Public Works and Safety Committee
Standing Committee Meeting Agenda
Monday, August 25, 2014
5:00 PM

Location:
Municipal Office Building
701 N 7th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101
5th Floor Conference Room (Suite 515)

Name | Absent
--- | ---
Commissioner Mike Kane, Chair | □
Commissioner Hal Walker | □
Commissioner Tarence Maddox | □
Commissioner Angela Markley | □
Commissioner Jane Philbrook | □
Jeff Bryant - BPU | □

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

II. Approval of standing committee minutes from June 16, 2014

III. Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 - GRANT: MARC GRANT AWARD PROCESS

Synopsis:
This communication is to update the elected body regarding the status of the grant award program, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. The Unified Government is in a good position to receive approximately $10.7 million in federal grants for a variety of transportation projects. The match and other expenses needed to undertake these projects require $9.5 million in local funds.

For information only and discussion.
Tracking #: 140280
Item No. 2 - COMMUNICATION: KDOT LOCAL CONSULT PROCESS FOR 2014

Synopsis:
KDOT holds a series of statewide meetings every 2 years to receive feedback on statewide transportation priorities, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. These meetings are called the "Local Consult." UG staff is preparing a position paper to be used to guide our discussion of local priorities. Information on our previous local consult positions was shared with this Committee in June.

For information only and discussion.
Tracking #: 140281

Item No. 3 - COMMUNICATION: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Synopsis:
The Unified Government has been implementing its Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) as required by our state permit and the EPA 2013 Consent Decree. One of the required programs is the management of stormwater generated from developed private property in which stormwater treatment facilities have been constructed, submitted by Brent Thompson, Public Works.

For information only and discussion.
Tracking #: 140282

Item No. 4 - COMMUNICATION: SOUTH PATROL UPDATE

Synopsis:
With the redevelopment of the old structural steel site in Argentine into a TIF District anchored by a new Neighborhood Walmart Store, it was contemplated that a new South Patrol Police Station could be developed within this project area in the future. In working with the State of Kansas Department of Corrections, it appeared our government would have the opportunity to advance the project now and build a new public safety facility which would house both the UG South Patrol and the State Parole Office. Unfortunately, after reevaluation of their current situation, the Department of Corrections has notified us that they will not be able to participate as a tenant in the proposed public safety facility, submitted by Bob Roddy, Public Works.

For information only and discussion
Tracking #: 140285
IV. Outcomes

Item No. 1 - Outcomes

Synopsis:
Overviews/discussion of the next phase.

PWS outcomes presented at the following standing committee meetings:
Aug. 12, 2013
a. Infrastructure. Improve and finance infrastructure to comply with federal regulations, encourage private investment, and build community.
b. Environment. Ensure natural resources are protected to the maximum extent possible; opportunities for additional natural areas are pursued; and the park system is enhanced.
c. Public Safety. Provide the public's safety through best practices with results in lower crime rate, safer dwellings and businesses, and efficient court services.
d. Multimodal Transportation. Create a transportation system that moves people to where they want to go including work, services, and amenities.

Dec. 16, 2013
a. Infrastructure. Presentation on the upcoming application round for federal transportation funding administered by the Mid-America Regional Council, by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. Staff estimates the UG is in a good position to be awarded $4-6M which would require local design and matching funds.
c. Public Safety. No discussion.

Jan. 13, 2014
Infrastructure. Presentation and discussion on a list of projects that staff considers good candidates from which to select projects for federal transportation funding, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer.

Tracking #: 120155

V. Adjourn
The meeting of the Public Works and Safety Standing Committee was held on Monday, June 16, 2014, at 5:05 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Markley, Chairman; Commissioners Walker (arrived at 5:19), Maddox, Philbrook; and BPU Board Member Gonzalez filling in for Jeff Bryant. Commissioner Kane and BPU Board Member Bryant were absent. The following officials were also in attendance: Joe Connor, Maureen Mahoney, Ken Moore, Renee Ramirez, Chris Cooley, Misty Brown and Debbie Jonscher.

Chairman Markley called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and all members were present as shown above. Commissioner Walker was not preset for the roll.

Approval of standing committee minutes for April 21, 2014. On motion of Commissioner Philbrook, seconded by Commissioner Maddox, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Agenda:

Item No. 1 – 140198...HONORARY STREET NAME: REV L.D SIPPLE

Synopsis: Request by members of the Timothy Baptist Church, 1937 N. 24th St., to provide an honorary street name for Rev. L.D. Sipple on Garfield Avenue from 22nd St. to 24th St. presented by Lideana Laboy, Public Works.

Bob Roddy, Public Works Director, said Lideana is not present. I’ll make the presentation and answer any questions. This was a request that the Public Works Department received. It complies with our policy regarding the honorary street naming. The petitioners submitted a report on the contribution Rev. Sipple made to the community over the last few years. In addition, a vast majority of the people along the street did support the honorary street naming of Garfield from 22nd to 24th St.
Commissioner Maddox said I just want to say, I first received a letter for Pastor Sipple. I want to say this on the record. I’ve been knowing him every since I was a kid. He’s been an awesome pastor in the community. Not only that, he’s actually—I believe the church has acquired over nine or ten properties on the street in which the church resides. They keep up those homes, rent them out and make that part of the community look really good. He’s been preaching for over 30 years in our community. I think the street being named after him is a good process. I’m glad that we’re moving forward on it. Commissioner Philbrook asked do you want to move then.

Action: Commissioner Walker made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Philbrook, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Gonzalez, Philbrook, Maddox, Markley.

