The Unified Government Commission of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, met in regular session Thursday, April 9, 2015, with ten members present: Vacant, Commissioner At-Large First District; Walker, Commissioner At-Large Second District; Townsend, Commissioner First District (via telephone); McKiernan, Commissioner Second District; Murguia, Commissioner Third District; Maddox, Commissioner Fourth District; Kane, Commissioner Fifth District; Markley, Commissioner Sixth District; Walters, Commissioner Seventh District; Philbrook, Commissioner Eighth District, and Mayor Holland, Mayor/CEO, presiding. The following officials were also in attendance: Doug Bach, County Administrator; Jody Boeding, Chief Counsel; Bridgette Cobbins, Unified Government Clerk; Joe Connor; Assistant County Administrator; Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Melissa Bundt, Assistant County Administrator; Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Counsel; Emerick Cross, Commission Liaison; Lew Levin, Chief Financial Officer; Debbie Jonscher, Asst. Finance Director; George Brajkovic, Economic Development; and Captain Rance Quinn, Sergeant-At-Arms.

MAYOR HOLLAND called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL: Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane, Holland.

INVOCATION was given by Reverend Dennis Wistrom.

MAYOR'S AGENDA
ITEM NO. 1 – 150080…PROCLAMATION: NATIONAL SERVICE DAY
SYNOPSIS: Proclamation proclaiming April 7, 2015 as National Service Recognition Day.

Mayor Holland said I’m honored to be joined tonight with the Mayor’s of Edwardsville and Bonner Springs, Mayor McTaggart and Mayor Harrington. We are going to recognize all the volunteers we have here tonight.
PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, service to others is a hallmark of the American character, and central to how we meet our challenges; and

WHEREAS, the nation’s mayors are increasingly turning to national service and volunteerism as a cost-effective strategy to meet city needs; and

WHEREAS, AmeriCorps and Senior Corps address the most pressing challenges facing our cities and nation, from educating students for the jobs of the 21st century and supporting veterans and military families to preserving the environment and helping communities recover from natural disasters; and

WHEREAS, national service expands economic opportunity by creating more sustainable, resilient communities and providing education, career skills, and leadership abilities for those who serve; and

WHEREAS, national service participants serve in more than 70,000 locations across the country, bolstering the civic, neighborhood, and faith-based organizations that are so vital to our economic and social well-being; and

WHEREAS, national service participants increase the impact of the organizations they serve with, both through their direct service and by recruiting and managing millions of additional volunteers; and

WHEREAS, national service represents a unique public-private partnership that invests in community solutions and leverages non-federal resources to strengthen community impact and increase the return on taxpayer dollars; and

WHEREAS, AmeriCorps members and Senior Corps volunteers demonstrate commitment, dedication, and patriotism by making an intensive commitment to service, a commitment that remains with them in their future endeavors; and

WHEREAS, the Corporation for National and Community Service shares a priority with mayors nationwide to engage citizens, improve lives, and strengthen communities; and is joining with the National League of Cities, City of Service, and mayors across the country to recognize the impact of service on the Mayors Day of Recognition for National Service on April 7, 2015.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Mark R. Holland, Mayor/CEO of Wyandotte County / Kansas City, Kansas, do hereby proclaim April 7, 2015, as: National Service Recognition Day, and encourage residents to recognize the positive impact of national service in our city and thank those who serve; and to find ways to give back to their communities.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas.

MARK R. HOLLAND, MAYOR/CEO

Action: Presentation of Proclamation and Mayor Holland asked all volunteers to stand and be recognized.
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Mayor Holland asked if there were any revisions to the agenda. Bridgette Cobbins, UG Clerk, said there were none.

Mayor Holland recognized two high school students from Rockhurst High School who are in a US Government class for civic experience and they volunteered for this meeting. We want to recognize Nick Verbeck and John Russell.

Item No. 2 - 150068...REQUEST: SEND COMMUNICATION TO UG EMPLOYEES/CONTRACTORS

SYNOPSIS: Request County Administrator be directed to send a communication to UG employees and contractors regarding compliance with codes and regulations applicable to the design, engineering and construction of public projects, submitted by Doug Bach, County Administrator.

Doug Bach, County Administrator, said this is really a directive that’s been brought upon us from our current ordinances and regulations layout that when the Unified Government or the Board of Public Utilities are doing various projects be it on our own facilities and such; we should follow our development review process. It is one that has probably been in action for years that we don’t follow that process necessarily and we move on. It’s led to a few actions happening where we’ve had to go back and retract that or not been able to because we didn’t build it into the original budget. Through our joint meetings with the Board of Public Utilities where we meet with them quarterly, where we have elected officials from each side set on that, come to the conclusion that we will begin following all of the development review process as we go along. I’m sending a directive out to the organization to make it clear as well as Mr. Gray, General Manager with the Board of Public Utilities, has acknowledged that he will be doing the same.

Mayor Holland asked so this action, I actually initiated this. There have been a number of times when our Public Works Department or our building groups and the Unified Government has a lot of employees doing a lot of great work and there is sometimes an effort to be expedient and make sure things get done as inexpensively as possible. Sometimes we put things on the outside of buildings or in places that don’t follow our current requirements that we expect of
other businesses. There is equipment placed in the lawns and other things in Unified Government facilities that we would not allow another business to do. In fact, we would give them a citation and expect them to move it. The same with Board of Public Utilities, there have been instances where utility work has gone on and it has not gone through our review process and if another utility whether it be AT&T or one of the gas companies had performed the same work; we would’ve had them redo it because of the way it was laid out on our city streets. What this does is simply __ I thought we needed to pass a law that we had to follow our laws. It turns out that there is a law that we should follow our laws. This is just a reminder and I wanted to bring it to this Commission to take formal action on this to make sure that that’s a clear directive both to ourselves and the Board of Public Utilities. Our city does a great job and the Board of Public Utilities does a great job. It’s no knock on the organizations, it’s just an awareness that it’s been easy to not go through the normal process that everyone else has and it’s really a call to an awareness for all of our departments to make sure that we’re as diligent following the codes of excellence that we have for all businesses, that we lead the way and lead by example. That’s really what this is about and just would appreciate the Commission’s interest and the communities interest.

Action: **Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve.** Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Holland asked if there were any set-asides on the Consent Agenda. There were none.

Action: **Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve the Consent Agenda.** Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.
ITEM NO. 1 – 150063...RESOLUTION: AMEND MASTER EQUIPMENT LEASE PURCHASE AGREEMENT

SYNOPSIS: A resolution amending the UG's Master Equipment Lease Purchase Agreement dated October 17, 2013, with Banc of America Public Capital Corp. in connection with paying the costs of acquiring and installing certain equipment, submitted by Debbie Jonscher, Assistant Finance Director. On March 30, 2015, the Economic Development and Finance Standing Committee, chaired by Commissioner McKiernan, voted unanimously to approve and forward to full commission.

Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-23-15, “A resolution authorizing the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas to amend its Master Equipment Lease Purchase Agreement with Banc of America Public Capital Corp, the proceeds of which will be used to pay the costs of acquiring and installing certain equipment.” Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to adopt the resolution. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

ITEM NO. 2 – 150065...RESOLUTION: SALE OF UG PROPERTY AT 1207 & 1217 N. 5TH ST.

SYNOPSIS: A resolution authorizing the sale of UG owned property located at 1207 and 1217 N. 5th Street to GDC Financial Group, LLC, submitted by Charles Brockman, Economic Development. GDC owns the building improvements constructed on the property which they currently lease from the UG. On March 30, 2015, the Economic Development and Finance Standing Committee, chaired by Commissioner McKiernan, voted unanimously to approve and forward to full commission.
Unified Government Real Property

FULL COMMISSION APRIL 9, 2015

Real Property Location

April 9, 2015
Disposal of Real Property

- The Unified Government wishes to sell the real property located at 1207 and 1217 N. 5th Street in accordance with the Unified Governments Joint Ordinance No. O-120-06 and Resolution No. R-141-06

- Sell the real property to GDC Financial who desires to purchase the Property from the Unified Government

Current Condition of the underside of the roof overhang
Current Condition of the Parking Areas

Action items requested for tonight

- Adopt the Resolution
Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-24-15, “A resolution that the Unified Government Board of Commissioners hereby approves the sale of the property located at 1207 and 1217 N. 5th Street, Kansas City, Kansas, by the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, to GDC Financial for a sale price of $27,030.00. That the County Administrator is hereby authorized to negotiate the terms and conditions of such sale and to execute in the name of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, the deed and such other documents, certificates and instruments as may be necessary or desirable to carry out and comply with the intent of this resolution and to take any further action necessary to effectuate the sale.” Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to adopt the resolution. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

ITEM NO. 3 – 150067...RESOLUTION: 82ND & TAUROMEE STORM SEWER ENHANCEMENT

SYNOPSIS: A resolution declaring the 82nd & Tauromee Storm Sewer Enhancement (CMIP 5044) to be a necessary and valid improvement project and authorizing a survey and description of land for said project, submitted by Sarah Fjell, Engineering. On March 30, 2015, the Economic Development and Finance Standing Committee, chaired by Commissioner McKiernan, voted unanimously to approve and forward to full commission.

Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-25-15, “A resolution declaring the necessity and authorizing a survey and descriptions of lands necessary to be condemned for the construction, maintenance, operation, use and repair of the 82nd & Tauromee Storm Sewer Enhancement (CMIP 5044), all in Wyandotte County, Kansas.” Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to adopt the resolution. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.
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ITEM NO. 4 – 970013...REAPPOINTMENT: BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

SYNOPSIS: Reappointment of Lynette Jones to the Advisory Committee on Disabilities Issues, 4/9/15-5/30/17, submitted by Commissioner Walker.

Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve the reappointment. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

ITEM NO. 5 – MINUTES

SYNOPSIS: Minutes from regular sessions of February 26 and March 5, 2015, and special session of March 26, 2015.

Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

ITEM NO. 6 - WEEKLY BUSINESS MATERIAL


Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve and authorize fund transfers. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA

No items of business.

STANDING COMMITTEES’ AGENDA

No items of business.
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ADMINISTRATOR’S AGENDA

ITEM NO. 1 – 150045…RESOLUTION: ONGOAL SOCCER AGREEMENTS

SYNOPSIS: A resolution authorizing approval of a development agreement with OnGoal for the US Soccer National Training Center and a First Amendment to Multi-Sport Stadium Specific Venture Agreement, submitted by George Brajkovic, Economic Development Director. On March 30, 2015, the Economic Development and Finance Standing Committee, chaired by Commissioner McKiernan, voted unanimously to forward to full commission for consideration.

Doug Bach, County Administrator, said we are very excited to finally project in front of the governing body for consideration for final approval tonight. It’s a project that was first announced last July with the Governor as he was in the community. This really is a continuation of projects that are going on in the Schlitterbahn area as part of the whole project that was approved many years ago and then we’ve moved forward with amendments with the Schlitterbahn portion of it. We recently did approval of the Dairy Farmer’s project that was in this area. Now we’re ready to move forward with the final approval of how we’re dealing with the US Soccer and then there’s also amendments to this as to how some things were done with the original Sporting agreement. With that, I’m going to let Mr. Brajkovic come forward and he’s going to give a presentation on the project tonight.

Commissioner Walters said I need to recuse myself from this discussion because my company is involved in the planning of this project.

Commissioner Walters left the meeting at 7:15

George Brajkovic, Economic Development, said I want to take a quick moment to recognize some of the other team members both on the UG’s position on this as well as the developer. Mr. Todd LaSala who is working with us as UG Counsel, and then Robb Heineman and Chase Simmons are here representing the developer. Our presentation is one that should be familiar to the commissioners that are on the standing committee. It’s kind of the same format they’ve seen twice on this project. Really, we’ll probably do a lot of this presentation in concert with Mr. LaSala and probably Mr. Heineman if you have those questions.
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We typically have a slide that tells you about what we’re here for tonight and kind of the history on this project. I think we’re all familiar with the history of the project. Really what were here for tonight, like Mr. Bach mentioned, there’s two documents that go along with this particular project. Before we dive into those let me just spend a couple of minutes on the STAR District. This was the expanded STAR District that was approved last August. You can see the various project areas, kind of the beige color Project Area 1 represents the existing Waterpark.

Project Area 2, the gold color is the auto plaza that construction is underway. It looks a lot different out there right now than it did a year ago. You can kind of see some pad sites that bleed into that purple area representing hotel and restaurant opportunities there. You approved a Project Plan for Area 1 and Area 2 at the same time the district was created.

Project Area 3, in the green, always kind of represented some future development. It had square footage requirement on retail, that square footage requirement was going to be reduced, you can win an office project, and as Mr. Bach mentioned, we were fortunate enough to win the Dairy Farmer’s deal.

Project Area 4 in the purple, is really what we’re here to talk about tonight. So staring at the left side of the screen you’ll recall that’s an overlay into the Village West Area. That is just for the incremental change in the sales tax. As the existing STAR Bonds are paid off, none of those sales tax revenues are affected. They flow to all the appropriate jurisdictions. It’s those
that have retired in those incremental change that becomes available to help pay for this project. The purple in the middle represents about a 40-acre site that is leased for the US Soccer Project. It’s leased from the Schlitterbahn folks and then the purple on the far right represents about 130-acre site, the Speer family property, where the youth tournament soccer fields are proposed. We’ve got a little more detailed slides on all of those coming in. I wanted to kind of go back real quick, this is the exact slide that you saw in August 2014, when we were talking about just the totality of this STAR District. Again, tonight we are talking about the US Soccer project which is an extremely strong component of this district. It’s a $64M project that will be part of almost $665M project when the district is completed. The two documents we’re here for tonight, the development agreement and the 1st Amendment to the Venture Agreement.
Kind of trying to highlight some of the key components that each document considers on the SVA. You’ll recall the original agreement was looking for three urban soccer fields. This has a proposal to replace those urban fields with a variety of Futsal locations and again we’ll get into a little more detail with that. Again, the tournament fields, those were originally planned in the Wyandotte County Park in Bonner Springs and now that’s proposed to move to the Speer family site and staff is in support of that.
Then the US Soccer Development Agreement. Again, it’s a $64M STAR Bond project. It does include the National Training Center, and then again, the tournament fields component of that.
Starting with the tournament fields, we tried to do a little inset of that original STAR Bond District map and then impose over kind of a more detailed drawing of what the Speer family property would look like. You can see highlighted are eight tournament fields and then four
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future fields. Part of the youth tournament venue has a requirement that there are 12 fields made available. Eight are definitely going to the Speer site. We could add or the developer could add four here or use four of the fields that will be on the National Training Center site to create that 12 field venue. You’ll see also on this slide there’s also kind of an area there, State Avenue is on the south side or the bottom of the slide and it leaves about a 50-acre area that’s unplanned. We do have some provisions in the agreement that talks about who has development rights to that and how that works, and if you’d like to hear a quick summary of that maybe I could ask Mr. LaSala, or we could come back to that later if there’s questions.

Todd LaSala said on the balance of the Speer property, that lower half, not only of that property, the developer in this case, OnGoal, will be the developer of record of that site for two-years. What does that mean? That means they have really the first right to propose projects to the UG and have access to that site to use to do those projects. If they exercise that right, they have to present to you a plan, you have to approve the use and like the plan, but assuming that is all the case, they would then pay the UG for that site. We’re going to take ownership of that site in connection with the closing of the STAR Bonds and they would pay us close to $57,000 an acre for the land that they would use if they exercise those development rights. That’s the same price that’s being paid under the option agreement with the Speer family. That occurs for a two-year period. During that same two-year period the UG has the right to propose projects to the developer, go to the developer and say we have something that we’d like to do on that southern half and the development agreement provides a mechanism for you all to work that out with them if that’s the case. At the end of two years really the UG would be the primary developer of record. Thereafter you would be in the driver’s seat on those proposals. The only thing that the developer has asked after that initial two-year period is that we don’t do industrial uses there or ticketed events for hockey. They’ve asked for restrictions on that second half of that site to last for a period of 20 years.
Mr. Brajkovic said moving back to the 40-acre lease site for the US Soccer project, again, it’s that middle section in purple on that STAR District map and we’ve kind of highlighted a little more detail here. What the development agreement calls for in regards to the National Training Center is 100,000 sq. ft. facility. What’s still being the signed or options being reviewed is that a single building, is that spread amongst the campus type environment. Again, the components we’re looking for the NTC itself, got some combination of indoor/outdoor fields. What we did at standing committee, I can invite Rob up and he can kind of talk a little bit more about the design elements here, because there are some things that are reserved as future development and you see kind of rather than an individual fields you see large area?

