible. This requires a balancing of City resources, integration of Transition Plan retrofits with CIP activity, and making Transition Plan work a higher priority than any other discretionary development and acquisition.

Regarding parks and facilities, there is other guidance by DOJ. If there is only one of a type of asset it must be made accessible. If there are numerous assets of the same or similar type, such as playgrounds and sports fields, the City need not necessarily make all accessible. When the issue of recurring assets arises, DOJ does not specify a ratio or percentage that must be accessible. Our work in preparing transition plan recommendations relies on making a minimum of one of every three recurring assets accessible, and dispersing accessible assets throughout the City. This assures that no matter where a resident is, some City assets are near that person and are accessible.

Lastly, title II at 35.150(d)(a) requires the City to provide an opportunity for the public to participate in the development of the transition plan. The City conducted two public feedback sessions on December 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> of 2022. This is discussed in more detail later in this report.

### **What Are the ADA Requirements for Municipal Communications?**

The title II regulation, at 35.160, requires that City of Shawnee communications to the public with disabilities must be “as effective” as communications to those without disabilities. People with certain health conditions such as deafness or impaired vision may not be able to ascertain

the message within the communication. People with a cognitive impairment may not understand the message. People with physical disabilities that limit their ability to use a mouse may not be able to get the cursor to the content on the website.

More and more local governments were using their websites for communication with the public as well as with employees. Certainly today, in a Covid-19 era, that reliance has only grown.

The broad requirements apply to the City website, letters, contracts, aural communication that might occur at a City Council meeting, emails, phone calls, and more.

### **What Are the ADA Limitations? Technical Infeasibility and Undue Burden...**

Title II does impose some restraint on the making of reasonable modifications, removal of architectural barriers, and making communications accessible. DOJ expects that these restraints will be implemented as an exception, rather than the rule.

In the 2010 Standards, technical infeasibility is defined within section 106.5 regarding Defined Terms. The City need not make retrofits when doing so is technically infeasible. Again, recognizing that the ADA sets a floor and not the ceiling, the City can choose to make the retrofit. A retrofit to an existing facility may be deemed as technically infeasible when it meets the condition described below:

“With respect to an alteration of a building or a facility, something that has little likelihood of being accomplished because existing structural conditions would require removing or altering a load-bearing member that is an essential part of the structural frame; or because other existing physical or site constraints prohibit modification or addition of elements, spaces, or features that are in full and strict compliance with the minimum requirements.”

Title II also defines undue burden. The concept of undue burden typically includes three elements: undue administrative burden, undue economic burden, and fundamental alteration. DOJ requires at 35.130(a)(3) that the City bears the burden of demonstrating that denial of a request by a person with a disability rises to the level of one of these three conditions. Each is cited and discussed below.

**35.150(a)(3) Undue Administrative Burden:** DOJ and the US Congress recognized that there may be circumstances in which a small local government, will find it difficult to administratively obtain the personnel, devices, and processes by which it can make reasonable modifications, or remove barriers. This circumstance will be hard to show in the City. In an area like Shawnee, some jurisdiction, nonprofit, or business may have addressed and resolved the request related to disability the City faces.

**35.150(a)(3) Undue Financial Burden:** DOJ and the US Congress recognized that there may be circumstances in which a local government will find it difficult to provide the fiscal resources to make a modification or to remove barriers. This circumstance will be hard to show for the City. DOJ guidance requires that the entire City budget be considered before the City claims Undue Financial Burden. For example, if a support for a child with a physical disability will require the creation of a firm and stable accessible route to sports fields, the City must consider operating and capital budget unexpended resources in determining

whether it can grant this request for modification. It will be difficult to show Undue Financial Burden for an agency like the City of Shawnee.

As an important note, City staff must understand this approach. Often, staff will consider only the budget they control, in making decisions about Undue Financial Burden. That is not the correct approach. If a City employee takes a job at another agency, and there are \$10,000 in salary savings due to that departure, it is the burden of the City to show why that \$10,000 could not be allocated to the accessible route example above.

**35.130(b)(7) Fundamental Alteration in Nature of the Service, Program, or Activity:**

DOJ and the Congress recognized that a circumstance may arise where a local government will find it difficult to provide the requested modification based on disability because in doing so the fundamental nature of the service, program, or activity will be changed. As an example, beach volleyball is very popular. However, a person using a wheelchair will be unable to negotiate the sand surface in a beach volleyball court. If that person requests a modification such as replacing the sand with a hard surface court (wood, asphalt, concrete, etc.), the City could do so, as the engineering is not complex. Were that to happen however, the very nature of sand volleyball would be changed.

These same three concepts apply to City communications. These must be as effective for people with communication impairments as the City communications for people without disabilities are effective. Language identical to 35.150(a)(3) and 35.130(b)(7) is found at title II 35.164.

## **A GUIDE TO THIS REPORT**

There are approximately 1,942 access deficits identified in the 38 site reports. The ADA requires that the access audit identify every access deficit at every site. For each deficit, a solution must be identified.

As discussed later in more detail, the City does **not necessarily have to make every site accessible**. It **does** have to make every program it conducts within its sites accessible.

