Public Works and Safety Committee
Standing Committee Meeting Agenda
Monday, March 16, 2015
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 . Standing committee minutes from January 20, 2015.

III . Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 - RESOLUTION: JMHCP GRANT

Synopsis:
A resolution approving submission of a $200,000 grant application for the FFY15 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) through the US Dept. of Justice, submitted by Lisa Stimetz, PSBO. Funds will be used to expand the already established law enforcement and mental health collaboration plan. The $50,000 in-kind match will be a percentage of salary and benefits of KCK Police Dept. and Wyandot Center staff.

Tracking #: 150062
IV. Measurable Goals

Item No. 1 - PRESENTATION: 2015 MOWING PROGRAM UPDATE

Synopsis:

*For information only.*
Tracking #: 150054

V. Adjourn
The meeting of the Public Works and Safety Standing Committee was held on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Kane, Chairman; Commissioners Walker, Markley, and Philbrook. Commissioner Maddox and BPU Board Member Jeff Bryant were absent. The following officials were also in attendance: Joe Connor, Interim Assistant County Administrator; Jody Boeding, Chief Legal Counsel; Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Bill Heatherman, County Engineer; Mr. Tobin, Interim Public Works Director; Debbie Jonscher, Deputy Finance Director; Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning and Land Use; Tim Nick, Public Works Program Coordinator; Ron Stitt, City Architect; and Craig Duke, Deputy Fire Chief.

Chairman Kane called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and all members present are as shown above.

Approval of standing committee minutes from October 13 and November 17, 2014. On motion of Commissioner Philbrook, seconded by Commissioner Markley, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMITTEE AGENDA

Item No. 1 – 140402…COMMUNICATION: RAMP CLOSURE EB TO I-70

Synopsis: Communication regarding the need to close both ramps from I-635 that lead to eastbound I-70 due to KDOT replacing the I-70 bridge deck over Kaw Drive, which is immediately east of the I-635 interchange, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer.
Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said this first is an information item on upcoming work that KDOT is going to be doing on I-70, and we have Jim Pickett with us. Jim is the Metro Engineer out of the Bonner Springs office.

I’ll let Jim introduce the project. It will involve a significant amount of work and detours on I-70 and he’s going to give an overview of the work and also the communication and coordination activities that we’ve had on-going.

James (Jim) Pickett, Metro Engineer, Bonner Springs, said the main reason that we’re here, at least the primary project that I’m here to discuss, is I-70. There’re two bridges that cross Kaw
Drive. If you’ve noticed about every year, the turnpike has had to close down lanes, restrict traffic and do patching. The conditions of the decks have been continuing to deteriorate so we’ve been putting these bridges in for re-decking for several years and we finally, it’s expensive enough, you have to kind of save up your money in order to do it. Just to kind of give you an idea, we’re expecting to be over $10M for that portion of the project.

Associated with that, since we’re going to be affecting traffic somewhat, we’re going to do other repair work and I’ll talk about that just briefly. Probably the main reason that we need to talk to you tonight is the affect that we’re going to have on traffic. As we’re working on the project, we’re going to—there’re two phases that will be constructing this project on. To give you an idea on timeframe, the earliest that the project work can start is March 9 and have to be complete where it’s affecting traffic by December 11, so it’s a pretty extensive timeframe. We’ll be maintaining two lanes of traffic in each direction during the entire project. The thing that we’re doing is both ramps to eastbound I-70 will have to be closed during the entire time of the project. We have marked with the arrows the detours that we plan on utilizing.
Stage 1 Detour Routes

- **SB I-635 to EB I-70:** Kansas Avenue east to 18th Street, north on 18th Street back to I-70.

- **NB I-635 to EB I-70:** State Avenue east to 33rd Street, south to Park Drive, west on Park Drive to I-70 entrance.

- **Kaw Drive Exit:** Continue east on I-70 to 18th Street, Exit and Return to I-70 West to Kaw Drive Exit.

---

Stage 2 Closures

- **Phase Duration:** 4 Months
- **Closures:**
  - Exit 4A: Eastbound I-70 from Southbound I-635
  - Exit 4A: Eastbound I-70 from Northbound I-635
  - Westbound I-70 Entrance Ramp from Park/Kaw Drive
For northbound I-635 traffic, we’re going to try to catch as much traffic as we can at K-32/Kansas Avenue. That traffic that misses that detour, it’ll have to go up exit I-635 and State Avenue, go south on 38th Street and then re-enter I-70 at Park/Kaw Drive. For southbound, we are going to just have to take them on down to Kansas Avenue. Both of those detours will go Kansas Avenue over to US-69, 18th Street expressway and then continue on eastbound on I-70. Those are the things that we’ve been working with the Public Works Department trying to workout the best way to handle this and that’s what we’ve come up with.
Regarding a public involvement program, we had first thought that we would do a mailer. In later discussions and it actually come out of the Public Works Department, why don’t we produce a handout, something that could be taken from door-to-door. We’re going to prepare the handout and Public Works has offered to distribute that to the trucking companies there on Kansas Avenue and anybody that might be beneficial to know this information, then also any other commercial—I really like the one there in the area of State Avenue, east of I-635.

Just real briefly, that’s what I came here to talk to you about. Depending on how you respond to suggestions, we’ll go ahead and develop the public involvement piece and we’ll get that working and going over the next month or so. That’s briefly what I came here to tell you. Do you have any questions or comments about our project?

