Public Works and Safety Committee
Standing Committee Meeting Agenda
Monday, May 14, 2012
5:00 PM

Location:
Municipal Office Building
701 N 7th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101
6th Floor Training Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner John Mendez, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Ann Brandau-Murguia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Angela Markley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tom Cooley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Butch Ellison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Eidson - BPU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

II. Approval of standing committee minutes for March 12, 2012.

III. Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 - FAIRFAX INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

Synopsis:
Requesting approval of the annual interlocal agreement with the Fairfax Drainage District, submitted by Jim Larkin, Public Works/WPC. The Fairfax Drainage District has asked for an increase; however, staff recommends that no increase be given due to the financial and economic hardship the UG is experiencing.

Tracking #: 120093
Item No. 2 - RESOLUTION: COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD

Synopsis:
Requesting adoption of a resolution authorizing the appointment of the existing Law Enforcement Advisory Board as the community advisory board relating to the prohibition against racial profiling or other biased-based policing, submitted by Delia York, Deputy Chief Legal Counsel, and Rick Armstrong, Chief of Police.

Tracking #: 120115

Item No. 3 - JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT (JAG)

Synopsis:
Requesting approval to submit a $92,743 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) to pay personnel costs for six Teleserve Officers in the Police Dept. Teleserve Unit, submitted by Lisa Stimetz, PSBO/Police. Pursuant to the FY12 JAG solicitation requirements, the UG must make the grant application public and allow for public comment; therefore, it is requested to set a public hearing for June 7, 2012.

Tracking #: 120112

Item No. 4 - FOLLOW-UP: RESIDENTIAL PARKING IN ROSEDALE

Synopsis:
Follow-up on the residential pilot program regulating parking in the area generally bounded by Esterly Avenue on the north, State Line Road on the east, West 36th Avenue on the south, and Eaton Street on the west, in the Rosedale District in the vicinity of KU Medical Center, presented by Robert Roddy, Director of Public Works.

On October 6, 2011, the commission unanimously adopted Ordinance No. O-43-11. Per Sec. 5 of said ordinance, the pilot program was to be reviewed at the March 2012 Public Works and Safety Standing Committee meeting. At the March 12, 2012 meeting, the report was deferred until April. (The April 16, 2012 meeting was cancelled.)

Tracking #: 120092

IV. Goals and Objectives Follow-up
V. Adjourn
The meeting of the Public Works and Safety Standing Committee was held on Monday, March 12, 2012, at 5:00 p.m., in the 6th Floor Human Resources Training Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Mendez, Chairman; Commissioners Cooley, Ellison, Markley, and Murguia. BPU Board Member Terry Eidson was absent.

**Chairman Mendez** called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and all members were present as shown above.

Approval of standing committee minutes for January 17, 2012. **On motion of Commissioner Ellison, seconded by Commissioner Murguia, the minutes were approved.** Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Agenda:

**Item No. 1 – 120064…** A resolution adopting a policy for the KCK Fire Department to be able to accept a payment plan, modify, or cancel debts incurred as a result of emergency medical treatment and ambulance transport, submitted by Fire Chief John Paul Jones.

**Chris Alexander,** EMS Director, said we have drafted a policy to talk about ambulance debt modification. As you know, we were here last July to talk about the financial and statistics related to the ambulance service. We intend to come back next July to talk about last year. This came up as part of our getting enrolled in the Debt Setoff process. We are submitting accounts to Debt Setoff now. We’ve gotten some fairly good response from folks with some insurance information or willing to pay the account in full right off the bat rather than go to Setoff. It’s had a very good response even before we got it filed with Setoff. Now that it’s there, we’ve got some other people interested in that. The state is starting to identify some debts for us.
What we want to do is make a change in our debt collection process to help with some of the uncollectable debts. Right now, we have only the authority to bill 100% of ambulance transport. We cannot accept a payment plan. That’s not in any approved policies that we have right now. We also have nothing in place to actually write off a debt so everything stays on the books with the exception of bankruptcy or somebody dying and not leaving an estate. Everything is staying on the books. Now eight years into the ambulance process, that’s a little bit unwieldy. We would like some alternatives in terms of being able to collect some accounts. We have some folks who are interested in doing payment plans either on their co-pay or on 100% of the bill. We also have a few folks who we’ve identified that really do not have any financial resources. They have either gone through the hospital and the hospital has bedded them, looked at all their financial statements, tax returns, and everything and the hospital has written off thousands of dollars in debt or they can demonstrate to us that they have no financial means to pay a bill. We could send them to Setoff, we could send them to collections, and we’re just never going to get any money because of their financial circumstances.

What you have before you is a policy that resembles what the Health Department currently uses to write off some debts. Their policy has been in place for a number of years. We would like to adopt something similar to either give us the ability to accept a payment plan, potentially modify the debt, write off a small portion of that in agreement that they will pay the rest of the debt; or in cases of demonstrated financial need, be able to write off the debt completely. The policy has been reviewed by the Legislative Auditor’s Office, Legal, and our billing contractor for any conflicts with Medicare and Medicaid rules. We’ve been given approval by all three of those groups, so we put the policy out before you for your consideration.

You have a resolution drafted by Legal to adopt the policy. You have the policy itself. We also included some examples of letters that we’ve received from people in the past outlining their financial need or their circumstances. We’ve included a copy of a letter that the hospitals put out when they write off a debt in case you’re interested in that.

**Commissioner Ellison** said I noticed in the letter that KU and the amount of money they set aside for those kinds of things. What percentage of our runs does KU versus let’s say Providence. **Mr. Alexander** said KU and Providence both receive about one-third of our patients a piece and the rest are distributed throughout the metro. We’re talking 33-35% for KU and 33-35% for Providence.