In this report, we identify some broad solutions, such as refreshing all accessible parking, as a way to address issues identified in the site reports, and as a way for the City to manage compliance more effectively. This gives the City some flexibility within its compliance efforts to move resources and apply them with optimal impact. We offer these systemic changes as a complement to a site-by-site approach. The City will determine how to proceed, and many local governments apply a hybrid of a systemic and site-by-site approach.

The scope of our work does not include the design of a solution. Our recommendations are performance based. For example, if a parking stall at the Civic Center will make that recommendation, and will note the dimensions and sign type. The design of a solution is a task for City staff or contractors.

We recommend the following to facilitate review:

**First, read this Report.** It provides a “big picture” review of the issues and solutions.

**Second, read the 38 site reports.** View all reports digitally for instant access to the report for that site and the photos.

**Third, use your knowledge of the sites and the expertise of City staff.** City staff know City sites better than we do, and City staff know the staff better than we do. Blend in what you know with what we recommend in the report. There are many ways to solve access problems, and the successful alternative may well be one you define.

## COMMON ISSUES

In our work, some common big picture issues arose that complement the recommendations in the specific site reports. One of these is that ways in which maintenance affects accessibility to playground surfaces and other assets.

### Maintenance

The City uses a conscientious staff to maintain its parks and facilities. However, over time, every site yields to wear and tear. The recommendations below describe ways in which attention to maintenance can specifically address some access deficits.

1. **Provide training** to maintenance staffs regarding the features of an accessible route and how to ensure that it remains unobstructed so that staff locate park amenities, e.g., garbage cans or signs, are placed adjacent to the accessible route.
2. **Add door closer checks** to park maintenance staff checklists, and record observations on a regular basis. When too much force is required to open a door, adjust the closer.
3. **Purchase some new tools.** The City needs battery-powered 2' digital levels, and tools to measure pounds of force that are designed for this purpose. Do not use 4' digital levels. These tools can be assigned to staff for scheduled spot-checks at doors.

### Changes in Level and Gaps

The routes and sidewalks that make up the City's network of accessible routes are in fair condition. Wear and tear, settling, weather, and other factors combine to cause changes in level, and gaps along portions of those accessible routes, making that portion noncompliant and a barrier to many visitors with physical and sensory disabilities.

Removing changes in level and gaps has a significant universal design benefit too, as more people with all types of conditions can more easily use pedestrian routes, such as staff pushing carts of supplies, parents with kids in strollers, and people using an assistive device such as a wheelchair, Segway, or walker.

4. **Add change in level of more than .25" to park maintenance safety checklists** in 2023. This will help identify and correct these problems before they expand. Make or buy pre-measured shims and distribute to employees for their use and ease of measurement.

5. **Add inspections for gaps of greater than .5" to park maintenance safety checklists in 2023.** Identify and fill these gaps before they expand. **In the alternative, consider resurfacing segments of deteriorated asphalt routes.**
6. **Eliminate changes in level** by the end of 2026. Using the rationale that the most severe changes in level are the greatest barriers to access, make changes in level of greater than .75" the highest priority. Make changes in level of between .5" and .75" the second priority. Make beveling of changes in level of .25" to .5" the third priority. **Consider acquiring or contracting for a grinder.**
7. **Adopt** a policy about the use of Other Power-Driven Mobility Devices (OPDMD) at City sites, and make staff and the public aware of the policy. Every day, people with limited physical mobility start to use a Segway or similar machines.

**Per the new ADA title II regulation published September 14, 2010, City policies or processes permitting the use of OPDMDs were required as of March 15, 2011.**

These assistive devices provide great benefits to people with disabilities and the sooner the City has a policy in regard to their use the better. The policy could, at a minimum, address times of allowed use (dawn to dusk), speed limits, off-limits areas, status of the user as a person with a disability, and minimum age.

It is important to note that a power driven mobility device is not a wheelchair. That device has a separate definition and is already allowed in facilities and parks.

The Department of Justice has a good advisory on this topic. It is [here](#).

### **Obstructed Accessible Routes**

Employees **may** see an accessible route as an empty 36" wide space in which a potted plant or garbage can is a perfect fit. However, that blocks or obstructs the accessible route.

8. **Provide training to park maintenance, recreation, and administration staffs** regarding maintenance of accessible routes in parks and in recreation facilities.

### **Employee Work Areas**

The City employs many qualified and skilled full time staff, making services available to residents. The City employs many more on a part-time or seasonal basis. The City likely has employees with disabilities and in the future, will have **more** employees with disabilities, in all categories of employment.

It is important to address access to work areas, and both the title II regulation and the work of the Access Board do so. In section 203.9 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, the treatment of employee areas is made clear.

Generally, a person with a disability should be able to **approach, enter, and exit** the work area. This is addressed by requirements for accessible routes and accessible means of egress. Other factors are door width, and threshold changes in level.

Excluded from this exception are several types of common spaces in employee areas. Spaces such as the ones below must meet the access guidelines as they are excluded from the definition of employee-only areas:

- corridors;
- toilet rooms;
- kitchenettes for employee dining use, and
- break rooms.

In short, the key issues are the accessible route, changes in level, doors and entries, and maneuvering space once within the work area. This approach is effective so long as when the City hires an employee with a disability, or a current employee acquires a disability, it will remove architectural barriers in work areas or make other accommodations. The two recommendations below are important for all employees at all City sites.