Commissioner Philbrook said probably the major hang-up is going to be your stoplight there right in front of Kaw Power Plant. Right? Is that what you think is going to be one of your major slow downs is through there? Mr. Pickett said it’s going to be busy. Yes it’s going to be busy. Commissioner Philbrook said so we’re not going to modify how those signals work or anything. We’re just going to let…Mr. Pickett said typically we monitor those things and we work together with the Public Works group and make it the best that we can. Commissioner Philbrook said so in other words you’re thinking about it. Mr. Pickett said yes, absolutely. Commissioner Philbrook said I’m sorry, it’s that I’ve traveled that area so much it’s like. Okay, alright, I figured you guys knew what you were doing but I just had to ask. It’s the human part of me.

The other one that you’re talking about with the blue arrows, that’s the one where you come back down 38th Street, turn right and go under the bridge and then make your left to get on to go east? Mr. Pickett said yes, ma’am. Commissioner Philbrook said just wanted to make sure that I was in the same area you were. You think this is going to be March through December? Mr. Pickett said yes. There’s a lot of work to be done. Commissioner Philbrook said okay, thank you, sir.

Commissioner Walker said if you’re coming south then from the Turner area, you’re going to have to go all the way up to State and take 38th Street to come back east on I-70. Wouldn’t the alternative route for people from the south part, Johnson County and south Wyandotte County, wouldn’t that be 18th Street as an alternative or am I confused? Commissioner Philbrook said that is 18th Street. Oh you mean to take I-35 up to 18th Street? Commissioner Walker said yes,
take I-35 to 18th Street or for me it would be Steele Road to 18th Street and then come north to I-70 as opposed to trying to maneuver that all the way around. Mr. Pickett said you do bring up a good point in that all the traffic that’s going to go east on I-70 anyway they just as well stay out of that mess and by-pass it going to 18th Street Expressway. Commissioner Walker said I mean like Commissioner Markley and myself come to City Hall on a regular basis. Seems like the easier route for us would be, and people in south Turner would be, to move over to 18th Street and come north and hit I-70 east there as opposed to this or anybody really that uses I-35 should just avoid 635 altogether and go to the 18th Street exit and come north. Mr. Pickett said we can handle that a couple of ways but I think it’s a very good suggestion. Commissioner Walker said I think it would move some traffic although it is probably not going to principally affect people until they learn there’s an easier way to go.

Mr. Heatherman said and actually, Commissioner, you hit upon some of the same discussion that Jim and I had early on. The main purpose of the sign detour is to catch those people who are not either the first time through or occasionally coming through and on that, KDOT’s experiences is it’s best to keep to a very clear cut main route. This keeps them on a state highway most of the way. Folks are going to quickly learn any number of backdoors and those who get familiar with this are going to do exactly what you said. That’s going to happen on its own and it’s going to be a good thing because that’ll take the pressure down on the main detour route.

Commissioner Philbrook said so does that mean that you guys are going to have a notification down on I-635 saying eastbound is going to be closed up at I-70 off I-635 so it already routes them around to 18th Street? Mr. Pickett said that’s something we could easily add. As we do these projects, we come up with our best guess in advance of the letting and then we make adjustments as we go. Commissioner Philbrook said well, I know you guys are flexible but I was just asking that question especially since Commissioner Walker brought that up with directing people before they even bother coming up I-635 to go east on I-70. Mr. Pickett said let me introduce, if I can, Paul Gripka. He’s our field engineering administrator and he’s a key guy in developing these plans and to comment.

Paul Gripka, Field Engineer Administrator, said we put these together with El Picko Ditra, we always recognize these are the people that are not familiar with the area so you direct them the
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best way you can to get through. Also, with trucks, a lot of times they can’t take some of the other routes. We know that the first few days it could very well be some kind of chaos, people going all over and finding their routes. Normally after the first week it settles down. We thoroughly expect a lot of people to just entirely avoid this area to get through there which would take some of the pressure off.

The other reason why we actually—there’s a real short distance in there on those ramps before they get to the bridge and that’s why we’re closing the ramps partly. The other thing is when you have merging traffic into a main stream like that, it causes a lot more backup so you carry a whole lot more traffic through if you don’t have the ramps verging in. We found that out recently here on our new setup on K-7 and I-70. The thing that will carry traffic very nicely was before the ramp got reconfigured in that same area was one lane, all of a sudden we were backed up to the toll roads on two different days with about a seven mile backup. They show you what the difference can be of having ramps coming through and just trying to carry the I-70 traffic through so that is also part of what we’ve done here.

Based on our experience, this will probably be the best approach and we will be using—we’ve got the scout boards that are on at 635 and then on I-35 and all that. They will be involved in the public part of it ahead of time. Not everybody reads those we know that too but anyway it’ll help. Commissioner Philbrook said you can try.

*Item No. 2 – 150010…VIDEO: WASTEWATER SYSTEMS VIDEO – OVERFLOW CONTROL*

**Synopsis:** The UG will be making major investments in our wastewater system to meet the demands of the EPA Consent Decree. At the same time, these investments will help us address long-standing maintenance and capacity issues within our system, submitted by Bill Heatherman, County Engineer. A video has been developed to help inform and educate our citizens about this program and the need for the investment.