*March 12, 2012*
Commissioner Ellison said under this plan, apparently we’re not in the red with the service. Mr. Alexander said correct. Commissioner Ellison said I’m sure you’ve looked at it. I thought to myself, once the word gets out, all you have to do is not pay and write a letter then that debt would go higher. You’ve calculated, I’m sure, what percentage—I noticed 26% of this—you’ve calculated the amount of debt we can incur without going in the red. Right? Mr. Alexander said yes. Commissioner Ellison asked what happens if you get to that line where we cannot afford to do this with “x” patient and they can’t pay. Mr. Alexander said right now we’re estimating we’re going to see 20 to 25 requests like this a year. The majority of those have means to pay. They just need a payment plan so we’re not writing off any of those debts. At worse case, we’re writing off a small percentage of those debts. In terms of the ones that are asking for 100% write off, we’re estimating maybe five a year. That may go up just a little bit with pushing people toward Setoff and then asking for something as opposed to just ignoring the account completely. We don’t anticipate that this is going to be a financial burden on the system. We’ve also committed to the Administrator’s Office that we’ll give an annual report showing the number of accounts and the amount that’s actually written off.

Commissioner Ellison said you look at KCMO and what they tried to do after we adopted this eight years ago, and they continually run bigger and more folks that are not going to pay; more gunshot wounds. They continually run into financial problems. What is the basic difference? I know ours is stationed in fire stations and strategic spots. Mr. Alexander said we’re doing okay. With authority, I can’t speak for them.

Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Ellison, Cooley, Markley, Murguia, Mendez.

Item No. 2 – 110226… Review and evaluate the pilot program regulating parking in the area generally bounded by Esterly Avenue on the north, State Line Road on the east, West 36th Avenue on the south, and Eaton Street on the west. This acknowledges the duty to review this program. Staff will perform the study and give a report at the next Public Works and Safety Standing Committee meeting. On March 12, 2012
October 6, 2011, the Commission unanimously adopted Ordinance No. O-43-11. Per Sec. 5 of said ordinance, the pilot program was to be reviewed at the March 12 Public Works and Safety Standing Committee meeting.

**Bob Roddy,** Director of Public Works, said as the review you just read, that’s what we’re here for. Just to acknowledge that, in fact, this ordinance required us to do a review and report back to the commission in March of this year. What we would like to request is that we complete that study starting this month and then come back to you at next standing committee.

**Action:** No action taken.

**Item No. 3 – 120056…** A resolution declaring the Culvert Replacement – Structure No. 17 at North 51st Street and Kimball Avenue (CMIP #5304) as a necessary and valid improvement, and authorizing a survey of land for said project, submitted by Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Legal Counsel. This project is in the approved 2012 CMIP. It’s planned that this construction will occur in 2012. It involves only minor right-of-way issues.

**Action:** Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Ellison, Cooley, Markley, Murguia, Mendez.

**Item No. 4 – 120063…** Communication submitting recommended changes to the current 50/50 Sidewalk Replacement Incentive Policy, submitted by Tim Nick, Public Works. The program is currently underutilized and the proposed changes should help increase homeowner participation.

**Bob Roddy,** Director of Public Works, appeared with Tim Nick. **Mr. Roddy** said before we get into this item, the item you had before regarding the culvert, when we got into doing that review,
we found that the pipe that was actually used under the road was actually an old boiler. For a boiler, it held up pretty good underneath the street. That boiler is headed for Ed Asner Metals after we’re done with it.

**Mr. Roddy** said the 50/50 Program is one that’s been in existence for five or ten years. We do a lot of different things with sidewalks, but the 50/50 Program was intended strictly to help pay for the replacement of existing sidewalks. It’s not for new sidewalks; it’s just for existing. Over the years, we found that the program has been underutilized. As a result, frequently by September, we’ve funded other projects that were probably not intended for the original purpose of the program. After looking at the program and the fact that we’ve got additional money because of the sales tax funds, Mr. Nick and I reviewed it and looked at some suggested changes to try to increase participation.

In the document that we presented to you, we have three major changes. In the handouts that you have with you, you have two attached documents and they start off with sidewalk replacement. The first document is the existing policy and the second document is the sidewalk replacement policy with red lines that include the changes. The three things that we’re proposing to change are in the existing policy, the dollars are restricted by district until September of each year. What we’re suggesting is that we move that restriction date to April 1. Because we’re late in this year, we’re suggesting that the restriction last until June 1, 2012, and then it be April 1 every year after. The reason we’re making this recommendation is because if we restrict ourselves, then we’ve basically missed the construction season. By September when no one is going to do generally any work, we think that will help. It will still allow the dispersion of the dollars by district as long as people take advantage of the January through April deadline.

The second item we’re proposing is that the 50/50 Program generally has had as its philosophy that it should be 50% UG money and 50% leverage investment by the homeowner. What we’re suggesting is that we change that ratio depending upon the number of houses that are involved. If you think of a sidewalk, the sidewalk should be a continuous path. It shouldn’t be just a patchwork quilt of improved sidewalks. What we’re trying to do is pay for that kind of investment. For one house its 50%, for two to five houses its 60%, and 70% for five houses or more. That percent is UG funded.

**March 12, 2012**
The last item that we’re proposing is if we have any money that’s not assigned after September 1 of each year, that the UG staff be allowed to use that to be spent on sidewalks adjacent to schools, parks, or UG buildings that we find to be a public health nuisance.

We’re not certain how this will impact the program, but we think it will help. Generally, we receive a lot of calls. We think that perhaps by showing a greater willingness for us to contribute toward the investment in the neighborhoods, perhaps we’ll get changes and see that program become more successful in the future.

**Commissioner Cooley** asked we’re only talking sidewalks; we’re not talking about curbs and gutters. **Mr. Roddy** said we’re talking about sidewalks.

**Commissioner Ellison** said it also mentioned pavement of driveway approach ways ten feet from that. **Mr. Roddy** said if we get into a sidewalk, we generally have to do part of the driveway apron. Frequently, that can get quite involved if there’s a big slope and it may go past ten feet just to get the right slope on the driveway.