9. **Address accessibility in the City personnel policies**, and note that, upon request by an employee, the City will make reasonable accommodations, which **may** include the removal of architectural barriers in work spaces.
10. **Require new construction, and alterations or additions** that include employee work areas to be designed and constructed so they are compliant with the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design and the Kansas accessibility requirements.

### **Accessible Parking**

The City maintains many public parking spaces. The test for the ratio of accessible stalls to all stalls is per parking lot. See our site reports for details.

11. **Create a parking stall template.** A suggested template is below.

### **Parking Stall Dimensions**

Stalls are a minimum of 8' wide. An adjacent access aisle must also be a minimum of 5' wide. The access aisle must be diagonally striped with **high quality paint**. The access aisle can be shared by two accessible stalls. In addition, the stall shall be identified by the International Symbol of Accessibility (ISA). A clearly visible depiction of the symbol shall be painted in blue on the pavement surface at the rear of the space

The collection of signs must include one with the International Symbol of Accessibility, such as the US Department of Transportation R7-8 standard sign (the blue icon in a wheelchair). Below that must be the statewide fine sign. Unless City of Shawnee has adopted a higher fine by ordinance, the sign must note the statewide fine. Federal settlement agreements require a third sign, on at least one stall, that says VAN ACCESSIBLE. This stall must be 11' wide with a 5' access aisle. An acceptable alternate is 8' and 8'.

Finally, the bottom edge of the lowest parking sign is a minimum of 60" above the finished grade. The signpost shall be centered at the head of the accessible stall and

we suggest that the curb cut and detectable warning run the distance of the access aisle.

**The most common deficit** in accessible parking stalls and access aisles is the slope. The 2010 Standards limit the slope to **not more than 2.08% in any direction**. **This is a challenging requirement that can take considerable effort to meet.**

### Connection to the Accessible Route

The access aisles should connect to an accessible route. The maximum running slope for the accessible route is 5%, and to account for heaving and settling, we recommend 4%. The maximum cross slope is 2%.

### Passenger Loading Zone

The loading zone must have an access aisle adjacent and parallel to vehicle pull-up space. The loading zone access aisle must be a minimum of 60" wide and 20' long.

12. In 2025, **implement a plan to correct or refresh every accessible stall** at every City facility. Incorporate this task into other plans that require parking lot repair, restriping, or resurfacing.

### Running Slope and Cross Slope

There are many sites with running slopes steeper than permitted. At some sites this was a minimal issue, but at other sites it was a significant variance. This condition naturally occurs when concrete settles, or when connections between new and old routes are off by fractions of an inch. Cross slope is equally important, as it serves drainage as well as access purposes.

13. **Revise standard specifications and details** so that in new construction and alterations the slope of the AR shall not exceed 1:21, or 4.7%, as opposed to 1:20, or 5%. This allows room for field error.
14. **Revise standard specifications and details** so that in new construction and alterations the ramp slope shall not exceed 1:13, or 7.7%, as opposed to 1:12, or 8.33%. This allows room for field error. It also makes ramps easier to use for everyone, not just people with disabilities. This universal design approach is also a risk management tool.
15. **Revise standard specifications and details** so that in new construction or alterations the cross slope shall be an integral part of the project and shall not exceed 2% or 1:50.

### Detectable Warnings

The US Access Board suspended the detectable warning requirement in the late 1990's, for several years. It was restored in 2002. However, it is not required in the 2010 Standards. **As a smart practice, WT Group recommends the use of detectable warnings.**

The detectable warnings at curbs **that are not compliant** are often a concrete crosscut, or a grid laid on wet concrete to create a diamond indentation. Over time, these should be replaced.



16. As with parking, **develop a template for detectable warnings.**
17. In the same year that parking is refreshed, **implement a plan to correct or refresh every detectable warning** at every curb or crossing at City facilities. If necessary, phase this out over a two or three-year period.
18. Weather greatly affects the life of detectable warnings. We recommend the use of durable, metal plates as opposed to plastic plates.

### **Door Opening Force Requirements**

Buildings within parks have many doors. Many have closer mechanisms. Some of these need adjustment to bring the pounds of force (lbf) necessary into compliance (5 lbf for interior doors and a suggested 8.5 lbf for exterior doors). However, some of the closers are just old. The wear and tear of 20 or more years erodes the closer effectiveness.

19. **Evaluate and determine the age of door closers.**
20. **Add door closer maintenance checks** to safety checklists in 2023 and for closers with 10 years of service or less, aggressively maintain them for effectiveness.
21. **Purchase and install new door closers** for all exterior doors (with closers 20 years old or more) and 50% of interior doors in 2025 or as soon as is possible.
22. **Purchase and install** new door closers for all remaining interior doors (with closers 20 years old or more) in 2027 or as soon as is possible.
23. **Consider acquiring, installing, and maintaining** power assisted door openers for City facilities with heavy consumer traffic.

### **Signage**

City facility signs serve several purposes. First, signs assist wayfinding in large sites.

Second, signs identify important permanent elements of facilities, such as restrooms. Third, signs facilitate access by people with vision and physical limitations.