**Bill Heatherman, County Engineer,** said this second item, we came here in August I believe and shared a little information about the upcoming public outreach program we would be doing with the Overflow Control Program. We are just now kicking off our road show phase so if you have any community groups, neighborhood groups that you would like us to be in attendance and give our public information message to, you can share that with me. We will get in contact with them
and get scheduled up. It is our goal to be on the road sharing this information high and low. Part of that is to have this video that was put together by our consultant to share the basic information. As this program evolves over a series of years, we can take this base template and update the message as things goes along. This first video is really intended to help folks understand the big picture of what we’re doing with the sewer program and our EPA mandates. With that, I’ll have us go ahead and play the video.

**Video presentation**

UGVideo12.1.2014.mp4

Mr. Heatherman said just about the amount of time it takes to make the popcorn to watch it so with that we would take any questions. I have Jim Larkin with me here. Any questions about the video, our outreach plan or the program that we have coming up?

Chairman Kane said no questions. That item is for information only.

**Action:**  No action

**Item No. 3 – 150007…GRANT: STORMWATER QUALITY EDUCATION PROGRAM**

**Synopsis:** Stormwater Quality Education Grant Program is a requirement of the UG’s Stormwater Management Plan and the EPA Consent Order. The grant would be implemented in 2015 with an annual budget of $30,000 funded from the Stormwater Utility Fund, submitted by Sarah Fjell, Engineering.

**Brent Thompson, County Surveyor and Stormwater Coordinator,** said I’m here on behalf of the stormwater team to brief the committee on an educational grant program that we started working on in 2014. Under our Stormwater Management Program and the EPA, we are required to implement in 2015. The purpose of this grant is to promote stormwater quality through educational outreach programs. Some of the details of the program are we have a $30,000 annual budget for the grant. What we’ve done is we set a ceiling of $5,000 per project for these grants.
The program was modeled after a few other types of grants that were around the community; one being Johnson County Public Works and the other one, MARC (Mid-America Regional Council). We also did some internal interviews with staff that put on a grant program last year, H2O to Grow. We were able to interview some of them and get some good feedback and lessons learned. We feel that we vetted this pretty well and that we obviously will have some lessons learned but think that we’ve done a pretty good job in being able to put this grant program out there. The project will be in Wyandotte County and will serve residents and businesses. The program is intended to support local youth and community groups, schools, not-for-profit organizations and other eligible entities.

I think that everybody received an application form and packet that kind of—we’ve gone through and streamlined this a little bit to make it a little easier for people to want to apply. Some of the grant applications get a little too involved. We’re trying to gear this toward teachers and so forth to fill that out. Basically this time is pretty much just for informational purposes and some endorsement from you guys. If you guys have any questions, we would be willing to answer.

Commissioner Walker asked you’re familiar with what Johnson County has done with this similar grant money and the kind of projects they’ve funded, either of you. Give us some examples of what you’re looking for with $5,000. It doesn’t have to be anything anybody would do here. Just what have people done with this kind of money in other communities? Mr. Thompson said I think what we’re looking at is for teachers to do rain garden type things at a school, maybe a Boy Scout project. For an Eagle Scout, if you’re familiar with the scouts, Eagle Scouts have to prepare a project. Maybe being able to do something for a church that may have some water issues, or anything to build, a rain garden, there’re rain barrel type projects that could be built with this. Just along those lines and those kind of type of projects; whatever we can do for water quality, pure education as well.

Chairman Kane said is there anyone in the audience that would like to ask questions on this. Seeing none, I accept a motion.

Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walker to approve. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Philbrook, Markley, Walker, Kane.
Item No. 4 – 150012…COMMUNICATION: SOLID WASTE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Synopsis: It is required by the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) that each county have a Solid Waste Planning Committee. It is also required by KDHE that the Solid Waste Master Plan be reviewed on an annual basis by the Committee and be approved by the Board of County Commissioners, submitted by Tim Nick, Public Works.

Tom Nick, Program Coordinator Public Works, said I’m here on behalf of the Solid Waste Committee. It’s required by KDHE on an annual basis to meet with the Solid Waste Committee and review our annual, I’m sorry, our five-year plan. We met in November of this year. Basically there was only one real small change to the plan this year and it actually took effect at the end of 2013 when we closed the recycling center. We shut that down. We then opened it back up in October of this year 2014 as a yard waste drop off center which did really well for the two months we had it opened. We closed it down for the winter months. That’s the only change that really takes effect.

A little note about the recycling center closing down, we got our numbers back from Deffenbaugh the other day and the curbside recycling went up almost 5% for 2014 once we closed the recycling center. As far as the review, we just need to forward the changes up to KDHE. We need approval from the full commission.

Chairman Kane asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on this matter. Seeing none, I’d entertain a motion.

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

Item No. 5 – 110073…OVERVIEW: COMPLETE STREETS
Synopsis: Overview of complete streets, presented by Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Land Use and Development.
Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Land Use and Development, said being passed around to you is a copy of the presentation and a copy of our complete streets resolution. I would note for those in the audience here, there are copies of both on the table behind me.