**Commissioner Cooley** said that also ties in where I was going with the question about curbs and gutters because that is an intracual part of your driveway. **Mr. Roddy** said we wrote it for sidewalks. Whether or not it could be included to curbs, we generally…**Commissioner Cooley** said I’m not suggesting that; I just wanted to ask that question. **Chairman Mendez** said I think you bring up a good point. Should we spell that out? **Mr. Roddy** said what we’ve seen is more interest in sidewalks. I can’t recall many people getting involved with curbs. Generally, if you do a curb, you’ll have to do the whole block and we’ve never seen that kind of interest. **Commissioner Cooley** said it usually ties in with any kind of street improvements, overlays, or whatever. **Chairman Mendez** said I guess that was meant more as a question to Legal. **Jody Boeding**, Chief Legal Counsel, said I don’t think anything requires you to do it. **Chairman Mendez** said it can go just like it is. **Ms. Boeding** said I think so. **Commissioner Cooley** said I think these are good suggestions. It makes sense that you can save some of the construction season.

**Commissioner Murguia** said Mr. Roddy, I think this is the best work your department has ever done. I love this. I read this on Friday and I was so excited. I’m on vacation right now and I
want you to know that I’m here because of this. I think this is great. I think the thought that went into it was amazing. I think you guys did a phenomenal job on it.

I do have just a little comment—little things and I don’t know that it’s important to spell out so I totally will leave it up to your discretion whether or not you need to spell it out sort of like Chairman Mendez’s question. When you look down at the third change that you made, it says include a change that would allow any funds still available after September 1…I’m sorry, it’s the section about where you’re saying next to Unified Government buildings or facilities.

Commissioner Markley said you were on the right one. Commissioner Murguia said I just didn’t get far enough. This is what I would suggest. Unanimously, this commission and our Mayor has supported health improvement sorts of things. What I would like to see is when I first read that, I will tell you I thought why would people want to walk to the UG maintenance building or some other UG facility. When I think of UG facilities, I think of stuff that the public really doesn’t go to. I know what you probably meant was like the community centers and things like that maybe.

Mr. Roddy said what we meant was we would look at areas where we have a defect and areas that there’s the highest benefit so like the ones where there’s the most amount of pedestrian travel whether it’s outside in front of this building where you have 200,000 people come in a year or whether it’s a community center. If it was one of the street garages where we have no walk-in traffic, obviously, that’s extremely low priority.

Commissioner Murguia said I just named some places. For me, and I would obviously like to hear from rest of the commissioners, but specifically neighborhoods where there’s lots of walking going on would obviously be very important. Schools which would just support what, I think there’s some commissioners here that are on the Safe Routes to School Committee for the Mayor, and I think that would just emphasize the areas around schools. I think the biggest thing that should be in here in print just to promote it is around grocery stores or facilities that provide food to people wherever they live in the neighborhood they live in. Also, retail amenities. I say that because we, as a government, are trying to promote health and fitness. We may not be able to make somebody go to a health club and workout. I look at sidewalks as a mode of transportation. Just like you said earlier Mr. Roddy, I don’t look at it as a patchwork quilt or a decoration in front of my house; it’s actually a way to get somewhere. From my perspective, I would like to see areas that were a priority or the emphasizes were on where people could chose
to use walking as an option to get there like to go get groceries or to go to school or whatever it may be.

Mr. Roddy said here’s the question. The reason why we picked the UG facilities, parks, or schools is that what we would be doing is taking whatever money and we’re the payer of the whole thing. If I’m in front of a grocery store, there should be a private party that has some responsibility in that. I would be concerned about us going in picking private winners and losers in that arena. Even though there’s high traffic, should the government be subsidizing this business over that business? That’s why we tried to pick ones that we are totally responsible for.

Commissioner Murguia said I hear you. I’m glad you said that because that’s not what I mean. I’ll give you an example. Maybe I’m not being clear enough. For example, Spring Valley Neighborhood Association in Rosedale, they are in need of curb and sidewalk replacement. There are enough residents that go up to the commercial area on Rainbow Blvd. but not all the way to the commercial area where it would just be residents that would be affected by that that could buy into that. That area, in my opinion, besides it being a neighborhood, should be a priority because its alleving to a retail area where people would go and shop. I would never suggest that we put in curb and sidewalk for a private business. I’m just saying that it would actually take people somewhere.

The only other thing I would encourage as what you said, are bus stops because we’re also trying to encourage less driving, more fuel economy, and getting people to use public transportation.

A sidebar comment is funding right now. The funding in that program is at a nominal level. I would anticipate that the way you’ve written this, it could become a very popular project. My only concern—I know you can’t fix that tonight so I’m just telling you in advance—the only concern would be that you get a flood of interest from people who are interested in seeing this happen and we don’t have any money so they get put on a list and then they lose interest over time because it takes them three years before they get matching money. I know that’s our job and you’re going to come back and say we set the budget, which we will do.

Mr. Roddy said in this case, I have good news. In prior years, we had $30,000 - $40,000. This year we have $100,000 and we probably have 80 – 90% of that money remaining. If we saw a flood of people between now and August, we can always alter future CMIP funds available.

Commissioner Murguia said the last one is if we want people out on the street and walking, which I definitely do, I think it promotes everything we do and I’m not sure that this is
your department, we’ve got to look at animal control. Mr. Roddy said you’re right. That’s not my department. Chairman Mendez said refer it to the proper authorities. You call the proper authority. Commissioner Murguia said I would be glad to call, but I just want you to know that unless we address that, it won’t work.

Mr. Roddy said I’d like to thank you for your compliment and actually Public Works does a lot of good work. We’re just very humble.

Action: Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Ellison, Cooley, Markley, Murguia, Mendez.

Commissioner Murguia said this program will be very residential friendly. Correct? Our residents will be able to just come to your department and fill out the information? It will be very easy? Mr. Roddy said Tim Nick’s the man. Mr. Nick said they have to get a permit, but they can call. The application, they can do over the phone so it’s a real simple process. Commissioner Murguia asked they can call you. Mr. Nick said they can call me.