The 2010 Standards treats two types of signs differently. Signs for permanent spaces, such as a bathroom, must be in both Grade 2 Braille and raised lettering. Signs that are directional or informational only require visual lettering of a certain size. Be certain to incorporate these approaches into signs in buildings and sites operated by the City.

24. **Create a sign template for use by the City** in 2023, and describe where and in what facilities signs will be used. The template could include size of sign, mounting height, mounting location, size of characters, space between characters, contrast between characters and background, icons or symbols used in the signs, City information (name of facility? phone number? main office number?), and more.
25. **Implement signage template and refresh** City signs in 2024.

### Bathrooms

Bathrooms are an essential part of a visit to a City site. Exercise, food and beverage, social activities, and more all rely on one of the oldest designs known to us. Making those facilities accessible is tremendously important.

26. **Develop a bathroom template in 2023.** Confirm it with the State of Kansas. This is a list of criterion for restrooms, not a design template. Be sure to include temporary facilities such as portable toilets in the template. The template should address the toilet, grab bars, items in the stall such as toilet paper and hooks, the stall, mirrors, sinks, hand towels, operating mechanisms, and more.
27. **Include bathroom renovations** at facilities in the City of Shawnee, KS Capital Improvement Plan.
28. **Consider the use of automatic flush controls.** These have environmental benefits and are a great way to eliminate some accessibility problems.
29. **In the interim, implement non-structural modifications recommended in each section of this report,** such as lowering mirrors, remounting grab bars, changing the height of toilets and urinals, installing compliant stall hardware, and so forth. These less costly changes on a site-by-site basis will serve your customers well until resources are available to renovate restrooms on a comprehensive scale.
30. **Make at least one portable toilet,** where provided at a site, accessible. This includes a portable toilet placed at a picnic shelter or adjacent to sports fields. These must be accessible and served by **an accessible route.**

**The City has sites with portable toilets; this must be addressed. Use our single-user toilet checklist, and require compliance by City vendors.**

### Alarms

In existing facilities where the City provides an aural or audible fire alarm system, a visual alarm is not required unless the building was constructed after January 26, 1992 or has been upgraded since that same date. If an alarm in an existing facility is audible only, it need not be modified to include a visual alarm unless it is replaced or upgraded in the future.

31. **Determine in 2023** if systems have been upgraded or replaced since 1992.
32. **Develop a plan in 2024** for the installation of aural and visual alarms in renovations.
33. **Retrofit construction that has occurred since 1992** to include aural and visual alarms by the end of 2027.

### Publications and Online Information

The use of a site grid in the City print and online materials is an important tool for residents. The City can now use that tool to communicate about access. The City should incorporate the

access work the City staff completes and indicate in the grid the location of accessible picnic areas and accessible playgrounds.

34. **Update print material parks and facilities** information to reflect City plans regarding access, and to note which sites the City will make accessible.

The same concepts apply to the City website. The website is an important tool for residents and the City should use the website to communicate about accessibility projects planned by the City.

35. **Update website** information to reflect City plans regarding access, and to note which sites are accessible or the sites the City will make accessible.

### **Maintenance Buildings**

The specific site reports address maintenance areas, and we describe the approach to employee areas earlier in this report. We note earlier that City staff can apply a different standard to employee work areas, but employee work areas are not exempted from access requirements. City maintenance staff should receive training in regard to applying the **approach, enter, and exit** strategy so that they understand the reason for the various requirements.

36. **Train maintenance staff supervisors** in accessibility concepts that are applicable to the maintenance building.
37. **Implement recommendations regarding parking, accessible route, changes in level, gaps, doors, and alarm systems** at the maintenance areas.

### **Unique Sites**

The City has several unique sites, such as Shawnee Town 1929 Museum, and two unique aquatic facilities. This raises the bar on the expectation of access at these sites, as there is no “alternate” site to which the City can direct patrons with disabilities to so they can enjoy the “programs” at these sites.

For these sites, efforts must be made annually towards the correction of access deficiencies. This can be done through existing capital plans, or by following our recommendations in the site reports for specific retrofit work.

## **PROGRAM ACCESS TEST**

The US DOJ test for existing facilities is known as the “program access test”. A “program” is an opportunity made available by the Department. It can be as diverse as eating a sandwich at a picnic table in a park, enjoying a playground at a park, enjoying a walk on Blackfish Recreation Trail, and attending a City Council meeting and making public comment. A program is not just an activity for which a person registers and pays a fee.

We note early in this section that the program access test does not apply to new construction or alterations and additions. New construction and alterations and additions must be designed and constructed to comply with the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design.

In the title II regulation, section 35.150(b) describes the methods an entity can use to make programs accessible. They include:

- Redesign or acquisition of equipment;
- Reassignment of services to accessible buildings;
- Assignment of aides to program beneficiaries;
- Delivery of services at alternate accessible sites;
- Alteration of existing facilities and construction of new facilities;
- Use of accessible rolling stock or other conveyances; and
- Any other methods that result in making its services, programs, and activities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.

Importantly, this section notes that a "...public entity is not required to make structural changes in existing facilities..." when any other method, such as those noted above, are effective. An element of the program access test is dispersion. For example, the City has 19 playgrounds. Those to be made accessible shall be dispersed throughout the City.