**Introduction to Complete Streets**

January 2013

I was asked to give you all a brief presentation on what are Complete Streets and how does it impact our city. I’m using a presentation developed by Smart Growth America and the National Complete Streets Coalition. This is out for use by the public without their permission so this is a copyrighted presentation but we have permission as a public entity to use it.
What are complete streets? They are streets that are for everyone no matter who they are or how they’re using the street by traveling. Whether you’re on a bike, walking, in a car, or on a bus, the street needs to accommodate all of us. There are a couple of pictures on the next two slides showing different ways that people get around and the interaction of people on the streets including those that have a disability of some kind.
Americans do want choices. Sixty-six percent of us say we want more options to have freedom to choose. Most of us have no choice but to drive because where we live and how we’re situated in relationship to the rest of our community. Most of us would like to spend less time in our cars. Sorry, Chairman Kane. **Chairman Kane** said trucks are okay.
Mr. Richardson said 59% say that we need to improve our public transportation including trains, buses and make it easier to walk and bike to reduce traffic congestion. There is another percentage there. The remaining 41% that think we need to build more roads and expand existing roads to help reduce congestion. There’s probably some degree of both of those that we need to do.

We do have a lot of potential here. Thirty-nine percent of all trips in the country are less than three miles and 17% are less than one mile. Of those trips that are less than one mile, nearly half of them are trips we get in our car to make.
Every trip starts with walking whether you’re walking to your garage or from your apartment to the bus stop, we do walk as part of our trip.

This slide shows just how much people will walk. There’s a good percentage of us about one-third of us that would walk a mile or so to work and about half of us would walk a mile to a
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church or a school. If you get beyond that, the percentage is pretty small of the very aggressive more athletic ones of us that would bike or walk three or four miles to work, church or school.

So who would want a more complete street? Forty-seven percent of older Americans say it’s unsafe to cross a major street near their home. There’s a lot of data about wide streets and elderly or disabled folks crossing streets and the number of pedestrian accidents that are resulting there in big wide streets and the crossing times that you have in signal phase to walk across the street are often not lengthy enough to allow pedestrians to fully cross those streets. I don’t know if we have many of those here, but in the bigger cities sometimes you get that. Fifty-four percent of older Americans living in inhospitable neighborhoods say they would walk and bike more often if the built environment improved. That probably fits our community pretty well, and 56% expressed their strong support for adoption of the Complete Streets policy which we have already.
Who else wants them? The millennials. I think if you look at the River Market and the folks that live over there, I think the millennials fit a good portion of that and with the streetcar coming over across the river, you’ll see a lot more folks that want that type of feel and atmosphere for some or all of their life.

The real reason is safety. There’re a lot of deaths that occur where there’s no crosswalk or sidewalk available. We need to have a policy that makes sure that we have good places for folks to cross the street where they need to cross.
The statistics are especially bad for people of color, for low-income communities and for older adults. If you want to look at the population segments that are really hit by this safety factor, those are the ones.

A lot of our streets in our community don’t have a sidewalk and some of them aren’t safe to cross on foot because of the signal configurations or the width of the street or some other reason.
Many streets for one reason or another are not safe for bicyclists.

Traffic jams and arterials and things like that create crashes. This isn’t a very good picture for an example for our community, but we do have streets that have congestion and have accidents in that congestion.
Sometimes we’re not inviting for the folks that ride our transit services.

We’re still in a program working on improving our ADA accessibility throughout the community.
Sometimes we just don’t make room for people. A great example that we fixed is along State Avenue with the grant funding over about the last six or seven years. We used to have streets that had this kind of a path down the side of them and now they have nice sidewalks for folks to walk on. We did other improvements along that line as well.
We do know how to build them right or more correctly. Just some examples here of different places where you can see that there’s a crosswalk, a bicycle lane, traffic lanes, turning lanes and they’re all distinct and separate, well marked.
We do have some roads that still turn out more like this. One of the other nice things that State Avenue did—probably our biggest intersection that had that look was 78th & State. We made a lot of major improvements at 78th & State to make it safer for everyone.

We do have a few of these sidewalks that come to an end, but we’re working on that.
Once again, this is an ADA issue that we’re working on throughout the community.

The solution is the Complete Streets Policy which we have and I’ve provided a copy of that to you.
Basically we make sure that the entirety of the right-of-way is planned and constructed for all that are going to use it so that it’s safe to operate a vehicle, so it’s safe to be on your bike or to walk, to get on the bus and that they all can interact together in a safe way.

Complete Streets policies

Ensure that the entire right-of-way is planned, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to provide safe access for all users

Complete Streets means:

High-level policy direction
Change the everyday decision-making processes and systems
Incremental approach
Long-term results
It takes a high-level of policy direction and a high-level of preplanning. These don’t happen by accident. We kind of changed the way we think about this everyday. How do we build a street? Mr. Heatherman, Mr. Tobin and before them, Mr. Roddy, worked on this and several of our new street projects to make sure that we had a better street outcome.

To make every street the most ideal, complete street is very expensive. We know we can’t do that but we have a policy that let’s us decide what facilities are important, on which street and what are the primary safety mechanisms we need to look at and examine on each street.

It’s not one street or one project. It’s kind of a way you look at every street that you go about building or reconstructing. It’s not saying we have to rebuild all of these at once. We know that this is going to be an incremental phased in issue over time. It’s not a silver bullet because we have all of these other issues that we have to deal with what’s around the street, environmental concerns and how much traffic is actually in the area.