Adjourn

Chairman Mendez adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

cg
Staff Request for Commission Action

Type: Standard
Committee: Public Works and Safety Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 5/14/2012
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 6/7/2012
Confirmed Date: 6/7/2012

Changes Recommended By Standing Committee (New Action Form required with signatures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Department / Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/16/2012</td>
<td>Jim Larkin</td>
<td>573-1301</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlarkin@wycokck.org">jlarkin@wycokck.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works/WPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Description:
Fairfax Interlocal Agreement: This interlocal agreement is an annual agreement and requires renewal for the year 2012. The Fairfax drainage district has asked for an increase based on the consumer price index for a total amount of $198,407.00. However, staff recommends that no increase be given this year due to the financial and economic hardship the UG is experiencing at this time. Therefore, staff recommends that the amount of $182,880.00 be paid to the Fairfax Drainage District for 2012. This is the same amount that was paid in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

Action Requested:
Committee approval of Interlocal agreement and then forward to the Board of Commissioners for approval.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $182,800.00
Source:
☑ Included In Budget
d ☐ Other (explain)

File Attachment

File Attachment

File Attachment
March 13, 2012

Water Pollution Control Division
Unified Govt. of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Ks
50 Market Street
Kansas City, KS 66118

Attention: Mr. Jim Larkin

Subject: 2012 Interlocal Agreement

Gentlemen:

The Fairfax Drainage District is enclosing three (3) partially executed original copies of the proposed Interlocal Agreement for 2012. In summary, the agreement calls for a (1) one year agreement by which the Unified Government will contribute a sum of $198,407.00 to the Fairfax Drainage District to help defray costs of sewer cleaning and related maintenance expenses attributable to sanitary and non-sanitary waste, sediment and debris for purposes of insuring adequate interior drainage within the District.

As in previous years, this year’s interlocal agreement payment includes an inflationary increase based upon the CPI change from 2008 to 2012. The attached BLS chart illustrates how this year’s payment was determined.

Please have all three (3) original copies executed of the proposed 2012 Interlocal Agreement and return one (1) copy to the FDD for our records along with the payment as soon as administratively feasible.

If you have any questions, please advise. The Fairfax Drainage District appreciates the willingness of the Unified Government to contribute toward the maintenance of the sewers in Fairfax in 2012.

Respectfully yours,

Stephen P. Dailey, P.E.
General Manager

Enclosures
Databases, Tables & Calculators by Subject

Change Output Options: From: 2001 To: 2012

Include graphs

Data extracted on: February 28, 2012 (3:46:35 PM)

Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers

Series Id: CUUB0000030
Not Seasonally Adjusted
Area: U.S. city average
Item: All Items
Base Period: 1982-84=100

Download: xlsx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>HALF1</th>
<th>HALF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>176.2</td>
<td>176.9</td>
<td>177.7</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>177.7</td>
<td>177.4</td>
<td>176.7</td>
<td>177.1</td>
<td>176.6</td>
<td>177.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>177.1</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>179.9</td>
<td>180.1</td>
<td>180.7</td>
<td>181.0</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>180.9</td>
<td>179.9</td>
<td>178.3</td>
<td>180.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>181.7</td>
<td>183.1</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>184.3</td>
<td>185.3</td>
<td>183.7</td>
<td>183.9</td>
<td>184.6</td>
<td>185.2</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>184.3</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>184.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>185.2</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>187.4</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>189.1</td>
<td>189.7</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>190.9</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>190.3</td>
<td>188.9</td>
<td>187.6</td>
<td>190.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>190.7</td>
<td>191.8</td>
<td>191.3</td>
<td>191.6</td>
<td>194.4</td>
<td>194.5</td>
<td>195.4</td>
<td>196.4</td>
<td>198.8</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>197.6</td>
<td>196.8</td>
<td>195.3</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>197.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>198.3</td>
<td>198.7</td>
<td>199.8</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>202.5</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td>203.9</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>200.6</td>
<td>201.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>202.4</td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>206.8</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>208.3</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>211.0</td>
<td>211.6</td>
<td>213.5</td>
<td>214.8</td>
<td>216.7</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>219.6</td>
<td>219.9</td>
<td>218.7</td>
<td>216.7</td>
<td>212.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>215.5</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>211.4</td>
<td>212.1</td>
<td>212.9</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>215.3</td>
<td>215.8</td>
<td>215.9</td>
<td>215.9</td>
<td>216.6</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>213.6</td>
<td>215.9</td>
<td>215.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>216.6</td>
<td>216.6</td>
<td>217.6</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>218.4</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>218.1</td>
<td>218.3</td>
<td>218.2</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>218.5</td>
<td>217.5</td>
<td>217.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>220.2</td>
<td>221.3</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>225.9</td>
<td>225.7</td>
<td>225.9</td>
<td>226.4</td>
<td>226.8</td>
<td>226.4</td>
<td>226.2</td>
<td>225.7</td>
<td>224.9</td>
<td>223.9</td>
<td>226.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>226.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOOLS
- Areas at a Glance
- Industries at a Glance
- Economic Releases
- Databases & Tables
- Maps

CALCULATORS
- Inflation
- Location Quotient
- Injury and Illness
- About BLS
- Contact Us

HELP
- Help & Tutorials
- FAQs
- Glossary
- About BLS
- Contact Us

INFO
- What's New
- Careers at BLS
- Join Our Mailing List
- Linking & Copyright Info

RESOURCES
- Inspector General (OIG)
- Budget and Performance
- USA.gov
- Disability.gov

Freedom of Information Act | Privacy & Security Statement | Disclaimers | Customer Survey | Important Web Site Notices
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN

THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

AND

THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT

THIS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS AND THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT ("INTERLOCAL Agreement") is made and entered into this ___ day of __________, 2012, between the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas ("Unified Government") and the Fairfax Drainage District ("District").