Rob Heineman, Sporting Club, said you know we just really started to get into the design of this site and it’s not the easiest site in the world from a grade perspective, there’s lots of elevation changes. We’ve been spending a lot of time on trying to figure out what way we can develop it such that we’ve got a lot of intimacy for the training environment for US Soccer and for Sporting so that’s what we’ve done. We’ve kind of reoriented the site more from the western edge to the eastern edge. I really like this site now. I think it’s coming together quite well, that you’ll be able to enter off Parallel in kind of one level, and then look down to the fields below and that Section D. Then, really what we’re looking at D, is just trying to
maximize how many fields we can get on the same plain without having to do a bunch of terraces and things of that nature, so that’s still a bit up in the air as we do design. Overall and I think we like this design a lot. There’s probably some future development we can do up there on F, but I think we’ve been having some discussions with Schlitterbahn who obviously owns the site. We have a lease with them. We do have various restrictions on what we can put on the site, so I think we’d like to look at some of that future development collaboratively with them, see if it’s energestic to what they’re doing, what they’re thinking. I think that’s the piece of ground for us, that’s a little bit up in the air, but otherwise, I think everything you see there A,B,C, E, F, and D we feel pretty good about where the planning is coming together.

Mr. Brajkovic said a couple more details, then on the SVA as it relates to Futsal. There’s been some discussion with using existing park property and underutilized tennis courts and very similar to the project that was done at Wyandotte High School. Really, the best way to think about that is one tennis court equates to one Futsal field. We have various parks that already have existing double tennis courts and the conversion of tennis courts to Futsal is part of the developer’s responsibility. However, if there is any facility that needs repair to the base, or if it’s a single tennis court location that needs a second base built to get two sites, the UG will
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finance and provide the base structures. Again, the developer comes in and does the surplus and
the fencing and all the other components that come along with that. What we’ve tried to do is
just remind everybody what are the existing double courts, what are the existing single courts;
and again, kind of target a completion date on this is really sometime this year. We think it will
come together in a fairly rapid fashion.

Mayor Holland asked, Mr. Heineman, would you come forward. There may be some people in
the audience or on television who are not as familiar as Futsal. The commissioners have heard a
lot about it. I have never heard of it until about two years ago. I’m pretty excited about it so
can you share just a two-minute piece about why we’re all excited about Futsal. Mr. Heineman
stated in some places in the world it’s called Futbol Rapdio, in Europe it’s called
Futsal for the most part. It’s small sided soccer. It’s a small field. It’s a hard court as opposed
to grass. Basically, what it really does is develop technical foot skills for players. The
interesting thing is as we’ve gone through the UG over the years and looked at these tennis
courts, in many of those locations you’ll see pop up soccer goals sitting there today and kids
playing on those same courts. It really came to us as something that we thought could be a very
good use for an asset that’s being underutilized today. Honestly as far as growing the game
from a sporting perspective, it’s really exciting to us because these are some of the skills that
candidly a lot of players in the United States don’t develop very well at a young age. Having
something like this available and then allowing us and US Soccer to contribute to the
curriculum on what’s going on those courts is exciting to us. I think it’ll be a great amenity that
will be well utilized and I think it’ll help us in the long-term win soccer games at Sporting Park.
The one thing I’ll say on this is these will be pretty quick for us to build once we sort of have
everything together. So the approval tonight, and any approvals that we need from the Parks
Department to the extent it’s on park ground, any conditions that we just need satisfied to get
under construction and once we’re under construction it’s probably a 70 to 90 day process. We
would love to have all these knocked out so kids could still play on them late summer or early
fall would be our intent.

Mayor Holland stated thank you for that. Kids play a five on five and it’s just a tennis size
court. The development agreement, when we originally signed this with Cerner, Cerner Office
buildings, new stadium, tournament field and it was not going to be Futsal courts, it was going
to be three regular soccer fields that were going to be built throughout the community. As we
worked that as a Commission for several years, this idea of actually having ten instead of three, and spreading them around, and having this unique opportunity for Futsal really became an idea that I personally got very excited about and I think some of the other Commission did as well. The maintenance on a grass field when kids are playing on it just to play and not just the tournaments. Here’s the problem we had, if we were going to do three tournament fields in the urban area, if it’s a tournament field you have to put a fence around it to protect it for tournaments. If you just open it up for everyone to play on, it gets played down to dirt and then it’s very difficult to play tournament’s on. I can tell you if we built three fields in our city and a put a fence around them, that would not be well received. Having these Futsal courts that are open to the public all the time, hard surface, the kids can play on five on five. If you go out to Wyandotte where the first two are, a beautiful court, you are going to see kids lined up to play there all the time. It’s really a great opportunity for the community. I just wanted to say more about that because I think this is an asset that we are going to appreciate for years. Mr. Heineman said I think the thing that you nailed on the head too, Mayor, you can play five on five, three to three and playing a full soccer field is a tough thing for kids to organize that many people to go play. I just think that this format is going to work a lot better for daily community use.

Commissioner Kane said well I’m glad the properties growing on you because I know there for a little while it wasn’t. Are you still planning on building a hotel on the Schlitterbahn site? Mr. Heineman said we don’t have a definitive plan on where the hotel is going to go at this point or where hotels may go. Hopefully, based on the US Soccer agreement that we have in place, it should allow us overtime to utilize multiple hotels. At this point, until we finalize this agreement tonight, we haven’t really done anything definitively with any hotel developers on where that site location will go.

Mr. Brajkovic said we’ve already kind of touched on the tournaments fields. It’s a 12 field venue. I wanted to highlight that the requirement within the agreement is that those are built and managed and I think the developer’s committed to having that in place by the spring of 2017.
Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-26-15, “A resolution that the Mayor/CEO of the Unified Government is hereby authorized and directed to execute in the name of the Unified Government as the voluntary act of the Unified Government the: (1) First Amendment to Multi-Sport Stadium Specific Venture Agreement by and between Developer and the Unified Government and (2) U.S. Soccer National Training Center Development Agreement by and between OnGoal and the Unified Government, and all other documents and agreements contemplated by these documents in substantially the form presented to and reviewed by the Board of Commissioners on April 9, 2015, with such changes therein as shall be approved by the officers of the Unified Government executing these documents, such officers’ signature thereon being conclusive evidence thereof.” Commissioner Walker made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kane, to adopt the resolution authorizing execution of the two documents.

Commissioner Philbrook said back to the hotel thing, originally they had the hotel off of 98th Street. I’m going to show my ignorance here because when you look at these contracts you guys are used to this stuff all the time. I don’t read these kinds of contracts. If you could illusionate for me and tell me how opened does that leave you on where you put the hotel in this agreement? Mr. Heineman said I would say that leaves us a lot of flexibility in where we put the hotel. We don’t have anything definitive on the hotel. Commissioner Philbrook said so it could be anywhere from the Speer property on the front side on State to out on 98th Street. Mr. Heineman said well specifically to the front side of the Speer site, that’s never a location that we would put it because of the residential on the south side. I know that was a specific concern of yours when we did meet. Commissioner Philbrook said it was, because I had people chewing on me. Mr. Heineman said that will not be the hotel location. We can guarantee that that’s not where it will be. There are hotel sites that we think could be appropriate for this throughout Village West. There are multiple on the Schlitterbahn site. Ones that are on Schlitterbahn ground that we do not have a lease on and then we do think there is a site or two that we do have a lease on but if we were to move forward on that location, we would have to have the approval of Schlitterbahn to do so. There are a number of different locations out here, but the frontage on State Avenue is not one. Commissioner Philbrook said well I appreciate you letting us know it out here in the open. Thank you.
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Mayor Holland asked, Mr. Brajkovic, we do have a motion on the floor. How much longer of the presentation is there, how many more slides? Mr. Brajkovic said three. Mayor Holland asked can you just hit those quickly because we want to move on.

Mr. Brajkovic said one of the changes is in regards to the parking lease that we have on Sporting Stadium. If you recall, there was improvements made on the Speedway property that lease back to this and we’ve got certain revenue streams and we just want to make sure that those revenue streams are shored up, that they cover the debt service on the bonds issued to make those improvements.
Again, the development agreement, National Training Center, Indoor/Outdoor components, there are local benefit provisions that give preference both in pricing and order of preference to local groups. The UG Parks & Recreation Department also has a free or reduced rate on certain components of that as well.
Again, just reminding it’s a $64M STAR Bond Finance Project. We try to highlight some of the key components of that. Those four items don’t add up to $64M, they’re just the bigger components of it. There is a radius restriction of 500 miles that US Soccer can’t do another project like this within that restriction and then one of the commissioner’s during the standing committee had questions or follow up, do we look at rate of return or rate of investment, return on investment for the UG on this project. What we try to do is highlight a couple of different, two different components from different documents.
The first is a local revenue pledge. This is based on one of the bond underwriters response to the RFP. We think that, again, in $31M to $42M of local sales tax dollars up to 17 years flow into this project to help pay for it. Using CSL study, they did three feasibility studies using the most recent one that was dated July 2014. We think that the project will produce $65M in new local sales tax dollars over 30 years.

**Commissioner Kane** said I think the Commission should be kept up-to-date on where this hotel is going so we have an idea of whether it’s the exact location. We need to figure out what’s financially beneficial for the UG as well.

**Commissioner McKiernan** said I just want to thank Mr. Heineman and Sporting for how they followed through on the Futsal courts and how that’s going to ultimately be executed. Very appreciative of how it’s going to turn out.

**Commissioner Townsend** said I too wanted to express my appreciation to the gentlemen with OnGoal and Sporting KC for their follow-up on this. I had some concerns during the standing committee that our kids might have to make a choice between learning how to play tennis or
soccer. I am very appreciative of the outcome that will place a Futsal court at Garland Park. We welcome Futsal in the northeast district of the city.

Roll call was taken and there were eight “Ayes,” Markley, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

Commissioner Walters returned to the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

ITEM NO. 2 – 150061...REQUEST: YMCA FUNDING

SYNOPSIS: Recommend that $65,000 from the 2015 and $10,000 from the 2016 Hollywood Casino grant funding directed to UG Parks & Recreation be allocated to fund the 8th Street Family YMCA operations from April 2015-April 2016, submitted by Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator. This item was previously heard at the March 16, 2015 Administration and Human Services standing committee meeting and the March 26, 2015 special session.
John Mikos, Chief Operating Officer for the YMCA, said we appreciate the opportunity to speak with you this evening. In front of you is a packet of the presentation and there’s also materials that we’ve supplied to you on some of the work that the YMCA has been doing in Wyandotte County specifically for your individual districts. That’s information we won’t be going over tonight but if you have any questions on those, feel free to ask those. We are very appreciative and very happy to be partners with the UG for the past two years through your funding and support to help the 8th Street YMCA continue its operation. We would not have been able to do all the things we’ve done in this community without your support. I’m also very proud to be able to say that we’ve used those resources that you’ve provided us in this last year to really leverage those things to be able to do more in this community had we not had that support. Many of you know that we do operate with membership and we also have some other funding sources so we’d like to give you a little bit of a picture of what we’ve done for this last year. We think that we can continue to maximize all this work that we have done and continue to move forward into next year as we begin to be part of your plan, to be part of the Healthy Campus as we move forward.
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Here is some demographic information regarding our membership and this is just 2014.

Through this last year serving 3,500 children, teens, adults and other seniors which represents about 631 households in 2014. I can tell you as of today that number has gone up to 801 households and serving over 4,000 individuals.

The other thing that’s really proud for us to be able to tell you today is 81% of those people that we’re serving every single day are receiving financial assistance. Those that are receiving financial assistance are those that are of need, it’s having an average household income of right around $18,000 per year. I’m going to be very clear about that. Those that are coming and utilizing the facility as members are receiving financial assistance and we are not turning anybody away. Additionally, where our membership and the people that we’re serving as members of the YMCA are a very good reflection of the community that we serve, 47% Hispanic/Latino, 28% Caucasian, 23% African/American, very good reflection of the community that we’re serving.
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This next slide really speaks to the leveraging that the resources that we’ve been receiving from the Unified Government this last year, $200,000 of grant services that are passed through revenue that we’re able to put directly into the community. These funds are not going to support the operations, that’s the funding that you give us. This is direct impact work for the community for which we would not be able to get these types of grant funding had we not been able to get your support that you have given us in the past year, almost tripling the resource allocation that you have given to us to the Y. When you start breaking it down in terms of what this looks like, in terms of the breakdown, in terms of revenue sources from the Y.
Where the UG money actually comes into it, 71% of our operating revenue comes from membership dues, that’s the biggest source of our overall operating revenue; followed by the Unified Government support which last year was total $86,000. This year we’re requesting $75,000 for the full 12 months followed by an additional $61,000, again, leveraging even more funds through annual contributions that we ask for in the local community to be able to pass through for services through programs and services. Another 2% for program fees followed by 1% in facility rentals. That gives you the overall picture of the operation.

What we’d really like to do now is give you a face to all those folks that we are serving that may not even be members of the Y. I’d like to introduce our Executive Director for the 8th Street YMCA, Simeon Henderson.
Because of the Unified Government’s support, the 8th Street Y impacts the lives of many!

BACK TO SCHOOL BASH

Over 350 children received backpacks, school supplies and haircuts.
Simeon Henderson, Executive Director, 8th St. YMCA, said as John kind of all alluded to already, the impact that we have at the 8th Street YMCA in Wyandotte County is amazing. On an annual basis during the month of August we have a book bag give away. This past year despite the rain and thundering that happened this past August, we served over 350 young people. Each one of the individuals that came to our facility received a free book bag, a haircut, and school supplies. That’s an amazing impact that we have.

**COOKING CLASSES IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HARVESTERS**

Through Spanish Cooking and Kids’ Cooking classes youth and adults received healthy eating cooking instruction and weekly groceries.

We also have free cooking classes sponsored by Harvesters. The cooking class is taught in Spanish. Well we have several cooking classes, but one is definitely taught in Spanish. We also have a cooking class for young people as well. Their family as well as the parents have the opportunity to come and learn and get free instructions about that.
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We also have a program to really address the achievement gap so we have an Early Learning Readiness Program. This is a year-round program where we offer it completely free to the community for children from the ages from 1 to 5, where they can come in with their caregiver and we assist them with preparing them for school.
At our facility we also have three Girl Scout chapters. We have two taught in Spanish and one taught in English and we have on a weekly basis about 16 to 20 participants that come and participate in this class at our location as well.

**NIGHT COURTS**

Night Courts provides a safe, positive environment for teens. In addition to basketball, activities include leadership courses.
This is one of my personally favorite courses. This is a collaboration with leadership through 2000. It’s a program called Night Courts. What this allows us to do is engage with young people across the community from different schools regardless of where they live at. We also receive a lot of participants that go to JFK Community Center. What they do is they come to our facility on Friday nights through the summertime and they get free opportunity to participate in recreational activities as well as get some leadership courses that we bring in different individuals from the community, some professional athletes as well as just professionals in the community as well.

**STEM-SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING AND MATH--ROBOTICS**

This program engages middle school youth in robotics programming.

At our facility we also have a STEM Program that’s a partnership with KC Stem Alliance. This program allows young people to engage in technology. Really, one of our first programs that we had in our YMCA was kicked off at the 8th Street YMCA and the first team was called Robo
Bears. They actually participated, they took 2nd place. They did a phenomenal job and this is actually hosted at Central Middle School.

STEM-CAMP

Another picture of the STEM-CAMP. You see the young people there learning how to really be creative user, innovative thoughts and to really just utilize technology in the future.