What is the right number, or ratio of accessible to inaccessible, for recurring assets? That is an unknown today. US DOJ has not, and likely never will, established a ratio or percentage. We do know that DOJ guidance indicates that unique or infrequently occurring assets are more likely to require alteration than frequently occurring assets.

We recommend the City adopt an approach requiring that a minimum of one of three recurring sites be made accessible. Additionally, unique sites shall be made accessible.

The program access test for the City and other units of state and local government is much more complex than the approach to existing facilities that a business or nonprofit may take. US DOJ, Federal District Courts, the Department of Interior, state courts, and state enforcement agencies have accepted our minimum of one-of-three approach. We know it is an effective approach that allows the City to optimize resources and make sites accessible to residents.

The concept of technical infeasibility is an important exception. The US DOJ 2010 Standards for Accessible Design note that when meeting the technical requirements, if the movement of a load bearing wall or element is required, technical infeasibility may arise. The City need not make alterations at a site when it is technically infeasible to do so.

In the subsequent discussions regarding playgrounds, trails, and other park assets, we apply our interpretation of the program access test. We note that this is a summary; for the detailed retrofit recommendations, see the individual site reports. For each category of asset, we will note whether we believe the asset is accessible; whether the asset should be retrofit for access; or whether the asset should be left as is and inaccessible, because the asset category satisfies the program access test.

We take no position as to whether the City has a number of assets in a category, such as tennis courts, that is adequate to the demand for tennis in the City. That is not within our scope.

### Playgrounds

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of playgrounds be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” described in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35). For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing playgrounds must be accessible. Treat this as a planning exercise and aim for one of three playgrounds being made accessible.

Our evaluation included 19 playgrounds. One site, Gum Springs, was under construction. Of the 19 audited, two are accessible. We recommend **changes** to eight more playgrounds. Any playgrounds to be replaced or altered in the future, or designed and built where one did not exist, must comply with the 2010 Standards and will therefore be accessible. The Program Access Park Grid illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of the City is close to an accessible playground.

38. **Continue to maintain surfaces and components**, per the site reports, so that the playgrounds at the sites below **remain** accessible:
  - **Ox Bow Park**
  - **Erfurt Park**
  - **Gum Springs Park** (as new construction, this must be accessible)
  
39. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the playgrounds below **become** accessible:
  - **Donald B. Gamblin Jr. Park**
  - **Douglas Highlands Park**
  - **Garrett Park (by baseball fields)**
  - **Jaycee Park**
  - **Monticello Springs Park**
  - **Swarner Park**
  - **Herman Laird Park**
  - **Wilder Bluff Park**
  
40. **Leave as is** the playgrounds at the parks named below, and if future alterations or renovations occur at those sites, make them accessible.
  - **Caenen Park**
  - **Charles J. Stump Park**
  - **Garrett Park (along Monticello Rd)**
  - **Listowel Park**
  - **Pflumm/Bichelmeyer Park**
  - **Quivira Glenn Park**
  - **Van Lerberg Memorial Park**

- **Water Tower Park**
  - **West Flanders Park**
41. **Advertise the accessible playgrounds** in the City website and publications. This is an important way to make the public aware of opportunities, and complies with the section 35.106 notice requirement in the title II regulation.
  42. **Consider the gradual elimination of engineered wood fiber as an impact attenuating playground surface.** For this surface to remain accessible, City staffs must more frequently inspect and maintain the surface. Unitary surfaces such as poured-in-place rubber or interlocking rubber tiles, and the artificial turf surface, are much easier to use for persons with mobility impairments and also meet the required standard for impact attenuation.
  43. **In the alternative to recommendation 42 above, increase maintenance staff hours at each playground with an engineered wood fiber surface.** The four maintenance tasks required for this surface are replenishment, raking to level, watering, and compacting.

#### Lake or Water Access

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of lake or water access be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35). For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing access points should be accessible.

We recommend that a minimum of one access point of every three be accessible. We saw three water access points and one is accessible. **We recommend no new access.**

The Program Access Park Grid illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident is close to an accessible water access point.

44. **Maintain the accessible features for the fishing area** at Erfurt Park, and if future alterations or renovations occur at Erfurt, maintain that accessibility.
45. **Advertise the accessible water access** in the City website and publications.

#### Trails

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of trails be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35). For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing trails should be accessible.

We recommend that a minimum of one trail of every three be accessible. We saw 15 trails and found three to be accessible. **We recommend access to two more.**

**Trail access guidance is not yet in the form of a final and enforceable standard.** The US Access Board does offer significant guidance, and we have applied it here to City trails.

However, the US Access Board does not have the authority to establish a Standard, which is the step above the **final guideline** that exists today. That said, we recommend the City continue as a smart practice to adhere to the Access Board guidance on this matter. The Program Access Park Grid illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident is close to an accessible trail.

46. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the trails below **remain** accessible:

- **Clear Creek Recreation Trail**
- **Erfurt Park**
- **Ox Bow Park**

47. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the trail below **become** accessible:

- **West Flanders Park**
- **Wilder Bluff Park**

48. **Leave as is** the trails at the following sites, until next altered:

- **Blackfish Recreational Trail**
- **Charles J. Stump Trail**
- **Donald B. Gamblin Jr. Park**
- **Garrett Park**
- **KCP&L Park**
- **Listowel Park**
- **Monticello Springs Park**
- **Pflumm/ Bichelmeyer Park**
- **Quivira Glenn Park**
- **Swarner Park**

49. **Advertise the accessible trails** in the City website and publications.