WHEREAS, the District, pursuant to authority granted by the State of Kansas, has caused to be constructed, maintained and funded certain sewer lines within the District to insure adequate interior drainage; and

WHEREAS, sediment and debris from sanitary and non-sanitary storm water discharge collects in the District’s sewer lines; and

WHEREAS, the sediment and debris comes from in-district and out-of district sewers; and

WHEREAS, it becomes necessary from time to time to clean and perform maintenance on the sewer lines to insure adequate interior drainage; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government collects sewer service charges for the Water Pollution Control sewer service fund from WPC customers in the District, who utilize the District’s sewer system to, in part, transport waste water to the Unified Government treatment system; and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. §12-2901 et seq. and amendments thereto entitled the “Interlocal Cooperation Act” authorize parties hereto to cooperate in the aforementioned public functions; and

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties AGREE as follows:

1. PURPOSE. The parties hereto enter into this Interlocal Agreement for the purpose of formalizing the parties’ agreement to provide adequate sewer services to promote industrial growth within the District.
2. **JOINT COOPERATION.** The District and the Unified Government agree and covenant to cooperate and assist each other in order that both the District and the Unified Government may better serve their respective constituents and customers, including, but not limited to, the exploration by the parties of alternative means to avoid or minimize the accumulation of sediment and debris within the District's sewers from in-district and out-of-district sources. In furtherance of this spirit of cooperation, the parties acknowledge the right of all to attend public meetings of the governing bodies of both the District and the Unified Government, but each wishes to issue an express invitation to the other to have a representative attend meetings of each others' governing bodies. In addition, the general manager of the District and the Director of Water Pollution Control of the Unified Government shall meet regularly to discuss matters of mutual interest.

3. **DURATION AND TERM.** This Interlocal Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for a term of one (1) year beginning January 1, 2012 and terminating on December 31, 2012 and neither party may terminate or extend the term of this Interlocal Agreement without the mutual consent of the other party.

4. **FINANCING.** The Unified Government shall pay to the District the sum of One Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand Four Hundred Seven and no/100 Dollars ($198,407.00) on or before October 1, 2012. The District shall contribute this revenue toward sewer cleaning and maintenance throughout the duration of this Interlocal Agreement.

5. **ADDITIONAL CHARGES.** In partial consideration of the payment, the District shall not advocate or pursue an additional user fee charge by the District to the Unified Government during the term of this contract.

6. **PLACING AGREEMENT IN FORCE.** The attorneys for the Unified Government and the District shall cause this Interlocal Agreement to be executed by the Unified Government and District and submitted to the Attorney General of Kansas for approval. Thereafter, this Interlocal Agreement shall be filed with the Register of Deeds of Wyandotte County, Kansas, and with the Secretary of State of Kansas, all in accordance with K.S.A. §12-2904 and §12-2905, as amended. Each party shall receive a duly executed copy of the Interlocal Agreement for their official records.
THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY,
KANSAS

By: _________________________

Attest:

____________________________________

THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT
OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY, KANSAS

By: _________________________

President
Board of Directors

Attest:

____________________________________

Secretary
Board of Directors
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS
AND
THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT

THIS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS AND THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT ("INTERLOCAL Agreement") is made and entered into this ___ day of __________, 2012, between the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas ("Unified Government") and the Fairfax Drainage District ("District").

WHEREAS, the District, pursuant to authority granted by the State of Kansas, has caused to be constructed, maintained and funded certain sewer lines within the District to insure adequate interior drainage; and

WHEREAS, sediment and debris from sanitary and non-sanitary storm water discharge collects in the District’s sewer lines; and

WHEREAS, the sediment and debris comes from in-district and out-of district sewers; and

WHEREAS, it becomes necessary from time to time to clean and perform maintenance on the sewer lines to insure adequate interior drainage; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government collects sewer service charges for the Water Pollution Control sewer service fund from WPC customers in the District, who utilize the District’s sewer system to, in part, transport waste water to the Unified Government treatment system; and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. §12-2901 et seq. and amendments thereto entitled the “Interlocal Cooperation Act” authorize parties hereto to cooperate in the aforementioned public functions; and

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties AGREE as follows:

1. PURPOSE. The parties hereto enter into this Interlocal Agreement for the purpose of formalizing the parties’ agreement to provide adequate sewer services to promote industrial growth within the District.
2. **JOINT COOPERATION.** The District and the Unified Government agree and covenant to cooperate and assist each other in order that both the District and the Unified Government may better serve their respective constituents and customers, including, but not limited to, the exploration by the parties of alternative means to avoid or minimize the accumulation of sediment and debris within the District’s sewers from in-district and out-of-district sources. In furtherance of this spirit of cooperation, the parties acknowledge the right of all to attend public meetings of the governing bodies of both the District and the Unified Government, but each wishes to issue an express invitation to the other to have a representative attend meetings of each others’ governing bodies. In addition, the general manager of the District and the Director of Water Pollution Control of the Unified Government shall meet regularly to discuss matters of mutual interest.

3. **DURATION AND TERM.** This Interlocal Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for a term of one (1) year beginning January 1, 2012 and terminating on December 31, 2012 and neither party may terminate or extend the term of this Interlocal Agreement without the mutual consent of the other party.

4. **FINANCING.** The Unified Government shall pay to the District the sum of One Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand Four Hundred Seven and no/100 Dollars ($198,407.00) on or before October 1, 2012. The District shall contribute this revenue toward sewer cleaning and maintenance throughout the duration of this Interlocal Agreement.

5. **ADDITIONAL CHARGES.** In partial consideration of the payment, the District shall not advocate or pursue an additional user fee charge by the District to the Unified Government during the term of this contract.