SALSA, SABOR Y SALUD

Salsa, Sabor y Salud helps Hispanic/Latino families make healthy choices, increase their activity and pursue healthier lifestyles.
This is another one of my favorite programs. Salsa, Sabor Y Salud which is a loose translation in English of eat healthy, be active. This program allows people, Latino, Hispanic community to come into our facility completely free. They get a six-week membership where they come and they learn about how to read nutritional facts on back of food packages and different things like that. They have a program which is another one of my personal favorites. They have a salsa tasting competition which is amazing. If you’ve never participated in that, come check us out at the 8th Street Y.

COMMUNITY EVENTS

The Y provides on-going programs to enhance the quality of life for the community.
- Trunk or Treat
- Kids Night Out
- Family Nights
- Healthy Kids Day
- Health Fairs
- Senior Activities
- AND SO MUCH MORE

This is another just highlight of our community programs. We have the Trunk or Treat which is around Halloween timeframe. We have Kids Night Out which happens on a monthly basis. We have Family Nights that happen on the monthly basis as well. We have Kids Day which is coming up April 25. We also have Health Fairs and other senior activities in the community.
Mr. Mikos said so these are the faces of the people you allow us to be able to serve every single day. We are very proud of the work that we do every day to be able to support this in our community. We ask your continued support through this next year.

Commissioner Kane said we all know I’m not a preacher, but of all the things that are in Wyandotte County, there is nothing more used by the entire community than that facility. I go there five or six days a week. One night I made an opportunity for myself because I was late and I went up and I saw a place full of kids running around, being taught certain things, listening to what was going on. It was so packed and so crowded, even with my stereo stuff on, I could still hear it, and I was laughing the whole time. If you go up there around 10:00 in the morning or whatever you see the senior citizens walk out. If you go up there at lunch time, sometimes it’s kind of hard to get on the equipment. Look at how many people across the board are using this facility. I know sometimes as commissioners we get territorial if we want something in our district. I actually passed the other Y out on Parallel to come down to this Y on Saturday morning and John’s there with me. The interesting part about it I could go out there but I’m used
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to this one. This is something that has been in the community forever. I started going there in 1971 with Commissioner McKiernan’s brother. Here’s the deal, nobody likes spending money. I realize $75,000 is a lot of money but how much are senior citizens worth, how much are our kids worth and look at ___ it’s non-stop traffic. I don’t know anywhere else that those of us from Wyandotte County can use. Like the Legends, we can go out to Legends, everybody else is out there with is. Gordon’s there every morning. If you think about how often that’s used and at $75,000 and how many thousands of people use it every day, every week or every year, and the different nationalities that use it, I’d hate to see us not fund it. I’d hate to see us commissioner’s become territorial over this because it’s a lot of money.

**Action:** Commissioner Kane made a motion that we give them the $75,000. Commissioner Philbrook seconded the motion.

**Commissioner McKiernan** said I certainly would agree with what Commissioner Kane just said and I would also be in support of this motion but one thing is a little concerning to me. When we first approved this money, and I think it was now two years ago, maybe a little bit more; we were in a crisis. It was important to stabilize this in the short-term while we developed a plan. My only concern is that it’s taken us longer than I thought it would to develop a plan to replace this Y with a new one that has other funding streams and other funding sources. I want to see us move with all due diligence toward creating that plan so that we’re not back here next year and the year after and the year after and the year after, but as this does support and feed right into and become an integral part of the Healthy Campus, I do support the motion.

**Commissioner Maddox** said I also am a member of the YMCA and spent various times there as a youth also. I have an issue with the proposal in its current state which is the request for $65,000 of Casino funds that are delegated to the Parks and Recreation Department to be removed and then given to the YMCA. One, because of over the past two or three months I have visited the Parks and Recreation facilities in my district as well as other areas and there are needs for upgrades. I spoke with various directors of those gyms and they’re saying we need this, we need that and often when they mention it to the higher ups in the Parks and Recreation Department, they’re told that there is no revenue available. This seems that would be that stream of revenue. Over three years we have reallocated those funds that would have went to the Parks and Recreation Department to the YMCA. We did it two years straight. As Commissioner
McKiernan just mentioned, the first year, okay, it was a favor. The second year, I heard various commissioners voice their concerns about going with the plan and now we’re here a third year and our facilities are constantly declining but we’re taking the funding that would go toward a facility and we’re moving them to the YMCA. I have somewhat of an issue with that. I’ve seen the upgrades that our Parks and Recreation Department need and when I think about the actual proposal that initially went for it was to say that we knew our Parks and Recreation Department facilities were declining and so we said we were going to allocate some of those funds from the Casino to upgrade them. Now three years straight we took that funding and we moved it elsewhere. For taxpayers who are on the low end of the stick or less fortunate who can’t pay for a YMCA membership, that’s where they go, to the Parks and Recreation Department. I am a proponent of the Parks and Recreation Department and I think we need upgrades.

I think a Parkwood pool needs slides. They’ve asked for that over three to five years. $5,000 they haven’t been able to get a slide. Here we are talking about giving $65,000 to $70,000 again. It gives me a little bit of heartburn when we talk about allocating $65,000 to the YMCA when the commissioners were given heartburn about having the appropriation to be able to give $50,000 out to needy groups in their community. Again, I speak up to that and I’m a little concerned about it because I thought this was going to be brought to the commissioners before this point because in the standing committee we discussed bringing it up to the commissioners before. Mayor Holland said it was brought to the commissioners before. It was presented before. Commissioner Maddox said that’s where I stand on it in that moment. Mayor Holland said at standing committee it was presented to the commissioners.

Commissioner Walker said I think I’m the one that said last year that I wasn’t going to vote for this again. Every time I make that kind of statement I find myself looking at who you provide services to and if it were just the lawyers, bankers, and the professionals that went over there to workout at noon, it would be no problem for me to vote to cut off the funding. I will be honest with you that when we voted to approve a plan for a new YMCA, it would have been mid-summer I suppose after April 2013, I was naively optimistic, I suppose; that we were going to have broken ground and perhaps even going vertical on that facility by now. The decision would be much easier if I thought this was the very last time you were going to come in here and ask for money. There is a point of which you have to look at things such as Commissioner Maddox has talked about because funds we give to you are funds that don’t go somewhere else and there are other needs. The usage and the benefits to the lower income people in Wyandotte County is April 9, 2015
there. I guess I worry, and I’m worrying out loud, that when we get down the road when does this subsidy for the 8th Street stop? How much longer before we break ground on a new facility and then when we do are we going to be continue to be asked for operational assistance. Your clientele is not going to be any different than it is now. It’s going to be mostly the same people in a new facility. Hopefully, more people will come and pay full membership, but let’s just say that the recipients of the new Y’s program are the same ones, you’re still going to end with a shortfall. I’m not seeing you make any plan that is convincing that you’re going to raise the revenue from some source. Either I’m not convinced or you’re saying it and I’m not hearing it. I just feel like every year we’re going to be giving $75,000, $100,000, $125,000 a year to keep this YCMA afloat unless something changes in this economic dynamic that’s driving this Y. No, I don’t want to cut off funding for the people that are being serviced. I wouldn’t mind cutting it off on Kane, you know, some of the other people that are members up here; that wouldn’t bother me one bit. It bothers me when I look at those children that are benefiting from it and it it’s going to be very hard for me to say no to this again tonight. I’ll have to eat crow in my words. This idea that we’re perpetually supplement the YMCA in downtown Wyandotte County is not going to happen, it’s not going to happen at least with my vote. I don’t want to say I’ll never do it again, but we better be moving on this YMCA pretty demonstratively by this time next year.

**Commissioner Markley** said Commissioners Maddox and Walker have done a good job of setting the stage for me. I’m going to beat the same drum that I always do. It’s nothing personal, it’s not you, it’s always what I say. I think we do a disservice to ourselves and to our taxpayers when we make budget decisions outside of the budget. I think we should be discussing this as part of the budget. Commissioner Maddox’s points were on point. We haven’t seen the proposal from our Parks and Recreation Department as far as what they want money for this year. We don’t know what they’re going to be asking for and what priorities they have. To take money and give it to someone else without giving our own staff a chance to present to us to me just seems like inappropriate timing. I would prefer to discuss this as part of the budget, a Revised Budget is going to come up in June and July for the Revised Budget for 2015. It’s not they have to wait to 2016 but I just think we need to consider it along with the rest of our budget items and I think those things that were brought up by Commissioner Maddox and by Commissioner Walker leads me to that same conclusion.
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**Commissioner Murguia** said I also would echo what Commissioners Maddox, Markley and Walker have said. I think this is a proposal that needs to be entertained during our budget cycle. You do great work. There are organizations just like yours that work with kids that are cute all over our county. They don’t have the opportunity to bring their proposal forward tonight. Just off the top of my head, I can think of an organization called the Boys and Girls Club. They do a phenomenal job and yet I don’t think, at least in my eight years up here, they’ve ever come in front of us and asked us for money to my knowledge. I just think it sends the wrong message and for me it’s about fairness and equity. Not that I wouldn’t absolutely entertain a proposal that you are submitting tonight, I think the timing could be better, I think the playing field needs to be leveled for everyone, and all of those proposals need to be heard at the same time. That would be my position. Again, nothing against your program, great pictures, darling kids, lots of organizations with the same thing.

**Mayor Holland** said I would just say one of the reasons, and just a little historical perspective, the Unified Government to my knowledge has never contributed to the 8th Street Y. The reason this began two years ago was the Y actually vetted five sites downtown to look to build a new facility and built a ProForma around a new full service facility that could serve the whole community. As we looked at that we took some time to do a master plan around the Y. It’s such an important investment as a community center. It’s about a $14M new investment downtown around 10th & State. We’re also looking at a new grocery store. Those two combined are about a $30M capital investment that have an opportunity to really leverage more development downtown. We did delay the fundraising on the YMCA in order to do a master plan. The master plan money was donated to us by the REACH Healthcare Foundation, the Greater Kansas City Health Foundation. and LISC because they saw the merits of the redevelopment opportunity to create a national model for healthy living in an urban area and to leverage that money to really help our struggling downtown to thrive once again. The master plan took nine months from start to finish. We have that plan in place now. We’re actively going out to the funders. We have made a number of visits already to the funders. The downtown YCMA project in Kansas City, Missouri just received approval yesterday from the TIF Commission for $16.9M for that project. The City Council still needs to approve that. This Commission made a matching pledge of $6M for a new community center that would be run by the Y here in our community. Really, the delay in the master planning I think have made it a better project. I think it’s increased our ability to raise the money for the community center. This financial partnership with the Y on this
operating piece with the 8th Street Y has been really a bridge to make sure that we need the base of membership at the 8th Street Y for the new YMCA when it opens. To close the YMCA downtown and then two years later build a new one and then to start fresh with new membership would make it very challenging. We would lose a lot of the membership of our business community, we’d lose a lot of the residential community and we’d have to start from the ground to build up. The best opportunity for the success for a new community center is to keep this 8th Street Y whole while we’re moving through the process. There are timelines on that need to be built and the money needs to be raised. We’re actively working on that. I’m very pleased with the progress we’re making on the Healthy Campus overall. You just received that communication a couple of weeks ago about our quarterly update on the Healthy Campus. My hope is that we will approve this tonight for this bridge fund. It is an unusual arrangement and it is borne out of the larger goal for the Healthy Campus to get us to that point.

The other history about why it is outside the budget cycle which, Commissioner Markley, I think is a very valid point. It was because the initial ask came two years ago in April and April was the contract date that was set. It has rolled on the April’s for the last two years. It’s more of a historical happenstance that it’s happening now then actually intentionally being outside of the budget cycle. My hope is that we’ll go ahead and approve this and understanding that there are many needs in our community as a bridge to get us to the Healthy Campus from there.

Commissioner Markley said, Mayor, I was just going to comment that part of the reason that I am concerned about it being on the budget cycle is because we do have now a more extended timeline for how long it’s going to take to get the new community center in place. If it’s not in the budget cycle this year, they’re going to be back here next year off the budget cycle asking again. I just want to get them in the cycle so that they’re part of our usual. Mayor Holland said I think we can pledge certainly this summer if there is going to be a request, that it needs to be in place for us to consider this summer rather than going around to next April. I think that’s a reasonable request to get this teed up on the budget cycle in the event that this ask continues.

Commissioner Walker said I guess you may be suggesting and we’re agreeing, I would be agreeable to, I don’t know what you want to call it, a bridge grant that would get them through the budget cycle and then consider it inside the budget and then we’re off schedule because this wasn’t thought of a couple of three years ago when this funding of the Y started. Commissioner Markley said I said the same thing then too. Mayor Holland said I am sure
Commissioner Markley was on record then as well. **Commissioner Walker** said I don’t disagree with Commissioner Markley at all that it ought to be part of the overall budget and we ought to have considered it. It’s no different, better, or worse than any of the other proposals but we’ve created this off-cycle dynamic and at some point they need to get through to the point where we can adopt the Revised Budget and fund them through the end of the year and then have whatever funding for 16, I guess it would be, that we are going to agree to do.

**Commissioner Townsend** said I just wanted to get some clarification on the ask here. On the request memo we’re saying that we’re recommending $65,000 from 2015 General Budget and then $10,000 from the Hollywood Casino Grant Funding so we’re looking at two pots of money here.

**Mr. Bach** said, Commissioner, what is laid is that last year during the budget cycle we have the $100,000 that’s contributed from the Hollywood Casino Funds that they give to us on an annual basis. Initially I put forward my budget, did not have a recommendation as to fund that, that was per direction of the Commission that would not be allocated to any sources. During the course of the budget cycle we opted to put $35,000 additional into some Parks and Recreation or into Parks for mowing purposes into our parks areas, so that was allocated over to that portion of it. We left the $65,000 unallocated. The directive of the Commission at that time was that we would wait and see if we had something we wanted to allocate it to during the during the 2015 cycle. We didn’t talk specifically about the YCMA though that is what we had previously used the funding for in previous years. As we only have $65,000 left in 2015 budget, then we would have to allocate $10,000 from the 2016 and this governing body has not had any discussion on the 2016 money yet. The $65,000 was discussed as a Commission and the decision was not to allocate it and leave it open for something that may come about from Parks and Recreation position last year during the budget process. The $10,000 for 2016 has not been through a budget cycle. Both pots come from what would be the Hollywood Casino grant money that comes back in toward parks and recreational activity in our community.

**Commissioner Townsend** asked would this impact the allocation that, we as Commissioners, will soon be making with the casino grant funding. **Mr. Bach** said no, it is not related to that. **Commissioner Townsend** said I have to say that I agree with the comments already made by Commissioners Walker, Markley, Maddox and Murguia. I would like to see this ask put on the
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same schedule as the rest of our funding requests. The Y does great work, but as do many others that come before us to ask for requests. I’m hoping I’m not hearing that in the future this request is going to be perennial until the new Y is built. I thought this was only a bridge for an emergency situation and got that impression last year and the year before so I do have some concerns as already been discussed that there’s no real plan in place for this funding issue for them.

Commissioner Maddox said, County Administrator Bach, can you give us a mask figure if this is approved tonight how much we have approved for the YMCA over the last three years that was allocated to Parks and Recreation but we reallocated it. Mr. Bach said off the top of my head I’m not sure I know that number. I’ll look at here and see if my staff, Lew or Jenny, do either one of you have that number? We put $86,000 toward it in last year’s contract. Mr. Mikos said it was $86,000 this last year and then $120,000 the year before that. It’s a 12 month period so it’s not a calendar year. This year 12-month period was $86,000; the 12-month same cycle previously was $120,000. Mr. Bach said the $86,000 did come from, and I believe the $120,000 did as well, came from the casino money that was allocated toward recreational activity in the community. Commissioner Maddox said so help me with a ballpark figure, help me with the math, what is that if we approve it tonight, how much is that? Mayor Holland said it would be $275,000. Commissioner Maddox said $275,000 in three years away from park and recreational facilities.