Item No. 2 – 140178...INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT: FAIRFAX DRAINAGE DISTRICT

Synopsis: Request approval of the 2014 interlocal agreement with the Fairfax Drainage District, submitted by Jim Larkin, Public Works/Water Pollution Control Dept. This includes a modest increase from $186,666 to $189,391.

Bob Roddy, Public Works Director, said this is a yearly interlocal agreement we have with Fairfax Drainage District. Water Pollution pays Fairfax Drainage District maintenance support for the sewers that are owned by Fairfax Drainage District in Fairfax. Water Pollution Control pays this because Water Pollution Control wastewater flows through and uses their sewers in the Fairfax area.

This year we did recommend that they receive a modest increase from $186,000 to $189,000. We have not had any raises with them probably for four or five years. We thought it would be appropriate. In addition, we did receive from Fairfax in a separate letter, that although the interlocal agreement does not discuss the issue of hike and bike trail. They did send us a separate letter at our request confirming that they are supportive of the hike and bike trail that was presented to the standing committee on April 21st. That will in fact happen this summer.
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Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by BPU Board Member Gonzalez, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Gonzalez, Philbrook, Maddox, Markley.

Item No. 3 – 140213...RESOLUTION: 55TH STREET BRIDGE

Synopsis: A resolution declaring the necessity and authorizing a survey of land necessary for the construction of the 55th Street Bridge, north of Leavenworth Road (CMIP 2134), submitted by Ken Moore, Deputy Chief Legal Counsel. It is requested that this item be fast tracked to the June 19, 2014 full commission meeting.

Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said this is fairly a routine action we take on projects when we’re acquiring property. I will note, however, that we have asked to fast track. This has been coordinated with the BPU Nearman Power Plant improvements and other work on 55th.

Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maddox, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Gonzalez, Philbrook, Maddox, Markley.

Item No. 4 – 140212...RESOLUTION: COUNTY LINE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Synopsis: A resolution authorizing an agreement with the city of Shawnee, KS, for the paving of County Line Road from 55th Street to 65 Street, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. The UG’s share of the cost is $101,796, which is in the 2014 budget.

Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said this particular item is funded through the NSRP program and this location. The half of the road that’s on our side was part of the District 6 recommendations for the 2014 program. This interlocal is just the agreement we need to have so the city of Shawnee, who is taking the lead on the project, so that we can reimburse them our share. We’re asking this one to fast tract as well. We’re in the summer construction season and there are just a lot of things we need to clear the plate and get them moving on.
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Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by BPU Board Member Gonzalez, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Gonzalez, Philbrook, Maddox, Markley.

Item No. 5 – 140212...PRESENTATION: PROJECTS FOR KDOT’S “LOCAL CONSULT PROCESS”

Synopsis: Presentation of various projects staff would like KDOT to consider under their “Local Consult Process,” presented by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. This is a process where local governments share their priorities for state-level investments and funding.

Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said I’m going to ask two folks to—Frank Weatherford is here tonight and he is project manager on one of the big projects that we’re going to be talking about but as former chair of the KCK Chamber of Commerce as well. Frank and I have had a number of conversations over the years about how we position our major needs and priorities in front. I also have Jim Pickett here tonight. Jim is the KDOT Metro Engineer.

Jim and I collaborate on a lot of projects. You’ve seen him before. Ultimately, when we take these recommendations and send them forward to Topeka a lot of times Jim’s ability to act as a go between and a representative on behalf of the county’s interest, and Jim excels at that and has really helped us quite a lot over the years in making sure our concerns were addressed and making sure that we understand KDOT’s concern as well. He has done a wonderful job at helping us move a number of projects through.
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KDOT Local Consult Process
- Background

- Regional meetings around the state for local governments to share priorities for state-level investments and funding.
- KDOT also uses the process to gain feedback on state-wide initiatives.
- Held every two years – last meeting was October 2012
- These meetings are quite important – they have influence with KDOT.
- Time is now to prepare for 2014 Local Consult (this fall, TBD).
- Position Paper from 2012 contained both projects and policy input.

The Local Consult process is the formal process KDOT uses to get local jurisdiction involvement. It tends to be every two years. This fall will be the 2014 rounds; specific dates have not been announced yet. Typically, it consists of a regional meeting in each of the KDOT’s six areas. The last time it was in Olathe. The time before it was here in KCK at the Armory. These are very important meetings. There’s no other way to put it. Both in terms of policies positions and things that we want KDOT to think about in the long-term as well as positioning specific projects that are of local concern and interest on the major KDOT system.

This Local Consult really focuses on the major systems. We’ve talked to you about MARC applications and federal funding but this is the stuff that is on the order of I-70, I-35 and I-435 type work. These meetings make a difference. Usually within months after one of these Local Consult meetings you can see how decisions are being made on projects and how things are moving forward. After the 2012 project there was a lot of emphasis on the Village West area and a specific announcement came that following February about moving forward on a preliminary engineering study. It makes a difference what KDOT hears and it makes a difference how we position our projects during these meetings.
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In 2012 we put a letter together which is attached to your agenda packet. What we’re here for tonight is to begin the conversation about the updates to that letter or other information that we want to share with KDOT. In the 2012 letter, we talked a bit about our policy priorities and perspectives as Wyandotte County and these bullet points kind of really hit to the kind of message that we’ve been asking KDOT to consider; which is continue their focus on reinvestment and really prioritizing reinvestment and rebuilds over expansions. Core areas is a priority more than outskirts. That’s because we want to be sure we’re making use of the cities that we’ve already built. We have an awful lot of redevelopment potential here in KCK but if the transportation dollars don’t keep the core area sound, it’s harder for us to necessarily get those redevelopments off the ground.
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A focus on chokepoints and problem spots versus just miles of land expansions, this is a very difficult and pretty high profile policy issue for KDOT around the state. Stay responsive to true demand, keep projects broken up in phases, continue to send the message that Village West is a very special economic development zone and the way it supports our entire county. Transit, walkability, complete streets and aesthetics. This is more and more becoming a factor in nearly every project we talk about. It is probably an area that if you looked 20 or 30 years ago is an area where's there's probably been the greatest change in thinking. We put together a list of our top priorities two years ago. The four dots in blue were very large projects. The five dots in yellow are medium size. I say medium by KDOT standards. They're really quite huge, each one of these projects. I just want to give you a little taste of them.
Large Projects – 2012 List