6. **PLACING AGREEMENT IN FORCE.** The attorneys for the Unified Government and the District shall cause this Interlocal Agreement to be executed by the Unified Government and District and submitted to the Attorney General of Kansas for approval. Thereafter, this Interlocal Agreement shall be filed with the Register of Deeds of Wyandotte County, Kansas, and with the Secretary of State of Kansas, all in accordance with K.S.A. §12-2904 and §12-2905, as amended. Each party shall receive a duly executed copy of the Interlocal Agreement for their official records.
THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY,
KANSAS

By: ____________________________

Attest:

______________________________

THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT
OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY, KANSAS

By:

President
Board of Directors

Attest:

______________________________

Secretary
Board of Directors
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN

THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

AND

THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT

THIS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS AND THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT ("INTERLOCAL Agreement") is made and entered into this ___ day of ___, 2012, between the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas ("Unified Government") and the Fairfax Drainage District ("District").

WHEREAS, the District, pursuant to authority granted by the State of Kansas, has caused to be constructed, maintained and funded certain sewer lines within the District to insure adequate interior drainage; and

WHEREAS, sediment and debris from sanitary and non-sanitary storm water discharge collects in the District’s sewer lines; and

WHEREAS, the sediment and debris comes from in-district and out-of district sewers; and

WHEREAS, it becomes necessary from time to time to clean and perform maintenance on the sewer lines to insure adequate interior drainage; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government collects sewer service charges for the Water Pollution Control sewer service fund from WPC customers in the District, who utilize the District’s sewer system to, in part, transport waste water to the Unified Government treatment system; and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. §12-2901 et seq. and amendments thereto entitled the “Interlocal Cooperation Act” authorize parties hereto to cooperate in the aforementioned public functions; and

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties AGREE as follows:

1. PURPOSE. The parties hereto enter into this Interlocal Agreement for the purpose of formalizing the parties’ agreement to provide adequate sewer services to promote industrial growth within the District.
2. **JOINT COOPERATION.** The District and the Unified Government agree and covenant to cooperate and assist each other in order that both the District and the Unified Government may better serve their respective constituents and customers, including, but not limited to, the exploration by the parties of alternative means to avoid or minimize the accumulation of sediment and debris within the District’s sewers from in-district and out-of-district sources. In furtherance of this spirit of cooperation, the parties acknowledge the right of all to attend public meetings of the governing bodies of both the District and the Unified Government, but each wishes to issue an express invitation to the other to have a representative attend meetings of each others’ governing bodies. In addition, the general manager of the District and the Director of Water Pollution Control of the Unified Government shall meet regularly to discuss matters of mutual interest.

3. **DURATION AND TERM.** This Interlocal Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for a term of one (1) year beginning January 1, 2012 and terminating on December 31, 2012 and neither party may terminate or extend the term of this Interlocal Agreement without the mutual consent of the other party.

4. **FINANCING.** The Unified Government shall pay to the District the sum of One Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand Four Hundred Seven and no/100 Dollars ($198,407.00) on or before October 1, 2012. The District shall contribute this revenue toward sewer cleaning and maintenance throughout the duration of this Interlocal Agreement.

5. **ADDITIONAL CHARGES.** In partial consideration of the payment, the District shall not advocate or pursue an additional user fee charge by the District to the Unified Government during the term of this contract.

6. **PLACING AGREEMENT IN FORCE.** The attorneys for the Unified Government and the District shall cause this Interlocal Agreement to be executed by the Unified Government and District and submitted to the Attorney General of Kansas for approval. Thereafter, this Interlocal Agreement shall be filed with the Register of Deeds of Wyandotte County, Kansas, and with the Secretary of State of Kansas, all in accordance with K.S.A. §12-2904 and §12-2905, as amended. Each party shall receive a duly executed copy of the Interlocal Agreement for their official records.
THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

By: ________________

Attest: ____________________

THE FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY, KANSAS

By: __________________________

President
Board of Directors

Attest: __________________________

Secretary
Board of Directors
## Staff Request for Commission Action

### Type: Standard

**Committee:** Public Works and Safety Committee

**Date of Standing Committee Action:** 5/14/2012

(If none, please explain):

**Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date:** 5/31/2012

**Confirmed Date:** 5/31/2012

### Changes Recommended By Standing Committee (New Action Form required with signatures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Department / Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/9/2012</td>
<td>Delia York/Rick Armstrong</td>
<td>5084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyork@wycokck.org">dyork@wycokck.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal/PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Description:**

During the 2011 Kansas legislative session there were amendments to the racial profiling law, KSA 22-4610(c) as amended by Section 3 of Chapter 94 of the 2011 Session Laws. One of the many changes requires law enforcement agencies to implement a policy. The AG has promulgated a model policy that has been reviewed by the KCKPD. The KCKPD has properly adopted a policy that complies with all aspects of the amended statutes with the exception of the establishment of a Community Advisory Board. The purpose of the board is to advise and assist in policy development, education and community outreach and communications related to racial and biased-based policing.

In an effort to comply with the 2011 amendments to the racial profiling laws, attached is a resolution authorizing the existing Law Enforcement Advisory Board as the community advisory board to assist the Chief of Police in policy development, education and community outreach, and communications related to the prohibition against racial or other biased-based policing.

**Action Requested:**

Adopt Resolution.

- **Publication Required**

### Budget Impact: (if applicable)

**Amount:** $  
**Source:**

- [ ] Included In Budget
- [ ] Other (explain)

---

File Attachment

File Attachment

File Attachment
RESOLUTION NO.____________________

AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF THE EXISTING LAW ENFORCEMENT ADVISORY BOARD AS THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD IN COMPLIANCE WITH KANSAS STATE LAW PROHIBITING RACIAL OR OTHER BIASED-BASED POLICING.