Commissioner Walters said I have a question about this information that you distributed. Just for clarification, I certainly don’t know your economic analysis or your internal procedures regarding membership costs; but I’m looking at the membership and I’m adding 1, 2, 3, and 4 districts and that looks like there’s about 14,000 individual, total individuals from those four districts and I’m just sort of thinking it wouldn’t be a very big increase monthly to cover $75,000 or $65,000 if you have 15,000 people involved. Mr. Mikos asked you mean between all the locations. Commissioner Walters said I’m looking at District 1, 2, 3, 4. It looks like the total individuals involved are about 14,000. Mr. Mikos said in each one of these there are different operating units having its own different operating costs. As an example, the other locations that have swimming pools whereas the 8th Street Y doesn’t, the operating cost associated with some facilities that are much larger and other programming is going to cost us a lot more. If the question you’re asking is whether or not we’ve got funds that we’re able to redirect to support
this, we don’t. **Commissioner Walters** said no, that’s not my question at all. I was thinking if you have about 14,000 people that use the Y and if you increase their fee .60 cents a month, wouldn’t that about cover it? **Mr. Mikos** said the problem right now is the number of financial assistance that we’re giving over the last couple of years has actually been going up. Trying to look at adding additional cost for membership right now, it would be very difficult for us to do that. We’re seeing greater need and we would just be turning around most likely giving it in terms of financial assistance so increasing the rates right now is not on our plan for those facilities.

Roll call was taken on the motion to approve the funding outlined in the request and there were and there were three “Ayes,” Philbrook, McKiernan, Kane. Commissioners Markley, Walters, Walker, Townsend, Murguia, Maddox voted “No.” Motion failed.

**Commissioner Markley** asked can I make a motion that we table this until budget. **Mayor Holland** said yes. I think the discussion has been do we want to fund a portion of it to get us through until the budget instead of tabling it all together and then I guess there would be several options here. It’s the will of the Commission.

**Commissioner Walker** said if she made a motion and got a second I’m going to make a motion to amend.

**Mayor Holland** said let’s talk about what we want to do.

**Commissioner Markley** said I think it depends on what that number would be. **Commissioner Walker** said I will support a motion to carry this over to budget with some bridge money to get them through the budget session. I don’t know what that number is because nobody has presented it. If it’s $65,000, whatever, then clearly somethings wrong.

**Mayor Holland** said if you take $75,000 divided by 12 that would be a good start. **Mr. Bach** said that would be $6,250. **Mayor Holland** said $6,250. **Mr. Bach** said April through August I believe that would be about $31,250. **Mayor Holland** said $31,250 would get it through the budget cycle and then we could vet it out with our other items, is that right? The $31,250 to fund
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it from April through August and then we would have our conversation in April to determine long-term plans.

Commissioner Walker made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kane, to provide $31,250 to fund the YMCA for five months, April through August, with the intent to get us through the budget and to give the opportunity within the budget cycle for full vetting. Roll call was taken and there were eight “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Kane. Commissioner Maddox voted “No.”

**ITEM NO. 3 – 150079...REPORT/RECOMMENDATION: CONSOLIDATE CHAMBER, WYEDC & CVB**

**SYNOPSIS:** Presentation and recommendation by Springsted Inc, regarding the proposal to consolidate the Kansas City, KS Chamber of Commerce (Chamber), Wyandotte Economic Development Council (WYEDC), and the Kansas City, KS Convention & Visitor's Bureau (CVB), submitted by George Brajkovic, Economic Development Director. On October 30, 2014 a public hearing was conducted to consider said consolidation.

**Mayor Holland** said this has been a conversation that has been going on for about a year and a half. The Commission met last fall and discussed this at length. We had a long public hearing. We asked for a study. The Administrator went out and found a group to do the study. Springsted, a group we’re already familiar with, they completed their study and have submitted it a week ago to all of the commissioners to review. What I am going to ask tonight is for Springsted to come forward and offer their presentation. Since we’ve already had a public hearing on this topic, we’re not going to have another public hearing. We are going to offer each of the three affected agencies to make a five minute presentation on their reflections on that study. That would be the CVB, the Chamber and WYDEC. Each group will have an opportunity to make a presentation so we can hear from them on their reflection from it and then we’ll open up to the Commission for discussion.

**Mayor Holland** asked, Administrator Bach, do you have anything additional. **Mr. Bach** said no, Mayor, I believe you have set this up well. I would recognize Dave Unmacht with Springsted, Inc. to present his findings.

*April 9, 2015*
Findings

Consolidation Analysis

David Unmacht, Springsted Incorporated
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David Unmacht, Springsted, Inc., said I’m here tonight to present the findings that are on the screen. I will do that in a very efficient manner. I think roughly 15 to 20 minutes I should be able to cover it all. I’m going to walk through the document at a high level and talk about my observations. I was retained by the Unified Government to help evaluate the consolidation proposal and present policy options.

On October 30, 2014, you had a two-hour and roughly nine minute hearing in this chamber on this question. You were presented with two options. Option 1 was to really consolidate, Option II was not. The CVB was against it. The Unified Government decided to wait and take another look at this.
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This evening really you have two additional options but there are two components. Option I is to not consolidate, take no action or encourage some collaboration of some level. Option II is to consolidate and that has two subsets. Subset I is to accept the proposal on the table or ask for a new proposal and go forward. You really have a continuation of two options but each one has an A and a B and I’m going to talk through those during the course of my presentation.

There’s essentially 10 sections, it’s about 25 pages. My point tonight I think to focus on really is number 3, number 6 and number 9. I’m going to scroll through the rest of them at a reasonably fair pace just to make it efficient. The key point in the study introduction is underlined and the only part that’s underlined. The study is not an evaluation of the services, programs or specific work of the three entities. No opinion is made or rendered on success or lack thereof or how each new entity is doing their job or carrying out their mission. I think that’s an important distinction to make. I’m not rendering an opinion on whether the EDC, Chamber, CVB is successful or not. It’s not what I did or what I studied. The study process is right there for you, roughly 15 steps. I believe and I think, based on the work that I do in this business, that the number of entities that we have, the number of people that participated and many of them are here tonight behind me that represent these different agencies and some are in front of me we’re very participatory. I would like to thank them for their time and effort and in particular the two Executive Directors, Greg and Bridgette, who also responded to some follow-up requests that I had. People were very passionate as you know. They really believe in what they believe in. It was an exciting project and it was a very good project to be part of. There’s an adage as some of you know and it’s kind of in the architecture, design, and engineering field that kind of form follows function. It’s one of those things that I do when I look in an analysis. I look for some of the foundational elements, if their present or not present, to help guide what policy options should be presented or what policy options in fact may be better than the other. As I got into this study I started to realize that there were some basic questions that weren’t answered or weren’t there that I wanted to raise with you as part of my analysis. If these in fact would have been raised, you may have had the ability to make a decision in October or you would have allowed me to provide a greater analysis in terms of just what is the Unified Government’s position on some of these things. I’d like to suggest, because there also material point within my findings, because I think they’re really relevant. I won’t read all of what I’m going to do, but a couple of these I think are important to point out.
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The following policy questions are posed to the Unified Government, you the commissioners, to consider in your deliberation of this proposal. The question is the answers to them and that is something you may decide to address or not.

Number one, do you believe that each of these three entities is, in fact, operating successfully. Are you in a position to evaluate whether or not organizational change are required simply as a result of their success or lack thereof. That’s an opinion that each one of you may have.

The Unified Government budgets, contracts, and authorizes just short of $910,000, each one you do differently and distinctively up to obviously the transient guest tax is the significant majority of that. The $200,000 with Economic Development Council and roughly $5,500 plus or minus to the Chamber so you have a lot invested in that. Do you believe you are obtaining optimal value and desired outcomes from the financial commitments you are providing individually and collectively? If hypothetically one of the answers is yes, then maybe your position on a consolidation is clear. If the answer is no, were not sure, or no were not, then maybe you have another observation about it.

Does the Unified Government, and this really is an important one, have an overall vision for economic development of city and greater Kansas City community? If you had a vision would that guide you in your consideration of whether or not this option makes sense?

Number 5 and the last one, presently in a high competitive environment regionally, nationally and internationally the three entities have a relationship characterized by somewhat mistrust and suspicion. That’s too bad. It certainly was something that I picked up in my interviews. It’s partly and based on the consolidation proposal. There’s essentially ten questions that are offered in the Unified Government policy options and I think they’re material consideration to help you decide whether or not you think it’s a good idea or not to consolidate.
Study Sections
The following ten (10) sections comprise the contents of this 23 page document.

1. Study Introduction
2. Study Process
3. UG Policy Questions
4. What are Findings?
5. Mission Statements
6. Consolidation Analysis Findings
7. Financial Analysis
8. Best Practices in Organizational Design
9. Policy Options
10. Study Author Observations

Study Introduction
The Unified Government of Kansas City, Kansas retained Springsted Incorpor to partner in a Consolidation Analysis of the Chamber of Commerce, Convention and Visitor’s Bureau and the Wyandotte County Economic Development Council. The Unified Government is seeking an objective evaluation of the consolidation proposal that was presented to the Board of Commissioners on October 30, 2014. The proposal to combine the three independent entities is contentious and the County is seeking an outside opinion on the merits of whether or not the three entities should combine. The study is not an evaluation of the services, programs or specific work of the three entities. No opinion is made or rendered on the success or lack thereof of how each entity is doing their job or carrying out their mission.
This is an important consideration as the opinions of the participants with respect to the work of these entities are a material consideration in the pursuit of consolidation.

Study Process
The experience of the author suggests that two components are critical to a successful study – process credibility and outcome credibility. Process credibility comes from the acceptance by all involved – in this case, the elected officials, staff and Board members – that the methodology used is credible and objective. In addition, the interaction with the individuals chosen for an interview must be transparent, open, and honest. For example, the issue of confidentiality was critical to the willingness of individuals to participate. We did not violate our commitment to keep such input confidential and private. At the same time, it also required that the author be fair in employing criteria to determine which observations, comments and advice are most useful, valuable and reliable. Outcome credibility is largely dependent on process credibility; when participants have confidence in the process, they are more likely to accept the study findings and recommendations. When both elements are present, the results are a more realistic report with greater likelihood of valid conclusions leading to informed and deliberate discussion and action.

The foundation for this study was twofold: review of existing information and participant interviews. This was accomplished through one-on-one interviews, small group meetings and the submission and review of significant amount of information on each of the three entities. The author included other supporting steps in the process to strengthen the reliability of the process. Significant information was provided along with extensive history and background materials; however, we were careful and deliberate in including only the information pertinent to the areas of the study. Any omission of information was simply designed to stay focused on the main questions of the study.
Process Steps

The following steps are included in the study process.

1. Ongoing contact and communication with project coordinator staff from the US
2. On-site individual meetings with Greg Kindle and Bridgette Jabe on January 21, 2015
3. On site interviews with staff from all three entities (two-two-three - seven total)
4. On-site interview with CVB Board members and representatives
5. On site interview with Chamber of Commerce Board members and representatives
6. On site interview with WYEDC Board members and representatives
7. On site interview with three County Commissioners on January 21, 2015
8. Follow-up telephone interviews with Board members not present on January 21, 2015
9. A review of data and information including, but not limited to:
   a. Present data from each entity including budgets, staffing, minutes, job descriptions, organizational charts, brochures, letters of record, position papers, etc.
   b. Viewing the two hour and nine minute Board meeting on October 30, 2014
   d. Randall Assessment Summary – 2006
   e. Numerous letters, emails and memos of record of interested individuals, groups, businesses, associations, etc.
10. Additional information requests to staff and various parties
11. Phone calls and discussions with colleagues and peers in the Chamber, Economic Development and Convention and Visitor's Bureau business
13. Briefing with the County Administrator on March 12, 2015
14. Briefing with the Mayor, County Administrator and staff on March 30, 2015
15. Presentation to the US Board of Commissioners on April 9, 2015

In the author's opinion we collected and received significant input from each entity including the Board members, staff, and stakeholders. This data allowed us to draw valid and reliable findings and observations within the study.
UG Policy Questions

During the course of the analysis, it became apparent that in order to understand whether or not a particular course of action is correct or appropriate, certain basic policy questions must be raised (ultimately) answered. As the study progressed these questions became more and more relevant and substantive.

The following policy questions are posed to the Unified Government Board of Commissioners (UG) to consider in your deliberation of the consolidation proposal. Individually, these questions are important, collectively they may guide the UG in its consideration of the consolidation options.

1. Do you believe that each of the three entities is – in fact – operating successfully? Are you in a position to evaluate whether or not organisational changes are required simply as a result of their success or lack thereof in carrying out their mission and work? Even though you do not have direct control over their work and operations, as a member, funder and supporter, the UG certainly can have an opinion about how well you think they do their job.

2. The UG budget, contracts, and authorizes over $900,000 on an annual basis to support all three entities. Do you believe you are obtaining optimal value and the desired outcomes from the financial commitment you are providing – individually to each and collectively to all three?

3. Does the UG have an overall vision for economic development in the City and greater Kansas City community? If you had a vision would that guide you in your consideration of whether or not consolidation is a good or bad idea?

4. Do you believe the economic development efforts of the three entities are coordinated sufficiently? Can you point to combined and individual successes of each?

5. Presently, – in a highly competitive environment (regionally, nationally and internationally) – the three entities have a relationship characterized by mistrust and suspicion. Does the UG believe this is good business that leads to a successful branding, image and outcomes?

6. Is the UG in a position to encourage and seek more collaboration especially before you consider consolidation? Is it reasonable to require that an interim step be tried before the act of consolidation is pursued?

7. What value do you place on fairness and equity in a consolidation? How important is it for all three entities to be comfortable and right with the consolidation? In October of 2014, the UG did not support the Chamber/EDC proposal that – as you know – was highly opposed by the CVB.

8. Organisational change processes, as the UG knows very well, do not come easily or without challenges and often some level of anxiety, gain and loss. What considerations must be given to the detail of the implementation process and the questions that may arise from it?

9. What is your opinion on the outcome of the Collins Novitsky Report which stated that a separate model “best fit the goals to improve accountability, clarify responsibilities, predict revenue and annual budgets, prepare long range strategic goals, avoid conflicts of interest (that naturally occur when a single Board of Directors oversees multiple and sometimes unrelated agencies and still
maintain a close connection with the Unified Government and other related agencies. What follow-up has been done to determine that this has been the result? Did this outcome occur to the best of your knowledge?

10. Do you believe there is a discernable and distinct difference in the performance of the CVB after the separation than during the time it was consolidated with the Chamber?
What are Findings? They’re just definitions so if you wondered what I was doing with my 30 particular points, I tried to set it up with a definitional section called What are Findings and it laid it out very distinctly.
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Mission Statements. Mission statements are often used to support a particular position. It was clear in this particular case as well. People felt that the mission of the CVB was distinctive. The mission of the other two organizations were as well. In a consolidation proposal a mission statement could be compromised and I point out at the bottom of page 6 that this author, which is me, has done a lot of work and vision and strategy in mission development and goal setting and strategic planning. I think although missions are essentially important and they should be very viable, it is in and of itself a reason not to support a particular policy position. You could
combine mission statements or in tough environments, i.e. the tough recession, we saw many local governments change their mission because the conditions under which they were operating were dramatically different in 2007 to 2012, 2011 timeframe and so missions were in fact adjusted and were different.

The next one is really the heart and soul of this summary. There’s 30 particular findings. I’m certainly not going to read all of them. I tried to be succinct. I didn’t go back and repeat to
provide significant amount of information on the three entities because you are well aware of them and you know who they are, but I did for the record because I looked at the two previous studies, the Randall Assessment and the Collins, I think it’s Noteis Report 2008, 2010; if in fact at some point and time five, ten years from now if someone goes back and looks at this particular document, I wanted to make sure it was succinct and clear of what I was trying to do and how it lead me to where I was going in my analysis.