Large Projects

- L1- Lewis and Clark Viaduct
  - I-70 from Downtown, over the Kansas River
- L2- Missouri River Bridge Replacement at US-69
  - (MoDOT lead)
- L3- K-7 and I-70 Interchange
  - Through phase 4
  - Further work determined by traffic needs and coordination with surrounding communities
- L4- I-35 Northern Leg, 75th St North to State Line
  - Johnson and Wyandotte Counties
  - Of Importance to KU Medical Center/Hospital Campus

The large projects came down to Lewis and Clark Viaduct, Missouri River Bridge Replacement, US-69, K-7 and I-70 Interchange Project and work on the northern leg of I-35. I’m really pleased to say there’s movement on all four of these projects. You all have heard a lot about Lewis & Clark, the Phase I of that three phase project is moving forward.

I will say that Jim Pickett came almost four years ago and said, Bill, we’ve been thinking about this Lewis and Clark Viaduct. We’d like to partner with you all on a study. I commend KDOT for inviting us to be part of that.
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Missouri River Bridge Replacement, MODOT has the lead on that. I think you all have heard quite a bit about that. K-7 and I-70 Interchange, as it stands right now construction is programmed through Phase III. It's a ten phase project. I couldn't begin to explain what happens in every one of those phases. Our opinion was that the construction up through Phase IV would put us at a great resting spot. We expressed some concern that K-7 and I-70 not necessarily take all of the Wyandotte County momentum, because while it's an important project, it's just one of our needs and quite frankly is at the farthest reach of our kind of customer base if you will.
I-35 northern leg, 75th north to Stateline is the TIGER—the middle part of I-35 is KDOT’s current TIGER grant application but the long range studies have talked about that northern leg. There are a lot of constraints; a lot of challenges but our recent discussions with KDOT has confirmed that they recognize we need to keep attention there.

In our next letter we will probably really draw out the KU Medical Center and hospital campus and the need to keep that particular state asset as a high priority and how we think about I-35.

That’s just a picture of where the really large projects are. These are just some pictures. I’ll just kind of walk through kind of remind you the context of each of these investments.
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This is how K-7 and I-70 currently is. It’s already changing. The entire I-35 complex has an awful lot of pieces to it. The medium size lists are probably some projects you might be familiar with.

The Village West area and immediately after the Consult last year, about four months later the announcement came that the I-435 and State Avenue Interchange study would begin. I will tell you that we are poised to being the design stage for State Avenue and Village West here quite shortly. Our entire plan for that had been to have that project shovel ready and to move forward with financing so that construction could occur whenever financing could be secured. That State Avenue in Village West does include pedestrian and bike accommodations. We won’t necessarily—we’ll carry bikes to the Village West and State Avenue intersection and be able to have them access Village West Parkway in and around the stadium until they reconnect with things with points on west. Bike and pedestrians and aesthetics have been a big part of that project.
Lamar Avenue Bridge at I-35, someday the Lamar Avenue Bridge will be replaced. We have plans already for how the railroad could have an overpass there. That’s just a piece of long-range planning that we don’t want to lose out on.

Reconfigure I-70 and 635, the M3 and M5 project are really safety and spot upgrades to the I-70 and 635 interchange and the I-35 and 635 interchange.
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I-70 and Turner Diagonal reconstruction, that would actually be an opportunity when KDOT has those bridges to replace to actually release some land there. That whole interchange was laid out for when it was part of the turnpike and does not need to be so much. It’s all recognized that that could happen someday but we want to make sure that it’s an intentional plan that we’re working towards. Again, these are a picture of where those medium scale priorities fall. They are not medium priorities, they are medium size projects. I’ll walk through these away. One comment that Frank Weatherford shared when he looked at these with me was that we had projects that hit a lot of different funding categories. It’s not like you have to look at this and say which is Project I versus which is Project 9. It’s really a question of how do we position each of these projects to be in the place where they can get the most traction. I’m going to pass around. We made a print of the major map so that you have that as a take home.
Commissioner Philbrook said well this is more of a comment realization that for the lack of money whether it’s statewide or otherwise that it’s pretty hard to put it on a definite timeline, correct? As far as when we expect to do some of these things or do you feel comfortable in putting timelines on anything. Mr. Heatherman said I think we don’t get to put the timeline on them. We can express the urgency. I think what’s really happening at the state level is the state tends to work in 10 year highway bills. They tend to follow the decades. We are in really the middle of the 2010-2020 plan which goes by the name of T-WORKS. My understanding from KDOT planning is now is the time that the 2020-2030 plan is starting to be discussed. This Local Consult and maybe the one after it are really quite important for getting that next ten batch of projects identified and prioritized. I would let Jim maybe comment a little on that.