### **Ball Fields**

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of ball fields be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing fields should be accessible. We recommend that a minimum of one field of every three be accessible. We saw 10 ball fields and eight were accessible. **We recommend no new access.**

The Program Access Park Grid illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident is close to an accessible field.

50. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the fields below **remain** accessible:

- Charles J Stump Park (6)
- Garrett Park
- Swarner Park

51. **Advertise the accessible ball fields** in the City website and publications.

#### Athletic Fields

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of rectangular athletic fields be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

We recommend that a minimum of one athletic field of every three be accessible. We saw 20 athletic fields and 5 are accessible. **We recommend access to three.**

The Program Access Park Grid illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident is close to an accessible field.

52. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the trails below **remain** accessible:

- Charles J. Stump Park (3 of 7)
- Erfurt Park (2 of 2)

53. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the fields below **become** accessible:

- Herman Laird Park (3)

54. **Leave as is** the fields at the following sites:

- Quivira Glenn Park
- Swarner Park
- West Flanders Park (2)

55. **Advertise the accessible fields** in the City website and publications.

#### Picnic Areas and Picnic Shelters

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of picnicking be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” described in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing shelters or picnic areas should be accessible. There are more than 26 picnic areas and picnic shelters, and 24 are accessible. **We recommend no new access.**

**Picnic area technical requirements are not yet in the form of a final and enforceable standard.** The US Access Board offers significant guidance, and we apply it here to City shelters.



However, the US Access Board does not have the authority to establish a Standard, which is the step above the **final guideline** that exists today. That said, we recommend the City continue as a smart practice to adhere to the Access Board guidance on this matter. The Program Access Park Grid illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of the City is close to an accessible picnic area/shelter.

56. **Make corrections** needed to **maintain access**, including adding tables, to shelters or picnic areas at:

- **Caenen Park**
- **Charles J. Stump Park**
- **Douglas Highlands Park**
- **Erfurt Park**
- **Garrett Park**
- **Herman Laird Park**
- **Jaycee Park**
- **Listowel Park**
- **Ox Bow Park**
- **Pflumm/ Bichelmeyer Park**
- **Quivira Glenn Park**
- **Sister Cities Park**
- **Swarner Park**
- **Thomas A. Soetaert Park**
- **Water District Park**
- **West Flanders Park**
- **Wilder Bluff Park**

57. **Leave as is** the shelters or picnic areas at the following sites, until next altered:

- **Monticello Springs Park (2 of 3)**

58. **Advertise accessible shelters and picnic areas** in the City website and publications.

### **Sand Volleyball**

The **minimum required** of the City by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of sand volleyball be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing sand volleyball courts should be accessible. We recommend that a minimum of one sand volleyball course of every three be accessible. We saw one sand volleyball courts and none are accessible. **We recommend access to one.**

The Program Access Chart at the end of this section illustrates the areas where we recommend work be completed so that every resident is close to an accessible sand volleyball court.

59. **Make corrections** cited in the reports so the sand volleyball court below **becomes** accessible:

- **Pflumm/Bichelmeyer Park**

60. **Advertise the accessible sand volleyball courts** in the City website and publications.

## **TRANSITION PLAN**

The City must have a transition plan per 35.150(d) of the DOJ title II regulation. Here, we have developed a Transition Plan for the City. A transition plan should identify the barrier, the corrective work, the date by which the work will occur (in our reports, the Phase), and the person responsible for barrier removal.

The City should remove barriers as soon as is possible. Phasing the work allows access to occur and makes the best use of the resources of the City. We recognize that each phase requires a different number of years for implementation. The City should determine the annual activity within its fiscal years.

In the view of DOJ, the recreation design requirements were available to the City since 2004, if not earlier. Enforcement staff has said at meetings and in conversations that work should have already been underway to identify and remedy access deficits.

We recommend work in three phases. We also note work we believe need **not** occur in a category titled City Option. Should City plans change, or should other resources become available, the corrective work needed at these sites is known. Finally, we recommend that some work occur as a smart practice.

We have made cost **references for planning purposes** for the corrective work recommended. We note that these are not estimates and should be used only for planning purposes. The final design, the year in which the work will occur, the relationship with the contractor, and many other factors must be considered before a cost estimate is made.

Our total of all cost references is \$6,647,574. The work in Phase One, Two, and Three totals \$3,454,740. We recommend the City complete the work in the first three phases in twelve years.

We have balanced work through all three phases, and the City can certainly choose to reorder those recommendations. Our phasing is described below.

- In Phase One, we recommend work in two categories: easy to do with existing staff and fiscal resources (low-hanging fruit), and work at recently built sites that is not compliant (such as parking). We suggest that completion of this phase requires seven fiscal years. Cost references for Phase One are \$2,540,634.