WHEREAS, the Kansas State Legislature passed Senate Bill 93 as amended, effective July 1, 2011, in which cities or counties can appoint an advisory board composed of not less than five persons representing law enforcement, community leaders and educational leaders to advise and assist in policy development, education and community outreach, and communications related to racial or other biased-based policing by law enforcement officers and agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (hereinafter “UG”), its elected representatives and officers are committed to fair and impartial policing;

WHEREAS, the UG has previously authorized the establishment of a Law Enforcement Advisory Board comprised of more than five persons representing law enforcement, community leaders and educational leaders for the purpose of advising the Unified Board of Commissioners, the County Administrator, the Wyandotte County Sheriff and the Chief of Police on existing and potential law enforcement issues and of serving as an informational liaison between the Wyandotte County Sheriff, the Chief of Police and the community on law enforcement activities, programs and initiatives; and

WHEREAS, the existing Law Enforcement Advisory Board is properly comprised of members to assist the Chief of Police with the policy development,
education and community outreach, and communications related to the prohibition against racial or other biased-based policing.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMISSION OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS, AS FOLLOWS:

The Unified Government, by and through its elected Commission, hereby authorizes the appointment of the existing Law Enforcement Advisory Board as the community advisory board to assist the Chief of Police in policy development, education and community outreach, and communications related to the prohibition against racial or other biased-based policing.

ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS THIS_______ DAY OF ______________________, 2012.

__________________________________________
Joe Reardon, Mayor/CEO

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Unified Government Clerk

Approved as to form:

__________________________________________
Delia M. York, Deputy Chief Counsel
Type: Standard
Committee: Public Works and Safety Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 5/14/2012
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 6/7/2012
Confirmed Date: 6/7/2012

Changes Recommended By Standing Committee (New Action Form required with signatures)

Action Requested:
Board of Commissioners to review and approve the KCK Police Dept.'s application for FY12 JAG funding.

Set public hearing for June 7, 2012 to allow for public comment on the grant application. Pursuant to the FY12 JAG solicitation requirements, the Unified Government must make the grant application public and allow for public comment.

Budget Impact: (if applicable)
Amount: $0
Source:

- [ ] Included In Budget
- [x] Other (explain) 100% Grant Funded
MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Works and Public Safety Standing Committee

FROM: Lisa Stimetz, Public Safety Business Office

DATE: May 4, 2012

SUBJECT: FY12 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Application

The Kansas City, Kansas Police Department is seeking approval to apply, on behalf of the Unified Government, for the Edward Byrne Memorial FY2012 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG).

Following is a synopsis of the grant proposal to be considered at the Public Works & Public Safety Standing Committee meeting on May 14, 2012.

Edward Byrne Memorial FY2012 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG)

FY2012 Local Solicitation – The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas has been allocated $92,743 by the U.S. Dept. of Justice under the Edward Byrne Memorial JAG Program to be used prevent or reduce crime and violence. This is a non-matching grant.

The Kansas City, Kansas Police Department has six (6) police Teleserve Officer positions that are currently funded through the U.S. Dept. of Justice FY09 Recovery Act JAG Program and the FY11 JAG Program. Securing funding through the FY12 JAG application will allow for the continuation of the Police Department Teleserve Unit. The Police Department considers Teleserve Officers critical positions in helping the department fulfill its mission to the citizens of Kansas City, Kansas. The Teleserve Unit is a vital part of the Police Department’s effort to reduce violent crime and drugs in its community.

The Teleserve Unit assists police officers of the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department to facilitate calls for service from the community by acquiring necessary information for incidents, reporting and investigation by way of telephone. The Teleserve Unit takes police reports, which enables the Police Department to operate more efficiently by allowing patrol officers to dedicate more time to proactive enforcement activities and improves the department’s response time by reducing the number of reports taken by patrol officers in the field. This allows field officers to patrol the streets combating crime and not having to make misdemeanor police reports and handle information calls.
Program Narrative

Applicant’s Name: Unified Government of Wyandotte County/ Kansas City Kansas

Project Title: Teleserve Unit Continuation

Amount Requested: $92,743

Program Goals: Retain 6 Teleserve Officer positions, leverage patrol man power and efficiency.

Statement of Problem

The nation’s current economic situation continues to grind on revenue sources for local governments. The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas is again faced with relying on grant funding for the continuation of its Teleserve Unit. Loss of this funding will negatively impact the Kansas City, Kansas, Police Department and its ability to fulfill its mission of preserving life and property as civilian positions could possibly be abolished.

The Kansas City, Kansas Police Department has six (6) police Teleserve Officer positions that are currently funded through the U.S. Dept. of Justice FY09 Recovery Act Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program and through the FY11 JAG Program. Securing funding through this FY12 JAG application will allow for the continuation of Kansas City, Kansas Police Department Teleserve Unit Program. The Kansas City, Kansas Police Department considers Teleserve Officer critical positions in helping the department fulfill its mission to the citizens of Kansas City, Kansas. The Kansas City, Kansas Police Department’s Teleserve Unit is a vital part of the Police Department’s effort to reduce violent crime and drugs in its community. From June 30, 2011 to April 30, 2012, the Kansas City, Kansas, Police Department has noted a decrease in violent crime.

The Teleserve Unit assists police officers of the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department to facilitate calls for service from the community by acquiring necessary information for incidents, reporting and investigation by way of telephone. The Teleserve Unit takes police reports by which enables the Kansas City, Kansas, Police Department to operate more efficiently by allowing patrol officers to dedicate more time to proactive enforcement activities and improves the Department’s response time by reducing the number of reports taken by patrol officers in the field. This allows field officers to patrol the streets combating crime and not having to make misdemeanor police reports and handle information calls. By reducing the number of report calls, officers are available to respond to priority calls such as armed disturbances, domestic violence calls, robberies, and shootings.

Currently the KCK Police Department has an average response time of 7 minutes and 30 seconds from the time the call taker completes the call until an officer arrives on the scene. Teleserve Officers are an integral part of the public safety system and therefore are viewed as mission critical positions. Without adequate staffing of the Teleserve Unit, the citizens of Kansas City, Kansas can expect delays in the processing of calls, which can place their life and property in unnecessary danger. From June 30, 2011 to April 30, 2012, the Teleserve Unit completed 1,929 offense reports,
referred 913 calls to dispatch and handled 8,186 information calls for the Police Department. The Unified Government expects the volume of calls and reports to continue at a similar level for 2012 and 2013. Sustaining this valuable resource will allow officers to better serve the community.