Jim Pickett, Metro Engineer, KDOT, said I might just mention as Bill said, we’re well into T-WORKS with the projects that are in there that have been identified for funding. As you all know and as the commissioner has mentioned funding is a very important item. As Bill brings this up tonight, the Local Consult, the details are still being worked out on it but I think what we’re going to see there is an overview and a refreshment of where we stand with T-WORKS. This will be an opportunity to point out the projects that have been important to the Unified Government, Wyandotte County. Which projects remain to be important and any new projects that may be coming on the horizon? As Bill said, this is really an opportunity to bring those things up and be heard by KDOT and maybe some other partners that may want to partner with you in pushing for the projects.
BPU Board Member Gonzalez said Bill I had a question there. They’re not ranked in importance for anything. They were numbered. I saw 1-5. Does that mean—Mr. Heatherman said that’s correct. We did not imply a ranking when we shared this letter with KDOT two years ago. BPU Board Member Gonzalez said you could do one end of 635 but not the other end possibly. They won’t be done back to back. Mr. Heatherman said ultimately KDOT takes the Local Consult as just one factor in how the priorities are made. It is important for us if we can to be quite clear on what our number one priority is. The difference between just a wish list and effective strategy comes down to being able to articulate what our priority is and where we would really put the most effort. Probably presenting them this list of nine as presented lacked a little in terms of focus. One of the hopes we have of having this more engaged process with the commission this summer is that when it comes time in October, if we have one clear message we want to send, that’s we’re all on the same page.

Chairman Markley said well, it will come as no surprise to anyone that my favorites are M4 and M5, the Turner Diagonal Reconstruction and they’re reconfiguring I-35 and I-635. Some of you are probably aware from development discussions that we have some developable land along Turner Diagonal that we’ve had difficulty developing specifically because of the highway access there and the way that it’s laid out it just isn’t ideal for a lot of purposes. Commissioner Philbrook said thanks for speaking up for District 8. I so appreciate it. Chairman Markley said well it’s important to me, it’s right there on my edge. Commissioner Philbrook said that’s two of us. Chairman Markley said if we have to prioritize, for me those are two priorities, but most of these I’m at least generally familiar with and they all seem to be worthwhile projects.

Bob Roddy, Public Works Director, said this presentation that Mr. Heatherman just gave is in response in large part to what the commissioners have asked of us, to bring information early and often to you so that you are informed well in advance of decision making. I applaud Bill for putting this together. Chairman Markley said I appreciate it.

Mr. Heatherman said two final points, we’re inviting feedback. As the Public Works standing committee this is the right venue for working the issue. If you feel like other commissioners need involvement or you have something you’d like the staff to do to help widen that message, we’d
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invite comment over the next month and we would plan to come back here before the Local Consult with a revised format of the letter that we would plan to share. The other thing is I would strongly encourage the council and other leadership in the community, including the Chamber of Commerce and others to plan to come to the Local Consult and be part of that. I think I’ve seen a marching band from one of our other communities walk through. That’s just a joke, but the fact of the matter is, that other communities show up in full force with a very clear game plan and when we don’t do that we miss opportunities to make our point known. This is something that really does take more than just a couple folks going and it takes more than just winging it.

**Commissioner Philbrook** said it sounds like we need to put together a bus and make a trip. **Chairman Markley** said I was going to say too, can we get this list from 2012 sent out to the other commissioners just by email to let them know now will be the time to comment. I know it will be in out minutes but some commissioners are not as diligent with that.

**Commissioner Philbrook** said, Bill, you also mentioned other possible sources of revenue to do these different projects because not all of them will have the same source of money. Didn’t you say something about that? **Mr. Heatherman** said that’s correct. **Commissioner Philbrook** said with that in mind, is it possible for you to give us an idea of what some of the different sources could be for the different projects and what kind of monies we’re talking possibilities for. I know it’s kind of like a pipe dream type information in a way but on the other hand these are the things you take into account when you’re looking for money to do these projects. If we can be on the same page that might help a bunch in steering. **Mr. Heatherman** said yes, commissioner, we can do that.

**Mr. Pickett** said I might just make one comment. As we look at the projects that have been authorized to move forward in previous Local Consults, you know we’ve had a line of projects that have been accepted to move forward and some that were below the line that were not.

When I first came to my current position, the I-70 and K-7 project was just listed as PE only project and that was just for moving forward with preliminary design. That would be, probably, should that occur and come out of this next Local Consult, that would be probably the
first step for any project that might be selected to move forward. Once you do that then you’re one step closer to realizing that particular project.

**Commissioner Philbrook** said I just barely remember way back then, I’m being facetious because I remember talking to Bill the first time about State Avenue and that sort of stuff, and that was before I was elected. We talked about the possibilities of what that intersection would look like and just to the west out there at the Legends. I know we were talking at the time about—he knew and he stated very strongly that we have to have our ducks in a row and be prepared as he has repeated a lot of times. When it comes time for the KDOT money and other monies that we’re ready to hit the ground running. I think you have great partners in working with that.

**Chairman Markley** said one other thing I would say is in another round of applications; you sent out a nice email to all the commissioners saying when the comment period opened and those two things were a little different because it was online commenting but the same idea. Could you prepare that kind of email for this as well to let us know when there’s something coming up that public comment would be appreciated for? That was nice because we could forward it on to our constituents. **Mr. Heatherman** said yes, will do. **BPU Board Member Gonzalez** said would you please include Mr. Bryant too. **Mr. Heatherman** said yes. I will do that. **Chairman Markley** said I like how you just volunteered him there. It was great.