The second bullet on this particular page the question is who’s right and who’s wrong. I pondered that a lot in the analysis and the conversation. Lead me to believe because there isn’t a foundational direction that the Unified Government has in terms of economic development, strategy and vision that I could compare the structure request to, it lead me to believe there really is no clear right or wrong in this issue as you stand here today. The opinions and the passion of each of the two different groups are evident and they’re genuine. We had a process and motivations behind the process for questions and you saw that at your hearing on October 30, but I took certainly the passion and the purpose of the individuals that I met with in a sincere and genuine manner.

The second to last one on page 8 if you are following me, it starts with “there is a common belief across all three entities” and I think this is something you probably know but I think it’s important to state for the record. By all measures everyone agrees that this particular community, and this is a very positive thing, is a major tourism destination that is continuing to develop.” The potential is not quite established or known. However, based on my analysis and based on my interviews and the objectivity that I try to bring to this equation, there is not a common vision, strategy, or direction on how to continue, maintain and enhance the KCK such to maintain it as an emerging national destination. I think that’s important consideration for the Unified Government whether you do it on your own or whether you do it in the combination of this discussion of what to do structurally with these three agencies. One of the fundamental principles of each one of these three agencies is there generally alike, roughly budgetary size they are equivalent, roughly staff size they are equivalent and they do economic development and they do marketing. They do it differently and their purpose is different and I have quote I’m going to share with you in a few minutes that I thought one of the people that I interviewed really captured the essence of these three really well and I decided to include it. As you can see, through the combination of statistical information that is provided and this is something that you probably already knew, that they’re reasonably the same size.
The manner in which the Unified Government provides money is listed here at the top. You do an annual contribution of $200,000 to the one agency. You pay dues just under $6,000 right now. You contract transient guest tax just over $703,000. In our document we provided, and thanks to Mike Grimm for his help, we provided the information of what you’re historical contributions and your transient guest tax amounts were. It’s a nice history.

One of the items on the bottom of this page that I don’t have on the screen, and I think that is a material consideration because it’s relevant to what other options you want to talk about, is the current relationship between the Chamber and the EDC. There was a word that I had one of the commissioners used in my conversation, the word was “synergy”. What does synergy mean? The question really becomes kind of an analysis of a relationship. My wife is getting her Masters Degree in Administration. She’s a nurse manager at a major hospital in the twin cities. No kidding, two days ago we were sitting there and I’m working, she’s sitting at the counter, she says what does synergistic mean? I said I don’t know but I’m working on synergy with the Unified Government. But synergy is in place with the Chamber and the EDC. You can just feel it and how did I define it? The existing strong relationship between EDC and Chamber, sands, which means without, the CVB is part of the challenge of the two entities already very well connected and practice operations and culture while the CVB is distinct and stands alone. That’s just a statement of fact. That’s not a judgement, that’s not a good, or bad or otherwise; they have a relationship that’s clearly intertwined and the CVB is not today. That’s part of the conversation and that’s part of the analysis that the CVB provided with the consolidation proposal was it’s really two against one. It feels like it’s two against one.

Staffing is presented as of January 2015. In all likelihood that has changed, not dramatically on the top of page 11 and you see the different staffing positions that are held within each one of the three agencies. Right below that you see the quote that was provided to me that I thought was very effective. This is one of the people that I interviewed, the Chamber supports business to business relationships including the business climate, and this particular interviewer provided legislation as an example: the EDC helps to grow my business, although most of the time they’re focused on larger business but that was not a criticism. Finally 3, the CVB helps bring business to my business especially from people who I wasn’t expecting. I thought she captured the essence of the roles quite well.

Much of what I have on page 11 on the bottom is really relevant because it talks about what were the benefits of consolidation. In this particular document that was presented in summary by the proposers, and all of you have seen that, they lay out some pretty good rational
for the purposes of the consolidation. Then of course in the record from October 30 there is many, many, pages of reasons why opposite, why this isn’t a good idea. You were presented with two particular different sides. The opposition was largely based on, in part, the belief and the perception of what might happen or what has historically happened to CVB’s in consolidated proposals. Because they couldn’t state it as a fact, they had to state it has an anticipation or what has been done in other places or what could happen if, in fact, this was consolidated and I think that’s an important distinction.

Two thirds of the way through, I have these noted, 20 of 30 findings, and this is an important consideration, because those who presented the proposal were clear in stating to me that it wasn’t the case and those who were on the receiving end of the proposal being the CVB said in fact it was the case, so the fact of the matter is, it was a reality whether it was true or not is this notion of takeover. There is a perception that they’re trying to take it over and those that proposed said that’s not true those that were on the receiving end said yes it is. It is a reality in the conversation whether or not it’s true.

Number 21. It’s the bottom of this one at the top. This is quite possibly for members of the Commission and staff and folks. This is quite possibly the largest driver based on my assessment of this proposal is truly a belief on two sides that the organizations aren’t operating as well or as strong as they should. The CVB to the Chamber and the Chamber to the CVB. This is a material consideration as I point and I kept going back to this point in my analysis that part of the reason why this proposal, if not the majority reason why this proposal was put forth, is because people perceive that something could be done better or people believe that something could be done better. That lead me to the question of what do you believe. Do you believe they could be done better in a consolidation or do you believe they’re operating optimally now and that might lead you to a conclusion of what you think ought to happen. That’s where those policy questions started coming back. What’s the vision of this Unified Government on economic development, what are your strategies in economic development? Because if you have those, I could compare that to structure and it could lead to an easier conclusion because if that foundation isn’t there, you have two policy options without context and that’s what you were faced with in October and that is why with opposition it became a hard conversation to have. It’s still a hard conversation to have because those answers aren’t there. If they are there, it really does make it easier.

There is a question of cost savings and this is 23 on the bottom of 12. I truly believe based on my work and based on my history that you in fact would find cost savings in a
consolidation. It just would happen. How much is debatable, how much needs to be determined and you may not know for a year, two or three. Often times the combined organizations you have a startup cost. You have to invest to consolidate so you’re going to spend money to make money, if you will. How much can only be determined in an implementation plan. At the end of the day because there’s commonalities in organization, in program and administration you will have savings. To what degree it’s hard to say, but I think you can assume there would be in fact some savings. I think I’ll stop there on findings and continue on and wrap up in a few minutes, Mayor.
The working relationships between the three entities can be improved. The Board members that represent the three entities have a strong passion, commitment and energy in support of their organization. Interviewees across all three agencies gave much respect and deference to the commitment and leadership of Board members. Yet due to strong opinions the proposal has polarized their viewpoints. Personalities are strong and opinions on them are impacting the merits of the consolidation idea. One interview noted that there is “mistrust at the Board levels now and it has gotten personal.” Although only specific to the mission of the EDC, it can be implied and construed that collaborating and partnering with each other is an important objective. If not in formal way, certainly in an informal way. For all involved, if working together, pursuing common interests and benefiting the greater KC KC community are desired outcomes, then there is much work to do as the current relationships are constrained. \footnote{The Collins-North reports implies that they work together for the benefit of all.}

There are genuine philosophical differences of opinion between professionals and with the local officials about the work and nature of the convention and visitor’s bureau, chamber and economic development business. Some people passionately believe a consolidation makes sense and is a clear choice, while others with the same passion believe that the nature of the work is so distinctive that a consolidation compromises one or more of the entities. There is no clear right or wrong in this issue. \footnote{The list is not exhaustive, nor prejudiced in favor of any business, rather these are the common businesses that are used to support the point.}

The consolidation of the CVB, Chamber and EDC is truly a local policy decision. Although other structures exist that are often referred to and used to support a particular position. It must be assumed that structures of other entities are designed to fit their unique needs and policy pursuits. This study in both time and budget did not include a benchmarking comparison or an analysis of the pros and cons of other organizational structures (this certainly can be completed in-house). The greater Kansas City, Kansas community is unique and distinct in the state of Kansas and in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area. One interviewee stated it best: “What works in one destination will not always be as successful in another destination. A successful CVB will be measured, governed and operated to reflect that destination.”

There is common belief across all three entities that the completion of the Kansas Speedway, Village West, The Legends, Schlitterbahn, Hollywood Casino “and the adoption of the downtown plan” have positioned Wyandotte County-Kansas City, Kansas “as an emerging national destination.” By all measures, everyone agrees that KC KC is a major tourism destination that is continuing to develop. However, there is not a common vision, strategy or direction on how to continue, maintain and ensure that KC KC remains an emerging national destination. There is not a common belief on how to sustain and grow the destination. For example, the CVB “believes it is their responsibility to sell the destination, not any one specific attraction, although all attractions will benefit through CVB marketing.”

The LG suggests each entity through a financial commitment as follows: CVB with a contract for the use of the transient guest tax, the Chamber through an annual membership and the EDC through an annual donation.\footnote{The current LG contract expires on December 31, 2014, any change must come with 12 months notice of intent to terminate.}
The EDC is a non-profit economic development corporation that has been active since 1992. The EDC is an investor-driven organization funded by public contributions, investor dues and private sector sponsorships. Over one-half of the funding comes from the Board of Public Utilities and the UG. Promotional information identifies four distinct benefits of becoming an investor in the EDC: 1) Access to Information, 2) Prestige and Recognition, 3) Collaborative Partnerships, and 4) Networking. The EDC consists of three staff members with a consultant on contract. Presently the EDC and Chamber share an Executive Director and the two entities are partnering on operations such as finance and reception.14

The Chamber is housed in a renovated “21” Minnesota Building. The EDC is co-located in the same building and there is additional space available for build-out or office space arrangement. The co-location is more than just a shared office space arrangement as the two entities are working on a “progressive partnership” to offer “high value programs, events and services for investors and members.” Specific areas mentioned that are direct results of collaboration include: “increased involvement with the legislative committee, workforce development committee and the K-12 Career committee...which would not have otherwise occurred.”15 Synergies that presently exist between the Chamber and EDC include having the “same, health insurance carrier, small provider, external marketing agency, supply ordering, and handling of events and programs.” The existing strong relationship between the EDC and Chamber and the CVB is part of the challenge as two of the entities are already very well connected in practice, operations and cultures, while the CVB is clearly distinct and stand alone.

14 The scope of sharing the Executive Director is a function of any decision made by the UG in consolidation.
15 Minutes from April 29, 2014 Board meeting.
The three entities are all relatively the same size. Each has a small number of staff. The Chamber and EDC share various administrative functions such as reception duties, and financial work. Excluding contract personnel, the staff positions held in each entity are:

- CVB: Executive Director, Meetings, Group and Events Manager, Marketing & Communications Manager and Marketing Assistant & Visitor Services.
- Chamber: President, Director of Finance, Director of Marketing & Communications, Director of Membership & Sales, First Impressions Coordinator.
- EDC: President, Executive Assistant/Investor Relations, Business Retention & Expansion Director.  

Recent turnover in the Chamber and EDC staff has caused some level of nervousness and getting to know each other between the three entities. One interviewee, an active participant in all three entities, defined their differences in a uniquely personal manner noted:

- The Chamber supports business to business relationships including the business climate (legislation for example);
- The EDC helps me to grow my business although they are focused more typically on larger businesses; and
- The CVB helps bring business to my business, especially from people who are not expected.

The benefits to consolidation as contained in the October 30, 2014 public testimony and the summary of the interviews including material from the “All the Reasons WV” brochure include: seeking and finding new opportunities, gaining operational efficiencies, enhancing performance and programming, presenting a new, dynamic and cohesive brand, coordinating membership sponsorship activities, and coordinating marketing efforts.

The opposition to the consolidation as contained in numerous letters, memos and emails on the record suggested CVB independence in order to: retain the spirit of identity, minimize the loss of their efficienciees, retain the contract transient guest tax returns, avoid the loss of marketing, prestige and influence, and continue with the existing success of the organization. The CVB Board “noted that it is not in the best interest of fulfilling the CVB mission or for growing tourism in KC.” The Board believes that KCK is “leading tourism destination in Kansas and in the KC metro.”

The consolidation proposal was perceived as a “takeover” of the CVB — this is a major point of disagreement and contention. This point of disagreement was prominent in all testimony. Partisans are strong in support of intentions. Whether or not it is true, or an absolute misread of motivation, the fact is that the proposal — as it currently is on the table — will not be viewed by any different by the CVB than two entities attempt to take them over. Facts or perception this is a reality.

Quite possibly the most notable finding and the main driver of the dispute in the consolidation proposal is the difference of opinion that exist on the work of the Chamber and the CVB. These are distinct differences in thought and philosophy on the perceived value and success (or lack

---

16 The actual information may be different; this was the staff positions in January, 2012.
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• The benefits to consolidation as contained in the October 30, 2014 public testimony and the summary of the interviews including material from the “All the Reasons WV” brochure include: seeking and finding new opportunities, gaining operational efficiencies, enhancing performance and programming, presenting a new, dynamic and cohesive brand, coordinating membership sponsorship activities, and coordinating marketing efforts.

• The opposition to the consolidation as contained in numerous letters, memos and emails on the record suggested CVB independence in order to: retain the spirit of identity, minimize the loss of their effectiveness, retain the constant transient guest tax revenues, avoid the loss of marketing, prestige and influence, and continue with the existing success of the organization. The CVB Board “noted that it is not in the best interest of fulfilling the CVB mission or for growing tourism in KC.” The Board believes that KC is “leading tourism destination in Kansas and in the KC metro.”

• The consolidation proposal was perceived as a “takeover” of the CVB – this is a major point of disagreement and contention. This point of disagreement was prominent in all testimony. Passionate in support of intentions. Whether or not it is true, or an absolute misread of motivation, the fact is that the proposal – as it presently is on the table – will not be viewed by any different by the CVB than two entities attempt to take them over. Fact or perception this is a reality.

• Quite possibly the most notable finding and the main driver of the dispute in the consolidation proposal is the difference of opinion that exist on the work of the Chamber and the CVB. There are distinct differences in thought and philosophy on the perceived value and success (or lack

16 The actual information may be different: this was the staff positions in January, 2012.
The CVB is really a VLB as they do not bring conventions to the City.

The CVB has done nothing for us.

The CVB promotion materials are outdated and ineffective.

The CVB leaves out a major tourism source in the business traveler.

The Chamber is losing members and its financial position is weak, thus it is losing its attractiveness.

The Chamber is only doing this for the money, they have no other interests.

The Chamber is out of money and is looking to use future resources from the state bond district. The timing of this consolidation is not coincidental.

Consolidation is an effort to shore up a revenue shortfall by the Chamber and WVEDC. The only way it works, is if they use CVB (transient guest tax) dollars to make up their shortfall. Chamber Foundation is going away. Chamber and WVEDC need money. They see the CVB as the “Bank of the CVB.”

Testimony suggested that a consolidation of entities would compromise the transient guest tax funding, place the collection of the tax in jeopardy, and potentially violate the law. This point can only be true if there is an inherent assumption of violation of law by the pure act of consolidation. This testimony is not strong as there are clear accountabilities and methods to track and account for funds that need to be dedicated and agents only on certain functions. The perception that this could happen was a standard bearer of concern, the reality can and could be much different. Simply, the author cannot conceive of a scenario where the CVB would violate the law and in all likelihood can make representations to guard against this notion. The importance of this point rests with the fact that the CVB testimony was based on the perception that the consolidation is based on the Chamber’s desire to access the future state bond dollars.

There is disagreement over whether or not the consolidation of the three entities will actually result in operational efficiencies or savings. A preliminary spreadsheet was prepared that showed a potential savings but was not authenticated by the CVB. Testimony from CVB staff and Board members doubted the veracity of the savings and whether or not any was possible. The CVB stated, “There are no cost savings in a consolidated structure. In fact, the CVB will spend more than it currently does for operating costs.” Detailed discussions are needed to work through ideas and options, but the study author believes that in fact that there could be possible operational efficiencies and savings as there are common areas of overhead and similar program areas including marketing.

One of the main objections to consolidation referred to in written testimony was succinctly stated by this letter writer, “I am greatly concerned about this proposal as I see it
taking a major step backwards for tourism in KCK and again make the dollars that are earmarked for tourism promotion, be once again diluted to support other community organizations.” Common testimony was that the consolidation would be a financial detriment to the CVB. It is ironic that the proposal authors are defiant in opposition to this motive and it does not appear that any policy of the UG would support this either. The report has been said before enough that would make sense to do all that can be done to avoid this outcome in a consolidation under policy position of the UG.