**Program Design and Implementation**

The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas proposes continuing JAG funding with the current FY12 award dollars on January 1, 2013 and continue until the funds are expended on or about April 30, 2013. This will allow the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department to preserve the 6 Teleserve Officer positions.

The objective of job preservation is essential to enable the Teleserve Unit to continue to support the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department sworn officers in focusing on critical emergency and service calls. The Police Department will continue to track the level of calls and reports handled by the Teleserve Unit during that period and report on the level of efficiency provided by allowing sworn officers to redirect their activity to more mission critical activity.

The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas believes this use of the award meets the goals of job preservation while showing and expeditious obligation and commitment of the funds in a responsible and beneficial manner.

The Kansas City, Kansas Police Department tracks the reports taken and activity engaged in by all Kansas City, Kansas Police Department units including Teleserve. That data is reported monthly. Financial issues are handled in the Public Safety Business Office by the Police Fiscal Officer. That office works with Budget, Accounting and the Treasurer’s Office to insure the accurate tracking of draw downs so that all funds are segregated based on source and project and are clearly identifiable. Public Safety Business Office handles the entry of financial and program reports in the GMS system and maintains the financial records on hand in accordance with record retention requirements as outlined in each award, but in no case are records retained for less than three years.

**Timeline**

The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas anticipates JAG funding of the Teleserve Unit to resume on January 1, 2013 and run for 4 months through April 30, 2013 based on the award amount and the salary and benefits of the 6 Teleserve Officers. The data will be reported quarterly and will be reviewed by the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas and the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department to monitor the continuing effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
## BUDGET DETAIL WORKSHEET

Applicant's Name: Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas  
Project Title: Teleserve Unit Continuation  
FY2012 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program

### A. Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Name</th>
<th>Computation:</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Assistant III, Holly Bilberry</td>
<td>$2,575.73 mo x 3.5 mos</td>
<td>9,015.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Assistant III, Deidra Block</td>
<td>$2,715.73 mo x 3.5 mos</td>
<td>9,505.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Technician I, Vannessa Carvin</td>
<td>$3,231.87 mo x 3.5 mos</td>
<td>11,311.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Assistant III, Linda Green</td>
<td>$2,838.80 mo x 3.5 mos</td>
<td>9,935.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Assistant III, Patricia Joshua</td>
<td>$2,715.73 mo x 3.5 mos</td>
<td>9,505.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Technician I, Ronald Ramsey</td>
<td>$3,389.13 mo x 3.5 mos</td>
<td>11,861.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total Personnel Costs: $61,134.47

### B. Fringe Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Computation:</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FICA 1 (Social Security)</td>
<td>61,134.47 x 6.50%</td>
<td>3,973.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA 2 (Medicare)</td>
<td>61,134.47 x 1.49%</td>
<td>910.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>61,134.47 x 0.21%</td>
<td>128.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPERS Retirement</td>
<td>61,134.47 x 8.07%</td>
<td>4,933.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Dental, Vision Insurance 1</td>
<td>489.13 mo x 3.5 x 1 ees</td>
<td>1,711.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Dental, Vision Insurance 2</td>
<td>1,140.00 mo x 3.5 x 5 ees</td>
<td>19,950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total Fringe Benefits: 31,608.53

Total Personnel and Fringe Benefits: $92,743.00

### Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel</td>
<td>$61,134.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$31,608.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>$92,743.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</td>
<td>$92,743.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Request</td>
<td>$92,743.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Federal Amount</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type: Standard
Committee: Public Works and Safety Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 4/16/2012
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: Confirmed Date: 4/26/2012

Date: Contact Name: Contact Phone: Contact Email: Ref: Department / Division:
4/12/2012 Robert Roddy x5415 Broddy@wycokck.org
Public Works

Item Description:
Public Works Traffic Engineer has done a review of residential parking bounded by Esterly, State Line, 36th and Eaton. A detail of the review is attached.

Public Works recognizes that the signs have had their desired impact, but without issuance of permits, the ordinance is unenforceable.

However, at this time, staff recommends that the trial be extended for one year and that the ordinance be modified as needed.

Action Requested:
It is requested that the Standing Committee accept and approve the recommendations.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $
Source:
☐ Included In Budget
☑ Other (explain) Policy decision

File Attachment
File Attachment
File Attachment
TO: Robert Roddy, P.E.
    Director of Public Works

FROM: Lideana Laboy, PE, PTOE
      City Traffic Engineer

DATE: April 11, 2012

RE: Residents Parking Only Pilot Program
    W. 36th Street, Easterly Avenue, and Federal Avenue
    Between State Line Road and Eaton Street

This memo is related to the pilot residential parking program established in October 2011 as an alternative to regulate high demand of on street parking in residential areas and further the purpose and policy set forth in Ordinance Sec. 35-956. The pilot program was implemented within the residential district bounded by Easterly Avenue on the north, State Line Road on the east, W. 36th Street Avenue on the south, and Eaton Street on the west. The Public Works Street and Maintenance Department installed “Residents Parking Only” signs within the study area. Since then the Public Works Traffic Engineering Department has frequently observed parking patterns in the area. The following main review points have been concluded from field observation and evaluation.

- The number of parked vehicles in the area has been reduced
- The number of parked vehicles along these streets varies during the day but parking spaces are often available at anytime of the day
- Traffic Engineering Department has not received parking complaints from residents within the study area in recent months
- Based on field observations it seems that drivers are honoring the parking restriction for residents parking only. However, Traffic Engineering, Parking Control or Police Department cannot determine whether vehicles parked on these streets belong to residents or non residents.
- This type of residential parking regulation remains unenforceable at this time. Also, creates two type of residential parking system within the KU Med area with citizen some citizen paying for residential parking while others do not.

See the attached pictures of the area after installation of signs. Feel free to contact Lideana Laboy, City Traffic Engineer, 913-573-5700, if you have any questions or concerns.