**Action:** No action required.

**Item No. 6 – 140216... RESOLUTION: MERRIAM LANE, 10\(^{TH}\) TO 24\(^{TH}\) ST., FUNDING ADJUSTMENT**

**Synopsis:** A resolution approving the increase in funding authority for the Merriam Lane, 10\(^{th}\) to 24\(^{th}\) Street project, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. Local funding requirement has increased from $4.8M to $6.1M. This is a federal aid job administered through KDOT with $4.2M in federal grants. *It is requested that this item be fast tracked to the June 19, 2014 full commission meeting.*
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Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said Merriam Lane is a project that will start construction this summer. It’s a very complicated project and we’ve made a number of decisions based on doing right by the businesses, keeping things open in spite of fairly major utility conflicts, constraints in the project and making quite a bit of investment in the draining infrastructure underneath that road given its longstanding issues. The bottom line is we had budgeted between local and state resources. For the last several years we’ve been holding on a budget of $9M and we knew we were getting tight. Now that all the numbers are in we recognize we need $10.3M in authorization. That $1.3M increase we propose $500,000 through debt of the general fund and $800,000 through debt of the storm water utility. Because of the timing of the project we are also asking for it to be fast tracked so we can confirm to KDOT to accept the very good bid on a complicated project that they have in hand.

Commissioner Philbrook asked how does stormwater feel about that, the $800,000? Mr. Heatherman said stormwater is fine with that. Commissioner Philbrook said I’m just asking because it’s kind of important especially with all the stuff that we’re dealing with, with all the stormwater stuff.

Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by BPU Board Member Gonzalez, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Gonzalez, Philbrook, Maddox, Walker, Markley.

Outcomes:
Item No. 1 – 120155…OUTCOMES

Synopsis: Overviews/discussion on the next phase. PWS outcomes presented at the following standing committee meetings:

August 12, 2013

a. Infrastructure. Improve and finance infrastructure to comply with federal regulations, encourage private investment, and build community.

b. Environment. Ensure natural resources are protected to the maximum extent possible; opportunities for additional natural areas are pursued; and the park system is enhanced.
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c. Public Safety. Provide the public's safety through best practices with results in lower crime rate, safer dwellings and businesses, and efficient court services.

d. Multimodal Transportation. Create a transportation system that moves people to where they want to go including work, services, and amenities.

December 16, 2013

a. Infrastructure. Presentation on the upcoming application round for federal transportation funding administered by the Mid-America Regional Council, by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. Staff estimates the UG is in a good position to be awarded $4-6M which would require local design and matching funds.


c. Public Safety. No discussion

Chairman Markley said it says here that we are open for discussion on where we go from here as far as our outcomes. This is not my committee but they hopefully included our Outcomes in our packet which are infrastructure, environment, public safety and multimodal transportation. I would just open it up for any discussion as far as whether there is a particular topic we would like discuss in the next meeting that we should put on the agenda specifically or whether anyone has any item within our topics on which they would like staff presentation.

Commissioner Walker said I’d like intermodal transportation. What is the future? If we have any plans for the future. We have added some bus routes. I think there are probably some other needs. Commissioner Philbrook said yes, I like that idea. As you say, they’ve been working hard on that in transportation and when you talk intermodal that puts it all together between you know our bus routes, our biking, the whole nine yards. That would be good. Commissioner Walker said the other issues are clearly going to come up for discussion during the budget; it would appear from what we’ve heard so far from the Mayor and certain commissioners. We could build a lot of infrastructure. There’s no question we—I wouldn’t even know where to start or where to finish. I don’t see those. Those are going to go on every year for every commission for many years to come. There are issues with police and fire that are going to have to be
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resolved. I’m not hearing a long-term plan to change or convert to some new type of fire/police system. To me, right now, one of the things we could have a great impact on is the future of intermodal transportation, where we’re at and where we go from here.

Chairman Markley said I will just note, I noticed in my box we each got a request from someone related to the Transit Action Network. It might be interesting to have that discussion and if some of us are meeting with that group to be able to bring back that information. Again, this is not traditionally my committee so I will make note for the minutes that it would be fabulous if staff could be prepared with a brief report on transportation, maybe on what our current routes look like and next meeting we could be prepared to just have a roundtable discussion on planning for that area of our goal.

Mr. Roddy said this Transit Action Network; I assume that is public transportation. I’m not privy to—Chairman Markley said let me pull out the email I received in my box. I think it went to the commissioners. It just says it’s a transit advocacy group working to improve expanded transit in the Kansas City region. It says they were involved in the Rosedale/Argentine route and getting Johnson County transit to put up the JO bus stop signs throughout Wyandotte County. You’re welcome to see the email between meetings. Mr. Roddy said I would enjoy that. Thank you.

**Action:** No action required

Adjourn

Chairman Markley adjourned the meeting at 5:37 p.m.

tp

---
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Staff Request for Commission Action

Type: Standard
Committee: Public Works and Safety Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 8/25/2014
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: Confirmed Date: 9/11/2014

9/11/2014

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

| Date: 8/12/2014 | Contact Name: Bill Heatherman | Contact Phone: 573-5400 | Contact Email: Bheatherman@wycokc... | Ref. | Department / Division: Public Works |

Item Description:
Staff came to the Standing Committee earlier to discuss the MARC grant award process and to solicit recommendations. This communication is to update the elected body regarding the status of this grant award program. The Unified Government is in good position to receive approximately $10.7 million in federal grants for a variety of transportation projects. The match and other expenses needed to undertake these projects require $9.5 million in local funds. Due to timing constraints, several of these projects will need to begin work this year to stay on project schedule. Allowance had been made during the budget process to keep a placeholder sufficient to cover most of these costs – with the intent that specific project awards and amounts would be brought back to this committee for authorization. MARC will not complete their final recommendations until October, but staff feels that the preliminary recommendations from MARC committees are solid enough to justify budgeting for specific projects.