- In Phase Two, we recommend work in areas that are new to the 2010 Standards. This typically includes sports fields and courts, playgrounds surfaces, playground components, and other park assets. We suggest that completion of this phase requires three fiscal years. Cost references for Phase Two are \$544,430.
- In Phase Three, we recommend work in areas in two categories: elements not yet addressed by a final Standard, such as trails, and elements where correction is complex or costly. We suggest that completion of this phase requires two fiscal years. Cost references for Phase Three are \$369,676.
- We do phase some work as City Option. This is work at a site or element with access deficits where we believe the City already meets the program access test and need not make these sites accessible, until later altered for another purpose. Cost references for City Option are \$2,693,702 and are referred to in the Transition Plan as Phase Four.
- We identify corrections that are not currently subject to standards, but we refer to as “smart practices in the column labeled “SP”. These corrections, we believe, make your services and assets more accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities. Cost references for smart practices are \$499,131 and are referred to in the Transition Plan as Phase Five.

## **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

The ADA requires the City to provide an opportunity for public feedback in the shaping of transition plan priorities. Two public feedback sessions were held: one on December 12, 2022, at 1:00 pm and one on December 13, 2022, at 6:00 pm.

On December 12, three members of the public attended. Representing the City of Shawnee was Tonya Lecuru, the Director of Parks and Recreation. John McGovern represented the WT Group Accessibility Practice. No one attended the evening meeting.

At the meeting, Lecuru welcomed the attendees and noted that the City was committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and had retained the WT Group to assist in doing so. McGovern then reviewed ADA title II requirements that apply to the City, reviewed the ADA requirements as they apply to existing facilities and parks, and reviewed the required elements of a transition plan. He then reviewed some of the factors used by other counties in shaping their transition plan priorities, such as making more heavily used sites a higher retrofit priority than lesser-used sites.

McGovern then shared a PowerPoint with images of some of the observations made by WT Group staff when auditing City sites. These were examples, not a comprehensive review of the audits. Examples included parking slopes that were too steep or lacked proper signage, restrooms with grab bars at noncompliant heights, playground surfaces that were noncompliant, or ramp slopes that were too steep.

In the meetings, the audience discussed common issues of concern. The consensus in the meeting was to emphasize the basics at sites as a higher priority. This includes parking, signage, exterior accessible routes, facility entries, restrooms, and other common assets.

## FUNDING ACCESS RETROFITS

We have developed this section to discuss some of the potential funding sources other cities, counties, and governmental entities have used for accessibility compliance. This is a complex subject and many communities have developed successful strategies.

The overall effort is complicated by the lack of a dedicated federal funding source. This will not likely change in the future. Even if a change were to occur, federal funding is unpredictable, as we have seen from other federal programs. This portion of the report is intended as primer on this topic and is not intended as a comprehensive list.

### Earmarks

Some clients have pursued Congressional earmarks for access work. Earmarks are unpopular, and difficult to obtain.

While Congressional earmarks were not used for a decade or more, both political parties today support the use of earmarks. This is an opportunity for the City.

### Pandemic Relief Funds

Many municipalities have received pandemic relief funds and used those for a wide range of projects, including ADA compliance. This includes but is not limited to funding the cost of Transition Plan development, and funding the implementation of the Transition Plan retrofits required to make parks and facilities accessible to and usable by all.

Whether additional revenues will be made available is unknown. However, if funds are made available again, this can be a source for the costs of ADA compliance by the City.

### Community Development Block Grant Funds

Several of our clients have acquired federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for accessibility renovations at existing sites. CDBG funds often have a scale of priority. It is important to establish accessibility as a priority for CDBG applications.

### State Grants Programs

Several states, and several of our clients, have successfully pursued state legislation to set aside dedicated state funds that can be used for specific purposes, including access retrofits.

To name a few, Illinois, New Jersey, Colorado, Ohio, Florida, and Texas all have sources of revenue funded in various ways, such as a real estate transfer tax. While the various states have all at times not fully funded these grant programs, they remain an effective tool for cities regarding site acquisition and development.

### State Discretionary Funds

Most state legislatures provide some type of discretionary funding for members of the legislature. In some states, these are relatively small grants of under \$50,000, but in others the

grants reach six figures. These can be a viable option for a City with good relationships with state legislators.

### **Special Accessibility Legislation**

At least one state (Illinois) created, in 1974, legislation that allows municipalities and special purpose park districts to levy a tax to fund recreation for people with disabilities. Entities also apply the funds to access retrofits at existing sites and facilities. Statewide, Illinois park districts and municipalities levy an estimated \$50,000,000 annually for this purpose. No other state has adopted this model.

### **Private Giving**

Some of our clients have successfully sought private gifts for accessibility purposes. The private giving area is subject to fluctuations depending on the economy, political issues, and related fiscal impacts. In our experience, private giving works best when an agency has an employee dedicated to this purpose.

### **Corporate Giving**

Some of our clients have successfully sought grants from corporations. These may, for corporate purposes, come from marketing (such as naming rights to a facility) or from community giving. Many corporations have a related foundation that manages corporate giving. In our experience, corporate giving works best when one employee is dedicated to this purpose.

### **Community Foundations and Other Foundations**

Community foundations, which operate on a regional basis, have also been involved in accessibility giving. Perhaps the greatest example here is the multi-million dollar Kellogg Foundation project that improved accessibility in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and other states that bordered the Kellogg headquarters in Michigan.