The next few slides are just going to go through some different types of streets and how you might consider them to be a complete street.
Here you see a rural road with a side path.

In some communities you can share the streets because the traffic volume is low enough.
If it’s signed properly, you can narrow the streets down.

This is kind of a main street issue.
We have a center median and we have diagonal parking but once it’s fully constructed then there would be the bike lanes adjacent to the traffic lane with the parking closest to the sidewalk, more urban streets.

This might be what Minnesota Avenue could look like. We have a center median and we have diagonal parking but once it’s fully constructed then there would be the bike lanes adjacent to the traffic lane with the parking closest to the sidewalk, more urban streets.
Traffic calming devices and so you have a lot of different ways of calming traffic whether it’s texture or a speed table or I’d rather have a roundabout than a traffic circle but… Chairman Kane said that’s your opinion.

Mr. Richardson said and then we have buses and rapid transit. Our connex system is our most rapid transit.
Then there are ways to work within each neighborhood to make the street more friendly for the neighborhood and to prevent some of the cross traffic and through traffic in a neighborhood. We’ve done that in St. Peters Waterway neighborhood. We’ve done some work in there that helps calm the streets to make them safer and more complete just by how traffic can circulate the neighborhood.

This is kind of a new strategy and it’s angled head-out parking. You back into the parking place. You have to do a backup maneuver one way or the other so you do this at the beginning instead of...
at the end. We don’t have any of this in the city right now, but it might be something that’s proposed in the near future.

There are many different bikeways and how to do bikes. You can have a separate a cycle track which is where you’re fully separated by curb from the traffic and the parking or bike lanes and several others.

There are the roundabouts. Then paved shoulders are another way to do it.
I’m using their presentation sir; I’m not really intentionally bringing that up over and over again. There are links here for more information on this.

The committee that put this together.
Our ability to use the copyrighted presentation.

That’s what I prepared for you this evening. Once again, I provided you with a copy of our policy that we’re currently using. I would encourage you, if this is a topic of interest to you, that Smart Growth America and the National Complete Streets Coalition, they have more material on their website. I’ve downloaded presentations of other communities that have complete streets policies and the number is growing. In 2011 when we adopted ours, there were a couple of hundred
complete streets policies and now in 2013, there were over 600. We were kind of at the front end of that curve with our policy and you know I think that’s a good place for us to be. We weren’t the first ones to adopt it, but we’re working through to make our community better and how we build our streets.

Commissioner Markley said my question out of all of this, we do have a policy in place? Mr. Richardson said yes.

(Audio failure)...by claims to Village West area so that their folks can ride to the jobs that are nearby and the entertainment and other things there. When we looked at 39 Rainbow when that project there at $39^{th}$ & Rainbow came forward, we looked at the sidewalks, the turning movements, the pedestrians that are in that area, we looked at the transit in that area and we didn’t provide for bikes on Rainbow because we think there are alternate routes that would be better for bikes than on Rainbow at $39^{th}$ & Rainbow in particular. The slope is not conducive to bikes and high traffic right there so we think we’ll find a different way around that.

When we go to rebuild a street—we have two examples, State Avenue and Merriam Lane that we’re really undertaking a major reconstruction. State Avenue was planned before we had this policy in place. It does a pretty good job with most things but the bicycle. The other one, Merriam Lane, that has kind of a long history that started out—the idea of just paving the shoulders that were already paved and using them as bike lanes but then when the whole street really needed to be rebuilt anyway, it turned into a more complete street. When it’s done, it will be a very complete street. It will have parking and bike lanes, and sidewalks and it’ll be a very complete street.

On the private side, we haven’t had a lot of private streets built since we initiated this policy. We initiated this somewhat toward the middle of the recession. We haven’t had a lot of new subdivisions come in. Before that, this subdivision unfortunately didn’t get built, but the New Market Subdivision at Leavenworth and I-435 to Hutton there would’ve had many complete streets. All of its streets would have fit the profile of complete streets because of what the developer wanted and the way it was designed.

I would say in most of our subdivisions, we have a sidewalk and a lot of those are low enough traffic that it’s kind of a shared situation. Once you get out onto the main road and sometimes within some of the subdivisions, there’s a long main road where we may want to look
at a bike lane or something that’s more significantly signed but we really haven’t had those issues come up since the policy was in place.

We’re working on 98th Street and due to budget constraints, we’re kind of making that a complete street in phases because we couldn’t afford the sidewalks in the first phase but there’s really not a lot of traffic along there right now. As development occurs, it will have the capacity for making that a more complete street. Once again, the planning for that street was really done prior to the Complete Streets policy. We’re pretty new into this, but that’s how we would use it and how we have used it.

Chairman Kane asked if there were any more questions. Commissioner Philbrook said no, just a statement. I know that Bill Heatherman is right in the middle of planning and it’ll be going on for a while for Leavenworth Road. I’m sure he’s planning on having all that complete streets and I guarantee you speaking for those people that live along there, they’re going to be a bunch of happy campers that they’re going to have places to walk instead of pushing baby strollers up and down Leavenworth Road which is very dangerous. Thank you for adopting that, the complete streets and following that along.

Action: No action.