Action Requested:
Staff recommends that the Commission accept the anticipated grants and awards as shown on Table 1, and approve the budget and CMIP amendments as shown in Table 2. Changes are budget neutral.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $
Source:
☐ Included In Budget
☐ Other (explain) As shown in Table 2. Projects had been anticipated, so changes are budget neutral.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimated Construction or Primary Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Funding Award</th>
<th>Estimated Local Funds Required</th>
<th>Anticipated Federal Funding Year of the Grant Obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes Walking School Bus (Education/Outreach, Not Construction)</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes D: Rushton, Midland Trail, Hazel Grove (Construction)</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th &amp; 10th Street Bike Route, Metropolitan to Quindaro</td>
<td>870,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue and 18th Street Intersection</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>2016 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes E: Edison, White, Noble Prentis (Construction)</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 107 Southern Expansion - Operating Funds</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>2015 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 107 Bus/Station Upgrades</td>
<td>1,230,000</td>
<td>1,668,800</td>
<td>908,800</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>2017 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth Rd, East of 63rd to 38th St.</td>
<td>9,400,000</td>
<td>14,300,000</td>
<td>6,960,000</td>
<td>7,340,000</td>
<td>2017 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,819,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,347,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,743,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,604,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Years indicated are hoped-for projections, but not yet allocated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions to the CMIP:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes Walking School Bus (Education/Outreach, Not Construction. Not eligible for bonding)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes D: Rushoton, Midland Trail, Hazel Grove (Construction)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th &amp; 10th Street Bike Route, Metropolitan to Quindaro</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue and 18th Street Intersection</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes E: Edison, White, Noble Prentis (Construction)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 107 Southern Expansion - Operating Funds (Not Bonded)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,334</td>
<td>11,333</td>
<td>11,333</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 107 Bus/Station Upgrades</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth Rd, East of 63rd to 38th St.</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>4,840,000</td>
<td>7,340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Additions for Local Share of Project Costs</strong></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,341,334</td>
<td>3,111,333</td>
<td>4,951,333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,604,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offsetting Adjustments in CMIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered by Existing Sales Tax Funding (Cash) for Safe Routes to School (CMIP #332)</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered by Separate Proposal to be made by UG Transit for Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Southern Expansion Operating Funds (Cash)</td>
<td>-11,334</td>
<td>-11,333</td>
<td>-11,333</td>
<td>-34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered by the Intended Placeholder in Debt Funding for &quot;Major Arterial Roadway (Fed Aid) TBO&quot;</td>
<td>-1,500,000</td>
<td>-2,200,000</td>
<td>-3,400,000</td>
<td>-1,000,000</td>
<td>-8,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Debt Funding for the Placeholder &quot;Residential Collector Reconstruction&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay the Timing of Funds in Debt for a portion of &quot;Donahoo Rd 115 to K-7 Closeout&quot;</td>
<td>-200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Adjustments to Project Timings and Scope (Debt), to be determined in spring 2015 budget process</td>
<td>-880,000</td>
<td>-540,000</td>
<td>1,440,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Offsets from Other Existing Items in CMIP</strong></td>
<td>-200,000</td>
<td>-1,341,334</td>
<td>-3,111,333</td>
<td>-4,951,333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,604,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Adjustment will be Budget Neutral</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Request for Commission Action

Date of Standing Committee Action: 8/25/2014
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 9/11/2014

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>8/12/2014</td>
<td>Bill Heatherman</td>
<td>573-5400</td>
<td>Bheatherman@wycokck...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Description:
KDOT holds a series of statewide meetings every 2 years to receive feedback on statewide transportation priorities. These meetings are called the “Local Consult.” For 2014, the KC Metro area meeting will be Wednesday, September 24th from 9 am to 12 noon at the The Hilton Garden Inn, 520 Minnesota Ave, Kansas City, KS. UG staff is preparing a position paper to be used to guide our discussion of local priorities. Information on our previous local consult positions was shared with this Committee in June. We now ask the Committee to endorse or amend our proposed outline of 2014 priorities (attached). We recommend that as much as possible, we be direct and focused in our requests of KDOT. We also recommend that a delegation of elected officials, local business and community leaders and staff be assembled to magnify our voice at the meeting.

Action Requested:
Staff recommends the UG position in Local Consult be as given in the attached outline, subject to any changes the Committee or Full Commission may direct. A final letter for Mayor’s signature will then be developed for use at the September meeting.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $
Source:
- Included In Budget
- Other (explain)
INVITATION TO KDOT'S
LOCAL CONSULT PROCESS – FOR THE KANSAS CITY METRO AREA COUNTIES

From: Secretary Mike King
Subject: Local Consult Dates

The Kansas Department of Transportation and the Kansas Turnpike Authority want to talk about transportation with your community.

KDOT and KTA are very much looking forward to hearing from local residents about needs and priorities in their communities. We will again talk about projects that are important to consider for preliminary engineering to ensure that we have vital infrastructure investments "shovel ready" should funds become available.

In addition, this year we want to get your valuable feedback about KTA-specific expectations as you travel the Kansas Turnpike system. We will also be sharing the latest outcomes from the Kansas Freight Advisory Committee.

It is important that we hear from you about future transportation investments in your region. We look forward to the dialog and ask that you save the date to attend a local consult discussion near you.

Below you will find details on the locations and dates of this year's local consult discussions. Additional information including agenda will be available at a later date.