- The study author sought examples of how tourism is negatively impacted within a consolidation by taking an organized CVB professional who wrote a letter for the October Commission hearing to provide specific information on why and how this occurs. In a professional and sincere response, the letter writer noted, “it is very difficult to find anything but anecdotal evidence to support my statements because once a consolidation occurs, most if not all cities do not want to pay for an official follow-up study months or years down the road to see if their decision was prudent or not.” Written and personal testimony is consistently in support of the concern that the CVB is “compromised” in a consolidation. Time and resources do not allow for deeper research, but this response is an indication that perception can be a prominent factor in one’s belief.

- An oft repeated concern about consolidation is the compromise of staff resources dedicated to tourism and marketing. One letter writer noted aptly, “Having a dedicated staff that understands the tourism industry focused on enhancing Kansas City, KS as a destination of choice will keep your position strong and moving forward to grow your entire market share.” It would be beneficial and certainly appropriate to consider how staff resources will be assigned and dedicated in any new structure – not just to the CVB, but also to the Chamber and EDC. Two of the three organizations are engaged in marketing and the case could also be made – especially with good motives – that in fact tourism and marketing will gain in a consolidation. Since the original proposal was not detailed enough, it was unclear on this point and subsequently criticized for it.

- The CVB in their written record encouraged the Chamber and EDC to work with them to pursue collaborative efforts and outcomes. According to testimony, these invitations were not accepted and testimony from members of the Board was clear that their preference is to pursue collaboration.

- Process in a voluntary consolidation is essential. In a perceived or forced consolidation process, transitional problems and lingering hard feelings from the process and action are a short term policy and operational challenge. In the public sector they need to be managed and addressed. If unresolved, these lingering issues can build resentment, create dysfunction and impact the mission and work of the combined agency.

- A review of the meeting minutes did not answer the question of “Why now?” The CVB believes the timing is related to increasing future monies and the testimony from Chamber and EDC officials noted the timing is right to prepare a “forward looking plan” and pursue the benefits and opportunities a consolidation brings. It is reasonable to conclude that if you are for consolidation
the timing is right, if you are against consolidation, as a matter of principle and policy, then the
timing may never be right.

- Finally, it is evident to the study author that the parties to the consolidation are “structure tired”. Many of the same leaders and staff were present in Collins Notes process from 2008 through 2010. Within the sphere of organizational design, the public agencies five years is not very long. There is clear dissonance — on all sides — including heightened anxiety over the proposal.
Financial Analysis was really a summary and an aggregation of the information presented to us in budgets in 2014 and 2015. I’ll go to the last page to the financial consideration because it just pointed out what our stock in long-term of cost savings. What we tried to show here, we took the data that was provided by the three entities and we presented at the Chamber, EDC, and CVB and you can just see in the report the revenues where there from and the expenses and where they
go. We thought this would help you understand the make-up of each of the two. We did it for 2014 and we did it for 2015.
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Consolidated Financials. This is using the base document that was provided to us. It’s this document. We used this particular piece that was presented as a possibility or a proposal for consideration and the CVB did not endorse it so we can’t use it as authentic or authenticated because they didn’t support it or didn’t contribute toward. We’re using it as supastition or we’re using it as possibility or potential. Just present what was put out there. The net savings based on changes in revenue and changes in expenditures was proposed by the proposers up to $233,000. In all likelihood it would be something around there in between or less than that.
The question of what level of cost savings would be the Unified Government, what is material consideration for you. The transient guest tax money you contract. You always will to someone in all likelihood. The Chamber dues are $6,000. It’s money, it’s taxpayers money but it’s a small amount of money for Chamber dues and the amount of money you contribute to the EDC went up recently to $200,000. What is material consideration to you for consolidation proposal that you’d like to see that would be a net difference to make it worthwhile. That’s a question.
Best Practices and Organizational Design. I won’t go through these. These are offered to suggest that if you want to evaluate this consolidation proposal without the foundation upon economic development, then another option is look at what best practices are and you can compare and contrast this proposal to certain best practices. You have really three sections here on this page. What we will we accomplish? Some things to think about and some things to avoid and reasons why.
Policy Options. Briefly, I just want to walk through those. In the end it’s just Study Author Observations. I’ll make a couple comments for both of those and I’ll stand for questions and discussion.

Option 1. Do not consolidate. That’s Option 1A – Take no action. That means just let the course of the community go forward. It doesn’t mean that I don’t think it means that you do nothing literally. I think that you have some communication or you have some leverage of some
type financially and otherwise to say to these organizations the present relationships aren’t as
strong as we need to be and so we need to do something about that.

Secondly, in this option I think it would be a good idea to go back to the original policy
questions and say what is our opinion about these. What is our perspective about these basic
questions about economic development and in over the course of the few months or over the
course of the year, then in fact you could address those are maybe come up with some answers.

Option 1B. Develop a strong collaborative model. Now clear and testimony some of the
people that I interviewed said it won’t work because it hasn’t worked to date and people believe
that. My suggestion, I still think it’s a very viable model, why won’t it work. I went back and
looked at some of the mission statements of the EDC, if you look at the mission statement of the
EDC is to work with partners so you go right back to the core elements of what they do.
Everybody knows in order for this community to retain, maintain, and succeed successfully in an
international competition we need these three entities to be working at high altitude and high
optimal partnerships. The Unified Government would be able to through leverage, through your
authority, through your financial contributions to say listen, we’ll give you two months, three
months, four months, five months, six months, come back to us and let’s look at how we do our
marketing, how we do our administration, how we do our programming and come back with a
plan and present it to us at one of these board meetings and let’s see how it’s done.

Option 2. Call for consolidation. There is really two. Option 2A, support the proposal on
the table. A lot of work has been done already. People behind me have vested a lot of time and
energy in that proposal. Obviously it’s been challenged, it’s got some issues. One of the things
it doesn’t have to no one’s credit or blame is details. That’s one of the reasons why it was
subjective to so much criticism because it was largely conceptual because the details weren’t
worked out yet, they needed to be done. You have that foundation, the benefits are already there,
the benefits are going to be there in A or B in this particular option so let’s just move forward
with what we have on the table. I would suggest, as you see in this paper, that the Unified
Government would want to weigh in on some of those questions and criticisms that have been
raised or some of the fears and concerns because you want to do something about those or avoid
those from happening.

Finally, Option 2B, introduce a new consolidation process. The reality is you don’t
entirely start over because you’ve already started talking about what the benefits are. You have
an image and if I may, because you have an image, and that image is what people believe it is so
start over. If you believe that it doesn’t matter what one of the three entities believes whether it’s
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the Chamber, CVB, or the EDC, it happens to be the CVB here; it doesn’t matter what one of
three think or even two of three think. If consolidating is the right idea, then go forward and do
it and in a few years or five years or ten years, it will just be history. If you believe that in a
voluntary consolidation with some uncertain strategy and uncertain vision and no crisis or
emergency that all three entities need to be on an equal playing field but you want to consolidate,
then start over. Then introduce a new consolidation idea and have the Unified Government
vested in it through your resources and through your people and through your Commission to be
part of it, to lead it. In addition to that and finally on this particular option, and I say this at the
bottom, I said don’t let past practice dictate future performance. Those that have experienced or
those that are critical of it or those that are judging it in advance of it happening are saying this is
what’s going to happen if the CVB loses it’s interest, the marketing goes away, the Chamber
membership becomes the most important thing. All of those historical or perceptions get out
ahead of them and present a consolidation proposal that avoids that outcome.
Study Author Observations

The following supporting points are provided to share the study author observations based on the research, analysis and evaluation.

- Can a business case be made to combine one or more of these agencies; yes to a degree, but at what price? The consolidation proposal on the table is laden with strong personalities, perceptions, worries and very different opinions.

- Can a consolidation happen under the right circumstances? Yes. Is there an “overwhelming compelling” reason? In a practical sense, likely not. The UG would not need to fully answer that question if the consolidation was voluntary because all parties would be equal participants. That is not the case today.

- The question of financial and operational savings is not resolved, nor is there consensus. The entities do not agree on the financial impact and potential for savings. More work is needed in this area. Given that the agencies are small and do have administrative responsibilities and overlapping programmatic areas, it is fair to conclude that there can be savings from a consolidation.

- The UG is put in a position to pick and choose from options that lack consensus. Given the political dynamics, the UG may want to pause to restate or establish your vision for economic development. Thus the vision then could drive the structure question. In the meantime pursuing a new collaborative model is more than status quo or doing nothing.

- The marketplace of other comparable entities does not indicate that merging or consolidation is a trend or best practice in the industry. Conversations with peers indicate that KCK is not the only community that is facing these questions. Examples of other structures abound in the state and region.

- Given the set of facts and findings, collaboration seems like the best next step. Input from the City of Overland Park CVB noted, the City, Chamber and CVB conducted a highly collaborative joint branding study as a result, began sharing a unified tagline and creative branding, all three remain separate while collaborating. It is absolutely possible to collaborate and still succeed while operating independently.

- The original consolidation proposal highlighted that “strategy and coordination” between the three entities is lacking. Although there are degrees of difference on this point, there is a consensus that more can be done in these two areas. The main question is how? There is disagreement over whether the three entities can increase their collaboration. One interviewee noted that the “best reason why collaboration won’t work is because it hasn’t to date.” Is this an acceptable position? Does the UG agree with this observation? Isn’t an increase in collaboration a fundamental responsibility of all three entities? Can the UG leverage its initial energy and time, including its financial and political authority to bridge the gap or facilitate improvements in the relationships between the agencies?
Study Author Observations. I have just a page and a quarter of those. I’ll just talk about the one and I can go through any one of them but just to be in sync. The fourth one that’s shown up on this. The Unified Government is put in a position to pick and choose from options that lack consensus. Again, depending upon your position, it may or may not matter but it’s a fact. Given the political dynamics and the positions the Unified Government may want to pause to reset or establish your vision for economic development, thus the vision could drive the structure question. In the meantime pursuing a new collaborative model is more than status quo or doing
nothing. At the end of the day it certainly seems to me that you have vital options to move forward and things you could do short of consolidation or if you do want to pursue consolidation, you also have the option that doesn’t necessarily endorse the proposal on October 30, 2014 but it may introduce a new idea. Mayor, members of the Commission, thank you I’ll stand for questions or discussion.

**Mayor Holland** said thank you. What I’d like to do is, my suggestion is we go ahead and hear from the three other entities and then I’ll open it up for the Commission for questions and discussion. I decided we would go in alphabetical order and I think Chamber comes before Convention, so Chambers first, Convention, and W’s are at the end so WYDEC will go last. So Chamber, CVB, then WYDEC.

**Greg Cotton, Chief of Staff and General Counsel for Sporting Kansas City**, said I stand in front of you today as the Chairman of the Greater Kansas City Kansas Area Chamber of Commerce. I’d like to recognize a few of my board members here today, Todd LaSala from Stinson Leonard Street; Craig Gaffney from Country Club Bank, Rachel Merlo, Google, Pat Warren, Speedway; and Nolan Dees from our staff. Thank you all very much for being here.

I think when we first read this report the first word that came to my mind, quite honestly, was historic. The reason I say that is when I’m thinking, if I’m looking back 18 years ago when this community came together and unified around a county and a city government to do something incredibly unique in this community, you have the exact same opportunity to do that right now with three very strong civic organizations all of which are financially viable and solvent and yes, that does include the Chamber despite what you hear. Under the leadership of Greg Kindle at the EDC over the past 18 months to 20 months, the Chamber has is in a very financially viable situation. We do not need this money to operate as a Chamber of Commerce. In fact, we couldn’t use this money as you know statutorily, we couldn’t use the money. Reading the report there is a lot of redundant information in there. I think the thing that shown through to me and my fellow board members was passion. There are a lot of us that are willing to do a lot of hard work right now for you and for this community. We want to present to you and we want to present to the rest of Kansas City, the rest of the state of Kansas, the rest of this country and internationally a strong, united, efficient, thoughtful, marketing arm for this community. We want to work for you, we want to be your marketing arm and we want to be your evangelist. Two years ago when we tried to reimagine what this Chamber could be, we
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realized that we couldn’t do this alone. There were organizations within the community, civic organizations, that were doing it better than the Chamber, just to be brutally honest. The EDC is the greatest example of that. Incredibly well run organization, great leadership, and quite frankly two and half years ago we didn’t have that at the Chamber. We took some very difficult steps and we moved forward with this proposal to you in order to do something that we believe is going to be important for this community moving forward. I don’t want to take too much of your time. You’ve read this report, you’ve heard from us, you’ve heard our passion, our 600 plus members that represent the best and brightest of this community and across Kansas City, those doing business in this community but we believe it’s time to go big or go home. This counsel today if they have the ability, the courage, the conviction, to do something like happened 19, 18, years ago in this community, give us the opportunity and we won’t let you down. All you have to do to understand what we’re likely to do, what we’re able to do as a unified entity and hopefully all of you were at the Chamber annual meeting the other day. I see a lot of you were. The collateral materials that were produced there, the videos that were produced there, the pride, the passion, the joy that was in that room celebrating our community was outstanding and that’s what you’re going to get with a unified entity. I would ask you to give us that chance to do that.

Bridgette Jobe, Executive Director of the Kansas City, Kansas Convention & Visitor’s Bureau, said I am speaking on behalf of the Kansas City, Kansas Convention & Visitor’s Bureau Board of Directors. The CVB Board of Directors believe that the current structure of the CVB as an independent, seniorally focused, professional marketing entity, with it’s strong board leadership, provides the best impact for Kansas City, Kansas. We also believe that there is great opportunity for collaboration and synergy between the CVB, the Chamber, and Wyandotte EDC. Collaboration that is not currently happening. It is a challenge, I will be honest, to collaborate with organizations that for the last year and a half have mounted efforts to discredit us and in their own words take away our funding. Throughout the consolidation talks process the CVB has offered collaborative ideas to the Chamber and EDC in two separate letters and in various meetings. To date we have not received a response. Since the formation of the CVB in 2010 we’ve held a seat on our board for the Chamber Chair or their designee. We have suggested that the directors or presidents of each of the three organizations begin meeting on a regular basis to discuss projects, marketing efforts, and future plans. The CVB board included $12,500 in our 2015 budget to help pioneer a joint branding effort. We believe these ideas are just scratching
the surface, but it shows we are ready and willing to start the dialogue. There was a comment made on page 22 of the study that said the best reason why collaboration won’t work is because it hasn’t to date, and I’m going to be honest, we don’t get that way of thinking. If that attitude and that belief was one that this Commission held, then the majority of the recent development and growth that has taken place in our city would have never happened. This CVB Board made a conscious decision through this process to not tear down or discredit the work of the Chamber and the EDC. We believe both of those organizations are vital components to the business and economic growth of our community. We purposely did not attempt to discredit their performance or their materials. We want them to be successful. There have been comments throughout this process about the underpinning of motives for the separation in 2010 when the UG Commission chose to make a change and set up the CVB as an independent entity. I am going to respond to that because it is personal. When that change happened, yes, there were awkward times, change is hard. The awkward times came as a result of the separation not caused the separation. That is a very important distinction and one that has been misrepresented. Those of us involved in that process during and after the change continued to work together, we acted professional towards each other, we served on boards and committees and most importantly we collaborated on several projects.

On page 19 of the study consolidated financials were presented. Those financials were created by the entities who support consolidation. Those were not numbers from the CVB. We strongly question their validity and we believe any savings of a consolidated organization is minimal and very likely could be detrimental to the mission and outcomes of the CVB.