Item No. 6 – 150013…COMMUNICATION: DESIGN/BUILD FACILITY

Synopsis: Approved as part of the 2015 CMIP Budget was a project to construct a facility that would house Fire Maintenance and Supply, and the Water Pollution Control (WPC) Sewer Maintenance Construction, Sewer Maintenance Operations & Maintenance, WPC Records and Mapping, and Pump Station Operations and Maintenance. These two operational groups would share a pre-existing UG owned site, but not share the same structure, submitted by Mr. Tobin, Interim Director of Public Works.

Mr. Tobin, Interim Director of Public Works, said we’re here tonight to talk to you about a project that’s been a part of the long-term CMIP for both the Fire Department and Water Pollution Control Public Works for a long time. Not to be redundant because you’ve already approved the project, but both of these divisions are large. They have sprawling operations. Two key parts of their operations are located in non-central, often isolated parts of the county. This project was
envisioned not only to centralize some of their operations, but but to put them it a place where they can respond better to the public. In Fire, the main response would be the repair of the vehicles so they wouldn’t have to traverse all the way—everybody wouldn’t have to go east to Fairfax. With Water Pollution Control, their maintenance crews are dispatched across the railroad tracks down on Ohio. Railroad tracks are often blocked by trains. This project was approved; we moved forward. The site selected preliminarily was out at 82nd and Riverview on property that we own and you approved the budget at $4.25M.

As we move forward in the design build process, it became apparent quite early that that budget was not going to meet the needs of these two departments. The reason I’m here tonight is to update you on that and present some options to you. As you know, Water Pollution Control is—well, let me back up. The Fleet Center sits, which you’re all familiar with, on 22 acres. It has roughly 200 and some employees in it. Water Pollution Control has 70 some employees shoved into 3.5 acres with close to 60 or 70 pieces of equipment. They’re running three different operations out of there: construction, sewer maintenance and flood pump maintenance. They need room to grow plus with more federal mandates coming, those operations are going to expand.

The Fire Department currently has, well they’ve been living out of storage bins that have been stored at various fire stations throughout the community. They’re doing all of their maintenance on vehicles right now at Fire Station 15. They have vehicles stored at different fire stations throughout the community in a non-central manner. This project, we believe as a staff and Ron Stitt, Staff Engineer, is here with me, we believe that we need to adequately fund this project in order to move forward.

The three options that we would present tonight for you to consider is: 1) of course we could move ahead as you’ve already approved it at $4.25M, 2) we could move ahead with the project with the understanding that the funding would be increased as we moved into the budget process and the revised 2015 budget or, option 3) we could wait and just move this into the revised budget process. Obviously, as a staff, we would prefer option #2 but we’re here for discussion and to bring this before you all tonight and to get direction. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Walker asked how much? Mr. Tobin said the total budget number right now is closer to $6M. By the way, this is a bond project. It’s GO bonds that are funding this and one
thing I forgot to mention was on the Fire side, if you will recall they did have an adequate facility that we moved them out of when Schlitterbahn moved in. **Chairman Kane** said as much as I’d like to go ahead and pass this along, I think since it’s such a huge impact that I think that we would need to take it back with a revised budget and involve all the commissioners, not just four of us.

**Mr. Tobin** said I agree with you, Commissioner, in that it is a big project and it’s one that we want to do right. We don’t want to go in there and not have a successful project because first of all we don’t do this very often. In my forty years here, we’ve built one such facility like this and it took over 30 years to convince them to do that.

**Commissioner Walker** asked with the revised budget, will the site remain the same. Is that big enough to accommodate what you want? **Mr. Tobin** said oh, yes, more than big enough. **Commissioner Walker** said so we’re really just looking at the funding to make the facility adequately sized. **Mr. Tobin** said that’s correct.

**Commissioner Philbrook** asked how does that since you’re going to do GO bonds, how does that affect us on how much per year more we’re going to be putting out. Any idea for the payments? **Mr. Tobin** said it would be roughly $1.5M over 20 years whatever that works out to. **Commissioner Walker** said probably around $30 to $40,000 a year. **Mr. Tobin** said that’s more of a question for Lew. **Commissioner Philbrook** said well I know it is, but you brought it to us and dumped it in our laps so we’re going to obviously ask about money. That’s our job and so approximately between $30 and $40,000 a year. **Commissioner Walker** said in my closest guess. **Chairman Kane** said wait a minute, we’ve got an expert. We have the second expert. **Debbie Jonscher, Assistant Finance Director**, said it would probably be about $70 to $75,000 on the principal amount. **Commissioner Philbrook** said per year so we’re adding another $75,000. **Chairman Kane** said and that’s exactly why I think we need to take it to the revised budget. If the other commissioners were sitting on a committee and made a $70,000 move on our part, it might rattle our baskets a little bit. I want to do it and I know we need to do it and we’ve abandoned them, but as we prepare for this budget already, we’ve run into some budget overflow.
**Commissioner Walker** asked when was construction scheduled to begin. **Mr. Tobin** said we had hoped to be in the dirt before the end of 2014. **Commissioner Philbrook** said so we’re already behind. **Mr. Tobin** said one further finance note that I must bring up is the Water Pollution Control portion of the GO debt will be repaid by the Sewer System Fund. Isn’t that correct, Debbie? **Commissioner Philbrook** asked what’s that now. **Ms. Jonscher** said $3.2M, currently $4.2M. **Commissioner Philbrook** said it’ll still be if we went up to $6M, it would be $3.2M. Right? That’s what I’m asking. **Mr. Tobin** said no, it’s not a 50/50 break on the funding of the project. **Commissioner Philbrook** said well, I’m asking if the $3.2M is a solid no matter what. **Mr. Tobin** said yes, it is. **Commissioner Philbrook** said so that’s the question. The $3.2M or the $4.5M would be from the…