Wednesday, September 24th – Kansas City
9am – 12pm
The Hilton Garden Inn
520 Minnesota Ave
Kansas City, KS

The meeting locations are ADA accessible. Persons in need of a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device, large print or Braille material, or other accommodation to participate in this meeting should notify Tammy Torrez at tammyt@ksdot.org or (785) 296-2153 (Voice)/Hearing Impaired – 711. Please make accommodation request at least two weeks in advance of the meeting.
Outline of Priorities of the
Unified Government for Major KDOT Transportation Projects.
To be Incorporated into the 2014 Local Consult Communications

Proposed August 25, 2014

*** STAFF PROPOSAL FOR DISCUSSION ***

Project Priorities – Top 5

1. **I-435 and State Ave., including Village West and State Ave:** Thanking KDOT for undertaking the PES for I-435 and State which should confirm the best design by next year. Then urging KDOT to work with us on a creative local-state-private financing plan so that both projects can move forward to construction in the next 10 years.

2. **Lewis and Clark Viaduct (I-70):** Urging a firm commitment to 2017 construction of Phase I of the viaduct, and requesting an acknowledgment of urgency around completion of Phase II and Phase III in the next 10-20 years.

3. **I-35: Northern-Most Tier:** Requesting that KDOT work with UG and other partners to fund an advanced preliminary engineering study to further define long-term improvements to I-35 from I-635 north to the State Line. This is the next logical step to implementing the recently completed Moving Forward I-35 study. Remind KDOT of the connections with our local road system and KU Medical Center.

4. **K-7 and I-70:** Thank KDOT for commitment to the first 3 phases and acknowledge that Phase 4 is an important step that will address the priorities of today and near term. Suggest that further phases are of lower urgency and should not outpace the true traffic demand or displace other priorities in the County.

5. **I-70 Interchange Safety:** Recommend that KDOT commit to pragmatic safety upgrades in at least one of the following interchanges: I-70/I-635 or I-70/18th Street Expressway. In both locations, there are particular issues with the ramps serving the eastbound to southbound movements which we believe are a high priority.
Other Emerging Priorities

A. **I-70 Urban Corridor Renewal:** Undertake a corridor study of I-70 from Central Avenue to I-435 to ensure that major modifications are being contemplated. Would include considerations for ramp upgrades to I-635 and 18th as noted above, plus consideration of Turner Diagonal and I-635 improvements near Indian Springs to support redevelopment.

B. **Transit:** Remind KDOT of the importance of improved transit service in major metropolitan areas and encourage them to play a strong leadership and funding role to benefit transit providers.

C. **Aesthetics and Pedestrian/Bicycle Friendliness:** Encourage KDOT to continue paying attention to the “human scale” of its transportation investments by incorporating aesthetics and bike/ped features as standard elements of urban-area transportation projects. Ask that KDOT more fully embrace the “Complete Streets” philosophy.

D. **The K-5 & K32 Corridors:** Both historic state highway corridors are in need of joint planning and modernization. On K-5, we have both an eastern section of highly urbanized roadway ripe for redevelopment, whereas the western corridor may require consideration of new alignments. The K-32 corridor connects the southwestern part of our County with industry, commerce and residents and could, with key investments, support improved multimodal connections. Both corridors involve important relationships and priorities of various cities in Wyandotte and Leavenworth Counties. In each case, planning studies are being proposed to better assist in future management, and we ask for KDOT’s ongoing participation and support.
Appreciation for Past Responsiveness

Express appreciation for recent accomplishments and responsiveness to prior Local Consult rounds, including commitments to the following:

- I-435/State Preliminary Engineering Study
- I-70/K-7 - 3 Phases of Construction and Remaining 7 in Design
- US-69 Bridge at Missouri – Joint with MoDOT and under construction this year
- Lewis and Clark Study Master Plan and Cooperation on Aesthetics and Trails
- Ongoing Major Maintenance Work on I-70

Policy Goals Restated

- Reiterate our support for efforts to protect the dedicated sales-tax funding source under T-Works for transportation purposes.
- Target funds towards reinvestment and renewal of existing infrastructure.
- Retain KDOTs heavy focus on system preservation, major upgrades, and improvements to key choke points.
- Target KDOT investments in a way that supported infill and redevelopment.
- Be judicious in funding state highway expansions so as to be responsive only to the highest priority of real needs, and not so hastily as to induce sprawl.
- Prioritize projects consistent with the Visions in the MARC Long-Range Transportation Plan and the KDOT Five-County Study
Staff Request for Commission Action

Type: Standard
Committee: Public Works and Safety Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 8/25/2014
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 9/11/2014
Confirmed Date: 9/11/2014

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

| Date: 8/13/2014 | Contact Name: Brent Thompson | Contact Phone: 573-5400 | Contact Email: Bthompson@wycokck.org | Ref: Public Works | Department / Division: Public Works |

Item Description:
The Unified Government has been implementing its Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) as required by our state permit and the EPA 2013 Consent Decree. One of the required programs is the management of stormwater generated from developed or redeveloped private property in which stormwater treatment facilities have been constructed. An example of a stormwater treatment facility is a detention basin for a commercial site. The Unified Government’s Code of Ordinances, Chapter 8, Article XV requires owners of registered stormwater treatment facilities to regularly inspect and maintain their facilities, and provide an inspection report every two years. As of June 1, 2014, there are 23 stormwater treatment sites registered with the City, twelve (12) of which require an inspection be conducted this year. Because this program is now progressing, the Public Works staff believes that working with and collaborating with the owners will be beneficial in attaining future consistency and compliance.