There is mention in this report of strong personalities and yes, that is correct. There are some strong personalities on this CVB. I am one of them and I know there are others on this board but with those strong personalities comes passion, commitment, experience, tourism knowledge, and a solid belief in the work of the CVB and the value that it brings to this community. This CVB took a stand on consolidation, we took an unpopular stand. We could have taken the easy way out and vowed to smooth talk and intimidation. We took the hard road. We stood up for what we believe is best for the long-term growth of this community and that is what you as a Commission want. You want a strong Chamber voice, a strong EDC voice, and a strong CVB voice. Sometimes we will fall on different sides of the issue and that is good. With three strong entities you will hear all sides and all points of view and that is how good decisions are made. If you chose to consolidate, you will hear one voice and we wonder who’s voice that will be. We understand the real issue is transit guest tax. If it was about collaboration
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and synergy, we would have proposed consolidating with every other organization in this community that works with economic development or community development, that’s not the case here, the interest here is our funding source.

**Margaret Bowker, JE Dunn Construction,** said I currently serve on the Executive Board and as past president of the Wyandotte EDC. Tonight we have with us our president, Greg Kindle, who many of you know, and we have several of our members here in the audience today including Kansas Speedway, County Club Bank and others. Consolidation is something that came about a couple of years ago. As you know it’s been extremely difficult to operate in a business environment in the last five years. A lot of our companies in the audience, a lot of the companies that you represent have been forced to practice more efficiently and adhere to lead in principals when structuring their organizations. As such, over the past two years we noticed a lot of inefficiencies that may have been occurring between the three organizations, redundant positions, redundant missions, and a lot of redundancy amongst the three entities. With that we thought would we be stronger as one organization. Would we be stronger to our membership who are members of all three organizations or at least two and they have board members on the CVB. That’s where we began studying the Chamber, the Wyandotte EDC and looking to the CVB. With that, our intentions were strong, they were good, it’s how do we leverage our community to take full advantage of the opportunities that are presented to us in both the business environment and in the Convention &Visitor’s Bureau. We all benefit with stronger hotels, we all benefit with stronger businesses that are coming into the community and businesses that are growing and we all benefit from an economic environment that supports and grows our businesses. With that our board does support consolidation. We hope that you will too.

**Mayor Holland** said to give a little structure to tonight there are a lot of colorful phrases that describe this, but I will chose it’s time to fish or cut bait. We are going to entertain a motion and then we’ll vote it up or down. We’ve seen the options that have been presented either don’t consolidate or do consolidate. If we choose one of those, we have some options within them that we can talk through. That’s where we stand.

The other piece is talking to our Legal team. We don’t have actually the authority to tell these three independent organizations you must consolidate. That’s not within our pervue. The Chamber of Commerce is independent. We do provide funding for the other two. We provide
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about the vast majority of the funding for the CVB and we provide about half the funding for the Wyandotte Economic Development.

What we can do, we can direct our County Administrator as part of the 2016 budget to combine UG funding and direct it to a single entity which we believe can best perform the various functions of the three together. Those functions will be driven by our relationship to EDC and the CVB. If the Chamber of Commerce chooses to join, that would be their decision, but in terms of the ones that we have financial ownership in, then it would be us choosing to direct our funding between the two. That’s our task tonight.

I’ll lead off tonight. I just want to say a few things. I think these are three great organizations with great people in them. I can assure you on the campaign trail as Mayor, consolidation of these three entities was not something that had ever crossed my mind or something that I had considered. This was a proposal that was brought to this Commission by two of the three organizations that they saw an opportunity. That’s why we’re here today. It was the initiative of the boards of these groups looking around feeling like they could do something new. I will say I have listened to all the arguments. I have not relished the challenge of this decision. I would say at the end of the day I would support supporting one organization rather than two. I say two because, again, the Chamber is independent. If it wanted to join that would be the decision of that board. I believe our economic development and our Convention and Visitor’s Bureau could function better together. I’ll give these reasons. Cost savings are not necessarily the driving force for me. It’s not as though we have $900,000 in these and we need to pull back x amount of dollars and so, therefore, we need a consolidated function to save money. My hope is that we would continue to invest fully as we are in both organizations and that any cost savings though centralizing operations and redundancies would be driven back into more marketing and would be driven back into more economic development, not less. I’m not interested in an opportunity to take money away from these functions but actually to leverage more. I think there are some redundancies with event planning, administration, and marketing that could be done better.

I also think there is a huge interplay, synergy if you will, between tourism and economic development. We did economic development to bring tourism, tourism brings economic development. It’s two sides of the same coin. I think they are critically important to one another and I think that leveraging the opportunities, the project we just approved tonight from US Soccer, for me; my interest in US Soccer is not a ton of jobs that are coming to our community but it’s opportunity to bring additional tourism to our tourist industry. When I think of an
economic development and a willingness to spend money as the Unified Government is driven by the idea that I want additional tourists. Sly James has a phrase that he uses often, OPM, Other People’s Money. The more other people’s money that we bring to our community that continues to drive economic development. For me there is a strong innerplay between those two that I believe could perhaps be done stronger. I do think there are possibilities for collaboration. I just know collaboration with multiple entities is harder in my mind than it is for the single entity and so that’s where my view is coming from.

Finally, my biggest issue is an issue of branding and image for Kansas City, Kansas/Wyandotte County. I want a unified brand, a unified vision, a unified message about who we are and what we are. I believe the marketing money we spend on that translates easily to business attraction and business retention and it translates to tourism. Obviously, you have to nuance, the different aspects of it, to specifically target. Targeting a company to come build manufacturing is a different group than targeting Mom’s to bring their families here to spend the weekend. At the same time the materials that we develop can be used for both because at the end of the day if a business is coming here, they want to come to a community that has amenities for the families as well. I will say in addition to all the tourist we have out in Kansas City, Kansas the people in Wyandotte County often get to take advantage of those as well.

My last piece on this imaging and branding and cooperation. As I’ve talked to people around the metro area Kansas City, Missouri has three big organizations. They have a Convention/Visitor’s Organization, they have the Greater Kansas City Economic Development Area/KCADC, and they have the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce. All three of these are big and they’re all high functioning, they’re all doing fine, they all three have a different brand, they all three have a different image, and if you ask people for all the success their having, a lot of this success is independent, it’s not necessarily coordinated with one another. Then the city of Kansas City, Missouri has it’s fourth brand. You may have seen that they rolled out a new brand logo for Kansas City that is the city’s logo. You have the city, you have the CVB, you have the Economic Development, you have the Chamber all with their own branding. I don’t think that’s a good idea. I think we could unify our branding as a city, market ourselves better and do it. I do agree. I don’t think there’s any emergency. I don’t think the groups are doing badly. If they were doing badly presumably they would have already from us because we have members on the boards. I think it’s an opportunity that was brought to our attention by two groups that I just happen to agree with. I think if we’re going to do it, the time is now. If we’re not going to do it, let’s vote tonight and move on with our life. I think we’ve given this a due

April 9, 2015
hearing. I think we’ve heard from everybody and I think it is time to make a decision and to be ready to move forward. I present that. I will open it up for other commissioners who would like to speak at this time.

Commissioner McKiernan said this certainly is an issue that we have spent what seems like an enormous amount of time on over the past several months. I think there is certainly a lot of passion from everyone involved. There has been a lot of hard work from everyone involved which I must appreciate. Because of the passion that was on display in October I said I’d like somebody who doesn’t have a dog in this fight to give me a third party perspective. Mr. Unmbacht, we thank you for your report and as I prepared for this meeting I read it over several times and I kept coming back to the second to the last page where you had your Study Author Observations and these are some of the observations you made that have stuck with me as I have read that page. Can a consolidation happen under the right circumstance? Yes. Is there an overwhelming compelling reason in a practical sense, likely not.

Then this finding, given the set of facts and findings collaboration seems like the next best step. It is absolutely possible to collaborate and still succeed while operating independently.

Then this finding, the UG may want to pause to reset or establish your vision for economic development. I would suggest it’s broader than economic development. It is all of these other things that the Mayor has just said as well. Thus, the vision could then drive the structure question. In the meantime, pursuing a new collaborative model is more than status quo or doing nothing.

Finally, this one caught my eye. The marketplace of other comparable entities does not indicate that merging or consolidation is a trend or best practice for the industry.

As I am here today, I have to say that I am leaning toward what I believe you had as your Option 1B. I don’t believe we’ve been as clear as we could be on our directions that we give to these three organizations about what we want to accomplish and how we would like to accomplish that. I don’t think that we are leveraging our $900,000 investment as well as we probably could. This is not in the form of any sort of a motion. I’m just sharing what I’m thinking right now today is that the collaboration model and all this does, I understand, is it kicks this can down the road for another year and we have to keep thinking about this and ultimately its going to force us to make some sort of a decision more than I would suggest we make tonight. What if we pursued the collaboration model, we’ve heard, oh yes we can collaborate, well put up
or shut up. Let me see some evidence of this ability we have to collaborate. If we give clear and specific instruction and vision, let’s make it happen.

What if we did this, what if we maintained the funding as it is for the remainder of the current contract with the CVB. I understand we’d have to rescind our termination letter for the end of 2015 but what if we did that? What if we followed Mr. Unmacht’s suggestion and sharpened our focus as to what we expect and what if we established and communicated objective measures to each of the three organizations that we believe would demonstrate collaboration is happening and that would be collaborative branding, collaborative marketing, collaborative promotion, collaborative everything. What if we asked them to identify and work cooperatively to eliminate redundancies and overlaps. They’ve identified them, can we collaborative and cooperatively eliminate them. What if we establish new matrix for measuring tourism and visitors? Frankly, I have never thought, and I’m on record as saying this, I don’t think that hotel nights by itself is the matrix on which we should say yes we’re winning or no we’re not. There are other matrixs out there I believe we could collaboratively and cooperatively need to create those matrix and ask are we doing as well as we could.

Then, having given created, having given the vision and created the objective matrix, give our Administrator effectively the charge to conduct, and here’s the can down the road please, a review at the end of 2015 or early 2016 since the existing contract ends at the end of 2016. If we haven’t made progress by then, well you know what, we’re going to collaborate and if we have made progress by then, then we made progress and maybe there is no continuing, pressing, urgent need. Those are my thoughts as I sit here tonight having spent a lot of thought/energy on this. I am leaning toward your Option 1B.

**Commissioner Kane** said I like the idea fish or cut bait and I don’t mind cutting bait. For the audience, each commissioner met with the Chamber, they came in and showed us this chart, this grandiose chart, and they were going to be in charge and they were putting a strong personality in a very awkward position which would be a hostile takeover in my mind. I like hostile. I like it where you’ve got a strong personality and people are looking at you because they want you to make a decision because what I thought we were asking you to do is say yes or no. We combine them or don’t combine them. I’m kind of disappointed that we just don’t have a flat out don’t do it or do it.

A comment was made about you didn’t have leadership two and half years ago at the Chamber. I disagree. Cindy Cash is an outstanding lady that did a really good job and for you to
make that comment you should call her and apologize. Mr. Kindle does a great job, always has. The guys gone all the time. He’s never home. I live right down the street from him. I’m not sure if you want to combine Greg and Birdgette and the Chamber and not let those personalities grow. What you’re going to do if you combine them, then they’re stuck. You’ve got three leaders and no chief. I think we operate better when we’re separated because it was said earlier that the Chamber hasn’t always been our friend when it comes to some of the things of the Unified Government and that’s a fact. You guys support stuff in Topeka that has wholeheartedly hurt this community. Don’t let anybody forget you because you done it and I can tell you what it is. Here’s the deal. I don’t think we should combine them. I think they’re fine the way they are. I think that Greg and Bridgette do a good job and obviously you’re running the show now and I don’t know you, but I do not want to consolidate them and then make the other ones that are doing a really good job not grow.

Mayor Holland said I don’t see anyone else chiming in to weigh for a __ I think just in an effort to move us down a path, because we just need a path, and we’ll vote it up or down. I just got a light.

Commissioner Philbrook said I agree with Commissioner McKiernan. There has been a lot of talk about we can collaborate so as the words would be fish or cut bait, show us. Show us if you can collaborate and it’s up to us to give you some goals to work toward to see so you know what we want from you. We have been very derelict to duty. We have really not made ourselves clear from up here as what we want you to do. It’s just as much our fault as anybody else. I’m willing to take that responsibility on. I’d love to be part of this collaboration and I’d like to see it happen because I know it can happen, it’s just you have to want it to. You have to want to work together and really make something out of this community. Everybody says they love the community and they want to make it work. Let’s see it happen. I’m along with him. I’m on Option 1B.

Mayor Holland said what I’m going to do. I’m just going to make this motion and we can vote it up or down. If no one seconds it, that will be one answer and then we’ll move on from there. We’ll make a motion. We can still talk about it. I won’t cutoff discussion.
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**Action:** Mayor Holland made a motion that we direct the County Administrator as part of the 2016 budget to combine UG funding and direct it to a single entity that can best perform the various functions currently divided between the CVB and the EDC. Motion died for lack of second.

Mayor Holland said alright we have answered one question. We have just decided we will not consolidate these two organizations and we’ve given ourselves a lot of __ Commissioner Walker said the only thing I will say that I’m not ready to consolidate these two organizations. (Inaudible not speaking in mic). I am not opposed to it. We’ve been talking about this for a year and I’ve been getting hammered from both sides, all three sides and they all contradict each other. Somebody wrote a letter and nobody contacted me and consolidation was good for the government but it’s not good for this. It ought to be evident to everyone in the room and everyone at the table is that these three groups are dysfunctional. I mean, you know dysfunctional families, well we have a dysfunctional family here. I’m all in favor of __ if it had been my job involved in this as the leader of one of these three, obviously the Chamber wouldn’t be included in that, the other two. I’ve been working my tail off trying to get together with the other people and come up with a solution that could be jointly presented to us and sold. I’m not getting the sense that there is any kumbaya between any of these people. It’s all about (inaudible) who’s going to get it and who’s money it is. I mean that’s not what we want here. We want tourism to prosper but I think tourism is a very difficult measurement to make. Hotel room does not do it for me. You have a certain number of events. Certainly, our hotel rooms are going to go up once US Soccer comes into town. That has nothing to do with the Convention & Tourism Bureau. It’s just a matter of fact that there is going to be more people from out-of-town and they’re going to stay somewhere whether we have a CVB or not. Economic Development, the same thing. I mean I don’t always know what has been brought to the table by our economic development way. I just know that if you pool these resources and work together you’re probably better off. At the same time, pooling these three groups together right now, I can’t imagine what good is going to come from it unless we define the criteria that we expect and if they don’t meet it, than we consolidate them. I think consolidation of governmental entities was a good thing and I don’t see any imperative that would suggest that it wouldn’t be good here. It’s just that under the present circumstances I don’t think it’s going to work without major changes in each others attitude towards each other. If they don’t want to sit down and collaborate a year from now, I’ll vote to consolidate them and then decide which one goes.
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Commissioner Kane asked, Commissioner McKiernan, were you trying to make a motion earlier or what were you trying to do. Commissioner McKiernan said I was as much trying to clear my own head as make a motion, but I would make a motion that we follow from the report, Option 1B. The specifics of that I don’t have clear. Option 1B is develop a stronger collaborate model but with the stipulation that if that collaboration is not evident within a certain period of time, then a consolidation is the after effect of that. A chance to demonstrate the collaboration as possible, if it’s not demonstrated, then we’re changing course is where I would go. I don’t know how to operationalize that into a motion at the moment.

Mayor Holland said If I could make a suggestion. If we are going to call for collaboration, I think what would probably be most fitting is to, and I can think about this and do this, there are several parties here who are interested in this. I can assign a group of three or four commissioners who want to come up with those criteria and outline that process and to draw it up and give that direction to the two entities that we fund in terms of what that’s going to look like. That would be a recommendation that we do. I don’t know that we need a motion not to do something because we had the motion to do something and it didn’t go anywhere so there’s no ___ Commissioner Kane said I’ll make a motion then. In 2010 all three parties came to us and said you know what, this isn’t working, we want to go and boy they had a party. They were glad to get rid of Bridgette and throw everybody to the curb and say here we are.

Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion that we do not combine the three entities.

Mayor Holland said I think that sentiment has already been expressed by the Commission because the motion to combine failed and they are already not combined so I don’t know that we need a motion to not do that. I would just make the suggestion that we form a task force of commissioners to draft this up. I don’t think we need a motion to do that unless you want a motion to do that then we can do that.