**Commissioner Walker** said my only issue is I don’t want to wait until the end of 2015 to break dirt again. I mean that’s just—we won’t do the revised budget until summer. I mean we should be able to refer this to the full commission for discussion. I know the Mayor doesn’t or somebody doesn’t like the idea of budget items before the revised budget, but we need to give some indication that we’re going to be with or against this project at a certain level and move forward with it or not. It’s a project I don’t think anybody’s going to dispute. There’s need.

**Commissioner Philbrook** said so as I understand it, it’s possible that we could talk about it under special session under financial strategies and that way we can cover that then. **Commissioner Walker** said yes. I think we need to move this on a faster track than waiting until August to make a decision. **Commissioner Philbrook** said so then we can bring it to special session on Thursday. **Jody Boeding, Chief Counsel**, said yes. **Commissioner Walker** said well, whatever, as soon as—**Chairman Kane** said whenever that squeezes in Joe. I think this is something that all of us need to come back, Mike and everybody and say alright, here’s the effect and I agree I don’t want to wait until that. If we get all the commissioners together and say alright, this is what we need but while we’re doing that, then they’ll know what effect that will have to the budget.

**Mr. Tobin** said please note that the delays will just cost us more money. If the construction start was pushed off nine months to a year, that number might not be good. **Commissioner Philbrook** said that’s why we’re pushing it for special session. **Commissioner Walker** said we want you breaking dirt this summer. I do.

January 20, 2015
Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to bring this item before special session as soon as possible, where we can fit it in so we can move forward with this, so we can break ground this year. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Philbrook, Markley, Walker, Kane.

Item No. 7 – 150014…COMMUNICATION: FEES FOR THE NEW RESIDENTIAL HOME CONSTRUCTION

Synopsis: Continue discussion of the assessment of Unified Government fees for new residential home construction, submitted by Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator. The waiver of these fees ended on December 31, 2014.

Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator, said what’s coming around are two charts to help you continue your discussion about the waiver of building permit fees and sewer connection fees. You saw this slide at the Standing Committee on Economic Development and Finance and so you kind of know what our history was during the period that we waived the
connection fees. The next slide shows where we compare with other municipalities in the metro area. We tried to take a range of municipalities to show what really the total costs as much as we could call out from the data we had of what it cost for building permit fees and sewer connection fees. You see we’ve looked at these selected municipalities just to see where we fall out. Just kind of the raw data of what it cost us compared to other municipalities. As you see, we are pretty low compared to our counterparts across the metropolitan area.

This is just a sense of what, again, where we fall with our fees. Again, just for comparison sake, here’s kind of how we fell out and this is just for the year that we had the waiver of the fees. We tried to compare apples to apples. Some of the municipalities have other fees that we did not include like impact fees, street fees so we didn’t include those but some of those fees municipalities added are included which drove up the total cost.

We just presented this as additional information to the Standing Committee to give you a sense of where we fall in relationship to other municipalities as you all debate further this policy.

**Commissioner Walker** said I should tell you I sat on that committee as the substitute member when this number of builders from the area that are actively building in Wyandotte County up here. There may be some of them here tonight. I can’t tell for sure.

Their principle argument about continuing the waiver was what I would like to see along with this graph is what taxes are on a $200,000 house in each of these and how we compare to Leawood, Olathe and Overland Park. When you look at this, it’s clear that they can get that kind of money because people are willing to pay it to live there. The idea of us waiving our smaller fee had more to do with the concept that our taxes on a $200,000 house, just for example, are significantly higher than it would be in Leawood, Olathe and Overland Park. To what extent that’s true, I can’t tell you because other than knowing that they are higher, the friends I have that live in Johnson County and what they pay for a more valuable house which is less than what I pay. Do the two wash or does this really by waiving this $2,000 fee, does it help sell a house and pull a permit or not. I think the committee, the Economic Development Committee was it recommended approval of this and forwarded it well I guess to us—**Mr. Criswell** said that’s correct. **Commissioner Walker** said I didn’t remember it was going here and then—**Chairman Kane** said they threw the bone our way. **Commissioner Philbrook** said well, I think they just wanted to make sure that it crossed all the commissioners. **Commissioner Walker** said all the commissioner’s paths now. I didn’t have trouble with extending it another year because we are
showing an increase. Now is that increase related to the waiver of the fee or is it related to the general uplift of the building malaise that has afflicted us for the last five or six years? I can’t answer that.

Joe Connor, Interim Assistant County Administrator, said I just want to clarify from the last standing committee meeting that this got punted over here, there was no approval or recommendation, of approval. It was more of—Commissioner Markley said I sensed that. Mr. Connor said this is the next opportunity to bring it up because it was the building season and so they wanted this discussed by the commission sooner rather than later so it was given to this committee for, for us to bring further information to. Commissioner Walker asked aren’t we going to have to ultimately, as a full commission, have it now punted to the full commission for a decision. Mr. Connor said absolutely, yes. Jody Boeding, Chief Counsel, said I think they want a recommendation.