Action Requested:
Approval of the staff plan to provide the first inspection at no cost to property owners, if those owners agree.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $25,000
Source:
- Included In Budget
- Other (explain) $25,000 in 2014 for 12 inspections, covered by existing funds budgeted in the Stormwater Utility

File Attachment
TO: Public Works and Safety Standing Committee

FROM: Bill Heatherman, P.E. / County Engineer

DATE: August 13, 2014

RE: Post-Construction Stormwater Management Program Implementation Summary

The Unified Government has been implementing its Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), as required by the EPA for most municipalities in the country. Our requirements are similar to those of surrounding communities, such as Kansas City, Missouri. Additional details of program implementation were further defined under our EPA Consent Decree in 2013.

One of the required programs is the management of stormwater generated from developed or redeveloped private property in which stormwater treatment facilities have been constructed. A stormwater treatment facility can typically be a dry or wet detention pond, raingardens, bio-swales, permeable pavement or other structural installations which detain, retain and/or treat runoff generated during storm events, similar to one that was recently installed at the Legends Walmart store (refer to the attached photos). These sites are designed to manage the quantity and improve the quality of stormwater runoff to area streams and lakes, such as Wyandotte County Lake.

The Unified Government’s *Code of Ordinances, Chapter 8, Article XV* requires owners of registered stormwater treatment facilities to regularly inspect and maintain their facilities, and provide an inspection report every two years. As of June 1, 2014, there are 23 stormwater treatment sites registered with the Director, twelve (12) of which require an inspection be conducted this year. Because this program is now underway, the Public Works staff believe that working with and collaborating with the owners will be beneficial in attaining future consistency and compliance.

Our plan is to invite each owner and their engineer/designer to an informational meeting in mid-September 2014 to inform attendees of the Unified Government’s stormwater management program and the specific requirements as outlined in the Code. In an effort to establish and ensure certain standards and quality are followed for inspection and report submittal, the Unified Government will be offering to conduct the first inspection and to
prepare the initial inspection report for each owner whose treatment facility was
constructed prior to December 31, 2014.

For the 12 property owners affected this year, Public Works staff will be notifying each of
via a formal letter. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information. Public Works staff
will schedule inspections with each owner of the 12 stormwater treatment sites, starting in
October 2014. A similar process will be followed for sites that are due inspections in 2015
and 2016.

After the initial inspections are conducted and reports are generated by the Unified
Government, future inspections and submission of inspection reports for all sites on the
current registry and any new sites added to the list after December 2014 are to be conducted
by the owner. If any issues are observed, the owner is required to make all modifications,
repairs, replanting or media replacement as may be necessary and identified in the
inspection report.

If you have any questions concerning this particular program, please contact Brent
Thompson, Stormwater Coordinator, at 913-573-5710 or bthompson@wycokck.org

cc. Bob Roddy, UG
    Brent Thompson, UG
    Jim Larkin, UG
    Chris Burns, Benesch
RE: Inspection of Stormwater Treatment Facility

Dear ____(Property Owner)______:

By our records, you are the owner of the development at __________________. As part of your development, there is a wetland and rain garden on site, which was installed by your contractor to help minimize the environmental impact of your site on downstream creeks and rivers. These features are mandatory requirements of most new developments and are called “Stormwater Treatment Facilities”.

It is important that these features be inspected from time to time to make sure they continue to function. Under our ordinances, those inspections are the requirement of the property owner and must be done every two years. However, as part of the process of helping new owners understand their stormwater treatment devices, we are offering as a City to conduct the first inspection at no cost. We will utilize a professional engineering firm with experience in these systems. The inspection will satisfy your first inspection requirement and will hopefully yield some useful information for you in maintaining them in the future.

If you would like to take advantage of this offer, please contact me at 913/573-5710 or bthompson@wycokck.org.

If you have further questions about how these requirements came to be, please feel free to contact them. The obligation of developers to provide for stormwater protection devices was mandated by the EPA and local regulations to put these mandates into effect, were adopted in 2010.

Sincerely,

Brent Thompson
Stormwater Coordinator
Stormwater Treatment Facilities

Raingarden

Bio-swale

Bio-retention Pond

Porous Pavement

Dry Retention Pond
Staff Request for Commission Action

Tracking No. 140285

Type: Standard
Committee: Public Works and Safety Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 8/18/2014
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 8/7/2014

Confirmed Date: 8/7/2014

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>8/14/2014</td>
<td>Robert Roddy</td>
<td>573-5400</td>
<td><a href="mailto:broddy@wycokck.org">broddy@wycokck.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Description:
With the redevelopment of the old structural steel site in Argentine into a TIF District anchored by a new Neighborhood Walmart store, it was contemplated that a new South Patrol Police Station could be developed within this project area in the future. In working with the State of Kansas Department of Corrections, it appeared our government would have the opportunity to advance the project now and build a new public safety facility which would house both UG South Patrol and the State Parole Office. The project was included in the recently adopted budget, noting that funding would come from sources outside of the General Fund and that the project would need to come back before the Commission to discuss financing options. Staff proceeded forward with the Notice of Need (NON) process to select a design-build team for this project and was anticipating that the potential project and funding sources would be presented to Standing Committees this month. Unfortunately, after reevaluation of the their current situation, the Department of Corrections has notified us that they will not be able to participate as a tenant in the proposed public safety facility. As this information changes our building needs and design, cost per square foot and revenue sources, staff withdrew the NON, while we reevaluate the building and potential revenues.

Action Requested:
Staff will present additional information as to background and current status.

This is for information only.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $
Source:
- Included In Budget
- Other (explain)

0 File Attachment 0 File Attachment 0 File Attachment 0 File Attachment