Commissioner Markley said I think there is action. The action is still there. We’re not saying we’re not going to do anything because as the study said the status quo is not what we want. We’re saying we are going to do something, it’s just not going to be combining them.
Mayor Holland asked so, Commissioner Kane, is your motion then for us to set up a task force of commissioners for collaboration. Commissioner Kane said I don’t want to do nothing. I want to leave them alone. Mayor Holland said your vote is 1A and the other is 1B. So we do need a motion. Mayor Holland said your motion is 1A, do nothing, just leave them alone. Commissioner Kane said correct. Mayor Holland said just go back to sleep. Commissioner Kane said right.

Mayor Holland asked there is a motion on the table, is there a second for 1A, to do nothing and forget all about this. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Mayor Holland said we are 0 for 2 with motions tonight. Is there a motion for 1B, which is a higher collaboration with a task force of commissioners to articulate what that would be.

Commissioner McKiernan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Philbrook, for 1B.

Commissioner Murguia said just for clarity repeat 1B again. Mr. Bach said I believe Commissioner McKiernan might have tweaked it a little bit but 1B as it’s noted in the document states “create a business model that requires the three entities to strengthen their partnership in collaborative efforts, each entity is involved in economic development, marketing, operations and other administrative functions. The CVB is on record supporting these discussions and is open to moving forward toward a more cohesive and strategic shared direction. Identify policy perimeters and request the three entities to develop a model and return to the board with their plan in an agreed upon timeframe.” Commissioner McKiernan said and I would say that the Mayor’s suggestions of a task force does follow __ what I was going to suggest was and that last sentence for me is the key sentence. Identify policy perimeters and request the three entities, now we tweaked that a little bit with task force participation, to develop a model and return to the board with their plan in an agreed upon timeframe.

Commissioner Murguia said so my questions is this, do we have the legal right to demand that they do that. The question is I thought the only decision we make is whether we’re going to fund CVB or not. What we could do is say, there’s a criteria if you want this money and this is what the criteria is, but that doesn’t have anything to do with the vote. Are we in charge of these people, these organizations, where we can tell them what to do? Mayor Holland said we are in
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charge of the money that funds these organizations and we can set criteria about how we want that money spent and yes, and if that’s not met then we have the authority to withhold the money and assign it to a group that does met the criteria. **Commissioner Murguia** said I get that. That’s why I asked the reading of the motion. The reading of the motion doesn’t say that. The reading of the motion says dictating to people, these groups, what they need to do. I think it would be clear to everybody that in this situation we are like a funder. We establish a criteria, you met the criteria, you get the money. You don’t met the criteria, you don’t get it. The question tonight is are we going __ I really don’t know what that question is to tell you the truth because what I’ve talked to Legal about and heard Legal say we don’t really have the right to do what we’re trying to do. I would need more clarity on the motion before I’m comfortable voting or I would abstain.

**Mayor Holland** said I would ask for Legal opinion. What happens with an abstention? **Jody Boeding, Chief Counsel**, said it would be counted with the majority. **Mayor Holland** said it would be counted with the majority. **Mayor Holland** said it would be counted with the majority.

**Commissioner Kane** said all we’re doing is kicking the can down the street. When it’s all said and done I’m not going to change in the next six months. I don’t think the folks out there are going to change in the next six months. Six months we’re going to be standing here and we’re going to be what do we do now? I think it’s fairly simple that it’s not working. I don’t see that it’s going to change in six months and what guidelines do we tell them what to change to because we don’t know what their jobs are. I don’t have a clue what they do. All I know is the numbers look good and this guy ain’t never home. I mean look at it. You’re standing there. How long have we been going through this? **Mayor Holland** said oh mercy at least 12 months. **Commissioner Kane** said you’re out here, it’s affecting you. So every day you get up and you go to work and you’re not sure what’s going to happen in the next couple of months. Does that make you feel like you want to go to work? Commissioners, if this was happening to you, you would not like it. We owe these people an answer and we owe them an answer tonight.

**Mayor Holland** said Commissioner Kane and I agree on that last point just in opposite directions. We have a motion and a second on the table. The motion is to approve 1B for a criteria, oh my gosh -
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Commissioner McKiernan said I withdraw my motion.

Commissioner Philbrook said I withdraw my second.

Mayor Holland said there now is no motion on the table.

Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maddox, that we leave them the way they are and let them do their job. Roll call was taken and there were eight “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Townsend, McKiernan, Maddox, Kane. Commissioner Murguia abstained. Commissioner Walker voted “No.”

COMMISSIONERS’ AGENDA
No items of business.

Mayor Holland adjourned the meeting and reconvened as the Land Bank Board of Trustees.

LAND BANK BOARD OF TRUSTEES’ AGENDA
ITEM NO. 1 – 150064…COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS
SYNOPSIS: Communication requesting consideration of the following Land Bank applications, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager. The Land Bank Advisory Board has recommended approval. On March 30, 2015, the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee, chaired by Commissioner McKiernan, voted unanimously to approve and forward to the Land Bank Board of Trustees.

Mayor Holland said everything on the Consent Agenda is from previous action.

Item A
Applications for yard extension unless noted otherwise
4140 S. Minnie St. - Rosedale Development Association, Inc., for a garden
1346 Quindaro Blvd. - Thelma Suber
1508 Quindaro Blvd. - Charles Mills
2324 N. 91st St. - Twin Oak Ventures, Inc.
1910 Vermont Ave. - ZJ Enterprises, LLC
63 S. 26th St. - Roy Brown
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3914 Sewell Ave. - Paul Johnson, Sr.
1011 Quindaro Blvd. - Demetrius Austin
2930 N. 31st St. - Wayman Browning
228 S. 21st St. - Wade Lytch
235 S. 21st St. - ZJ Enterprises, LLC

Item B
Applications for parking
1700 N. 7th St.-New Bethel Church, Inc.
1702 N. 7th St.-New Bethel Church, Inc.
1704 N. 7th.-New Bethel Church, Inc.

On March 9, 2015, the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee, chaired by Commissioner McKiernan, voted unanimously to approve and forward to the Land Bank Board of Trustees. On March 26, 2015 the full commission held this item over until April 9, 2015.
Action: Commissioner McKiernan made a motion to approve all items on the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Kane.

A woman in the audience asked to withdraw Item B. Mayor Holland said I will accept Commissioner Kane’s second. Mayor Holland said Item B will be withdrawn.

Roll call was taken and there were nine Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Walker, Townsend, McKiernan, Murguia, Maddox, Kane.

Mayor Holland said that brings us to the items that have been removed, Item B. I would ask for Mr. Slaughter to come forward to make presentation. After his presentation I will open up the public hearing and following that I will take commission questions.

Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager, said we were asked two weeks ago to hold off three applications for New Bethel Church. Those addresses are 1700, 1702, and 1704 N. 7th St. They were brought before the standing committee back in March. They were unanimously approved. That’s why they were on the Consent Agenda tonight. I understand there are groups here for and against these applications. I’m for letting them speak and give their thoughts on this and I’ll be available for questions.

Mayor Holland asked do you have a map available. Mr. Slaughter said yes.
Mr. Slaughter said a brief description of the map. You can see 7th Street on the east, New Jersey on the south, Walker on the north. The green shaded properties there are the three land banks in question. Everything else other than on the far left bottom is owned by the church. The Land Bank’s position is that they already control, I would estimate way over to close 85% of that total block. We feel that having this property with the church would complete what they want to do for their plans. Mayor Holland said and this was approved by the Advisory Board. Mr. Slaughter said yes. Mayor Holland said and approved unanimously by the standing committee. Mr. Slaughter said correct.

Mayor Holland said this is the piece in question. I will begin a public hearing by asking for if there is any one in favor of this Land Bank Application moving forward to please come forward at this time.
**Pastor A. Glenn Brady** said I serve as the Pastor of the New Bethel Church. I have been here since 2009. At that time we acquired the property that is presently being shown. We’ve had tremendous growth in our membership. When I first came here we had approximately 50 some members. I come from Ohio and we can say that over these past five years I’ve been here our membership has grown to over 850 members and still growing. We are also very involved in the community. Commissioner Maddox has even had an event for the community in our church. Dr. Lane and the recent Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools had a forum there. We’ve done a number of things in part of the Riverwalk position that we’re doing now, Jersey Creek. We’ve also collaborated with a number of health issues so we’re very much involved. As you can see we have already presented to the Mayor and to the Planning Commission the design for a new church that will bring in several million dollars of development in this part of the corridor of 7th Street. These last three lots are the last remaining lots that we need to complete what we need for our design. My concern is, and I don’t know why the objection, these three lots have stayed vacant over a decade. Nothing has been done, no usage. Now we’re saying that we can take that property and finally put it to good use. We’re not asking for an adult store, or a Payday Loan, or liquor store, we’re asking for it to be a house of worship. I would think that anything that would enhance a neighborhood when you bring millions of dollars of private money to have a house of worship that will be a stabilizing force for the neighborhood, I think that it’s worthy. We’re not asking for any other monies as many of these of come tonight. We’re just asking for those three lots that have lied vacant for over a decade to be given to us. We’ve already done work with the zoning, the planning, and we’re waiting for it so we can move forward. We’ve already invested upwards to $55,000 engineering fees, architectural fees, and once we have this we can go back and finalize all of our plans so I certainly hope that you’ll be willing to do that. We’ve got other board members here are represented. I just trust that you’ll grant us this option that we can move forward. I think it will be an asset to Kansas City, especially to this area.

No one else appeared in favor.

**Mayor Holland** asked if there is anyone in opposition to this to please step forward at this time.

**Beverly Easterwood, Vice President of the Douglas/Sumner Neighborhood Association**, as indicated by my orange t-shirt. We talked about plans tonight. We talked about the plan for the soccer stadium, we talked about the plans for the Healthy Campus, and there is a plan also that
Douglas/Sumner participated in with numerous that took considerable time, effort, and money to develop. Ms. Lee made sure that all of you had copies of the development plan because about a year ago there was another issue about some Land Bank lots that were being requested and we had a meeting at the LISC office with Chris Slaughter, Donny Smith from the CHWC, Angela Elie who was our LISC representative, Mrs. Lee, and myself. We thought we came away with some conclusions that were going to be implemented. The main thing was that when we left that meeting we were going to be provided with a map that had all the Land Bank lots identified. With that map the Douglas/Sumner leadership would identify those lots that we thought might not be important to development for us going forward, you know for side lots like some of the ones on the Consent Agenda that may not be important to our future development. We never received that map. We were also told that all of the lots in the Douglas/Sumner area would be reserved and anyone that would request use of one of those lots would have to come forward with a development plan and also be given some kind of timeframe under which they had to implement their plan. We had no knowledge of the churches plan. We have always invited them to our meetings. One of the representatives from the church used to attend some of our meetings but there has been a disconnect between the communication. In short, it’s not so much we’re opposing the church, we’re just asking for some communication for some knowledge of plans that are being proposed that may involve the use of the Land Bank lots and let us communicate. In short, we would like to put this on hold, let us communicate together and see how we can move forward together.

Beatrice Lee, President of Douglas/Sumner Neighborhood Association, said I’m here because the I’m asking the commissioners to vote tonight to not approve this, reasons being it’s not only a disconnect, I get calls all that time and this is what is happening. They are wanting, out-of-town even wanting to get the lots in Douglas/Sumner. This is why we asked Chris Slaughter at our meeting at LISC to get this map together because this was our idea and we felt that what we could do as members, there’s a lot of 18 ft. lots there, if people wanted extend their yards or different things like that. We were going to mark down which ones that was available and that would eliminate a lot people wanting to get the land. They are saying that they called Mrs. Lee and Mrs. Lee said that she approved it. Chris Slaughter understood very clearly, he talked to me on Monday, said he would call me back. He did not call. There is a bad communication in the Land Bank about him communicating with us and we haven’t heard from him. Even though LISC has had a lot of turnaround and a lot of changes there, we still are going.
by our plan. We haven’t seen the map yet and that was a year ago that we requested that. What needs to happen here is that all of the partners need to come back to the table together and to start talking and get this thing back on track is what my request would be.

A woman in the audience said she was not here to speak in favor or in opposition to this particular local issue but since LISC has been mentioned a couple of times in this picture I just wanted to offer that we also agree that it would great if the church and the neighborhood association and LISC, potentially as a facilitator, could work with the Land Bank and with other stakeholders to really in moving forward think about how we can collectively address the plans that are existing for the neighborhood and future plans and really try and get on the same page. I’m sort of here to offer that LISC is still very obviously invested in Douglas/Sumner in working with the neighborhood association, we’d like to work with other stakeholders, and of course with the commissioners around land use and planning issues in Douglas/Sumner and so I would just like to put that forward on the table.

No one else appeared.

Mayor Holland said I would say our practice in these things is for the applicant, this is true in our Planning and Zoning and we intend to follow that here, the applicant has an opportunity to make a summative statement before we move to the commissioners so the applicant has an opportunity to come forward at this time and this will close our public hearing.

Pastor Brady said Mrs. Lee has sat in my office. We’ve delivered to them even a statement of our development. We’ve tried our best to communicate. We do not have a disconnect. The issue of the three lots, again, please understand; they are vacant, they have been vacant for ten years, nothing has been done. We have the opportunity to finish what we want with a fantastic design that will serve as a base for the 7th St. corridor. It’s been put off once. To keep doing it is going to hinder our plans with the development, with the city planners, I would encourage you. We’re not talking about a whole bunch of land. We’re talking about three lots that would just complete what we need. There are tremendous lots available all around. All we’re asking for is for these three that are presently not being used. We own all of the other property around. Nothing else could really done with it. I trust that we will not delay it. It’s already been approved unanimously and I trust that we can just follow through.
Mayor Holland closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Maddox said I was actually the one two weeks ago that had the properties pulled off the agenda. I had them pull it off the agenda because after I seen them on the agenda when it was sent to me I reached out to the president of Douglas/Sumner and I asked her had she been contacted about the property. The reason why I contacted her, upon being elected, I was told about the partnership that was made between Douglas/Sumner and LISC. In that partnership there was a Neighborhood Now Initiative which I’ve seen the paperwork for and I think, I guess, that was sent to everybody. In that Neighborhood Now Initiative there was supposed to be land that was blocked off for continuous development. Since that agreement has been made there has been roughly eight to ten houses that have built along the 7th St. corridor. It is my understanding that the hard work of the Douglas/Sumner Neighborhood Association should come into play with this. I believe before the first house was built there hadn’t been a house built in Douglas/Sumner in over 30 years. When you have that kind of thing going on, if we say that commissioners and a Commission that we work with neighborhood associations to make sure that they are the ones that are making sure that their community is in an upbeat fashion, then we should have a system that reflects that. If there is a Land Bank or anything of that nature and there is a Neighborhood Now Initiative in place, then automatically when those lots were applied for the neighborhood association president should have been contacted. It is my understanding that maybe there is a disconnect. I knew there was a disconnect, I’ve seen church grow, they have a great population of people down there. I’ve also seen the hard work that the Douglas/Sumner Neighborhood Association has done in getting that land blocked off and the homes built. If LISC is continuing to have that partnership there it is my opinion that Chris Slaughter and the Land Bank should be working with the Douglas/Sumner Neighborhood Association to make sure that they have the land that is needed to continue the growth in that area. Again, before the first was built, there hasn’t been a house built there in 30 years.

Commissioner Kane asked, Chris, how long have you been doing your job. Mr. Slaughter said since 2008. Commissioner Kane said since 2008 that’s the first complaint that I’ve heard about Chris. These lots have been vacant for ten years. Mr. Slaughter stated correct, probably even longer than that.
Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, that the Church gets the three lots. Roll call was taken and there were six “Ayes,” Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Townsend, McKiernan, Kane. Commissioner Maddox and Commissioner Walker voted “No.”

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS
No items of business.

MAYOR HOLLAND ADJOURNED
THE MEETING AT 9:50 P.M.
April 9, 2015

Bridgette Cobbins
Unified Government Clerk