### **Other Methods**

There are many other methods, each crafted by a community to meet a unique set of circumstances. These include:

- A New Jersey community, an Oregon community, and an Illinois community applies 100% of accessible parking fines towards recreation for people with disabilities.
- Many agencies have added a \$1 to \$10 surcharge to every registration, earmarking the fees generated for access and inclusion expenses.
- Several communities have successfully sought budget increases to address accessibility backlogs, just as they have with maintenance backlogs. Those increases may be general fund allocations, proceeds from successful referenda, or reallocations of under expended funds originally budgeted for other local

government purposes.

### Risk Management

Investing in safety saves money by avoiding legal expenses related to injuries on City properties. The same concept applies here. Investing in retrofits saves the City the cost of staff time and attorneys to defend against ADA lawsuits or administrative complaints. While we do not believe a decision about access should hinge solely on risk management factors, we do recommend that the City be aware of this factor going forward. ADA enforcement continues to grow and touch more and more communities.

Relief under the ADA is intended to be injunctive in nature, but the time consumed and cost of litigation can be a great drain on the human and fiscal resources of any unit of local government.

### The General Fund

Another method is to fund retrofits through the General Fund, Corporate Fund, or CIP. Some of the methods discussed earlier in this section help to reduce General Fund reliance. However, these complementary methods typically are not a substitute for General Fund support.

## IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Title II of the ADA is relatively straightforward. That said, we offer some suggestions below regarding implementation of the several mandates in the regulation.

1. **Maintain a strong relationship with disability advisory groups.** Make it a point to seek out and work with local advocacy groups, and seek their feedback on future initiatives. Having a good relationship between the City and the advocacy groups will help greatly in meeting the ADA mandates and improving the quality of life for all, including those with disabilities.
2. **Acquire and maintain the [Certified ADA Coordinator credential](#).** There is no nationwide credential required for ADA implementation. However, a Certified ADA Coordinator will benefit the City, keeping it current on implementation strategies and smart practices from other local entities in the United States.
3. **Identify available sign language interpreters and enter into agreements** before situations arise where the City needs such services. Negotiate rates, availability, environments where the work will occur, and so forth.
4. One of the title II requirements for communications produced by the City **requires the City to respond to inquiries in the form by which the person inquired.** We also believe that this is the courteous way to respond. Here, if an inquiry to the City comes in the form of a Braille document, the response from the City should also be in Braille. **We recommend the City either locate the nearest Braille printer and enter into an arrangement for use, or acquire one and have employees learn how to use it.**

5. **Acquire assistive listening systems.** There are three principal types: inductive loop systems, infrared systems, and FM systems. These devices are helpful for persons with some residual hearing. These devices separate speech from ambient noise and amplify speech. People who are deaf or hard of hearing may prefer, for various reasons, one type of device. The National Association of the Deaf has a brief review of the topic [here](#).
6. **Monitor the development of the website accessibility requirements.** The Department of Justice suspended the developing website accessibility guideline in 2016 because technology had advanced so much that the old guideline, developed in 2011, was obsolete. The plan was that US DOJ would reevaluate the guidance and issue a final and enforceable Standard in 2018. DOJ did not execute that plan.

A 2017 Presidential directive required that for every new regulation, the issuing agency must rescind two. This caused significant turmoil in the world of accessibility, where there are only three regulations (title II, title III, and the 2010 Standards). To rescind one of the three would have disastrous consequences for City residents with disabilities. The present Administration will not require such a rescission. It is therefore likely US DOJ will issue some new ADA regulations, but it is impossible to predict when. However, the City website must be usable by people with disabilities.

7. **Develop an ongoing series of disability training for employees.** Every day, new products appear on the market, agencies issue new enforcement decisions, and local entities develop and refine strategies for inclusion and access. Keep current on these developments and share this news with City staffs.
8. **Require employees to add access and inclusion subject matter to their “diet” of continuing education.** It is important to seek out and attend training events that relate to the work of the employee, and focus on access and inclusion.
9. **Invest in accessibility** so that City of Shawnee becomes an access destination and a model for other communities.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The City must still audit policies and programs available to the public. There are opportunities to provide community businesses with guidance and advice regarding compliance with ADA title III. There will be other rulemaking in the future, regarding outdoor recreation assets, single rider golf cars, exercise machines, websites, and final and enforceable public rights-of-way. The City can influence these rules through active involvement by elected officials, staff, and residents.

## CONCLUSION

The City of Shawnee has a variety of facilities and sites. The skilled staff operates facilities and sites the community wants and enjoys.

This report identifies some issues that are typical in the infrastructure of local government recreation facilities and parks, and some that are unique to Shawnee. The City takes steps towards accessibility every year and that undoubtedly helps. That said, access work should occur every year during the transition plan.

While no one can say with certainty how long the City can stretch these projects, the City should make access retrofits an ongoing part of its annual plans and budgets. US Department of Justice officials have said work must be completed as soon as is possible. **Be certain to understand that the City could be forced to accelerate its pace. Making access a high priority is critical.**



**Submitted by:**

**John N. McGovern, JD**  
**Partner, Principal-in-Charge**  
**WT Group Accessibility Practice**

JNM/TAT/CITY OF SHAWNEE FINAL REPORT 202301