Action: Commissioner Walker said well, I’m prepared to recommend that we waive the fee for another year. Evaluate it as part of the yearend process well in advance of the end of the year. We’re already doing this at a time when building permits, I assume, would’ve been pulled in January and pay for a building that would occur or start maybe in two months. Commissioner Philbrook asked so is that a motion sir? Commissioner Walker said that is a motion. Commissioner Philbrook said second.

Commissioner Markley said I was just going to say to clarify. The motion is we extend it for a year and discuss it as part of the budget. Commissioner Walker said well, yes. I don’t want to wait until January of next year to discuss waiving it again. It needs to be on the Administrator’s calendar for either strategic planning or budget or sometime in October. Are we going to extend it yet again another year and maybe at the full commission meeting we can compare what taxes would be on an example of a home. I’m not sure in Leawood if there’re many $200,000 homes.

Ms. Boeding said staff did want some clarification if you were going to make a motion to extend the waiver. Is it blanket all new buildings or there was some discussion among staff where it’s already platted areas. They’re in the works that you want to give them the benefit. I’d call on
Rob Richardson he can—there are different categories that you could extend the waiver as opposed to making it blanket. I think you should talk about that and at least consider it. Commissioner Walker said for the purposes of sending it forward, I’m making it blanket. Ms. Boeding asked well, can Rob explain what the two differences are. Commissioner Walker said well if we must. Ms. Boeing said it’s not that he’s advocating one or the other. Commissioner Walker said well, it’s not like we don’t understand, Jody. Ms. Boeing said well, I don’t understand, that’s why I’m asking.

Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning and Land Use, said there are subdivisions that are preliminary platted and subdivisions that are final platted. The subdivisions that are final platted have had the streets put in already. The way this exemption was originally passed was for those streets that were already built, where that big investment had been made, to help fill those up. Last year we had two new subdivisions, extensions of existing subdivisions with new streets that were approved to be built. Do you want to extend that to those new re-platted final platted lots where the new streets are going in or did you only intend for it to be to the lots that were final platted as of when the recession started? That was our primary question I think but a blanket is a blanket. We understand that.

Commissioner Walker said my intent was to give everybody who’s going to build a new home in this calendar year a level table. What I understand is that would not be a level table if it’s already been platted. They’re going to end up paying more for their lot and connections than the guy who now comes in and gets/pulls a permit and plats the subdivision. Mr. Richardson said I think it would be the opposite of that. The existing final platted lots would get the exemption. If you were going out and building a new street in a new subdivision, a new street, then that would not get it, get the exemption. We don’t have any position. We just want to make sure because there was some language that was confusing to the staff in the original resolution to whether or not this would apply to that new subdivision, that subdivision that was extended with a new street in the last year. What you’re saying is yes, it would and that would be the position taken. Commissioner Walker said for me I wanted it to be a level table for every builder and every buyer. I don’t see it being level unless we do that.
Chairman Kane said before we vote on it, there were some people that wanted to talk. Did you still want to talk because the ball is rolling the way you want.

Rusty Roberts, 11212 Rowland and work at 2100 Hutton Road, said the family’s developed a long time in Kansas City, Kansas, on residential and commercial. I’m just going to keep this real simple. Out of the whole Kansas City area, Kansas City, Kansas, has roughly about 8% of the population. Right now as far as the building permits, we’re right around 3%, between 3 - 4% of the whole city as far as building permits. We’re way behind. We’re losing business, we’re losing new homebuyers that we should be getting. They’re going elsewhere. It’s pretty simple when you do the math that way instead of looking at all the comparisons and the taxes and this and that and whatnot. We’re falling behind and that’s about all I want to say.

Chairman Kane asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak against this particular item. No one appeared.

Roll call was taken on the motion and there were four “Ayes,” Philbrook, Markley, Walker, Kane.

Commissioner Walker asked now that’s going to be referred to the full commission. Chairman Kane said yes. Ms. Boeding said it will be on consent agenda. If you want discussions then we’ll have to pull it. Commissioner Walker said someone will if they want it. I want to see you guys build lots of homes this year so I don’t look like a fool at the end of the year for pushing this.

MEASURABLE GOALS

Item No. 1 – 120155...MEASURABLE GOALS

Synopsis: Public Works
Mike Tobin, Interim Public Works Director, said you’re going to have to bear with me now because as a result of strategic planning, we’re coming forward to you with some metrics and some goals. In front of you if you hold up the chart that has the street sweeper on it—the street division of the Public Works Dept. operates a street cleaning program as you well know and all of you are familiar with. Street cleaning is an operation that is driven by a number of factors, the most important which is the weather. In our community, the worst the winter, the more we have to clean the streets.

As you look at this chart, you will note that we’ve given you 2012, 2013 and 2014. You can see that in 2012, there was a lot more sweeping that was required and that was accomplished. That was the real bad winter if you will recall. Also to note that when the economy crashed and we started scrambling to make budget, one of the things that we cut in Public Works to try to make our numbers was reduce the amount of salt that we purchased. As we move forward from 2007, we used up all of our salt reserves and we began throwing a lot of sand and salt mixture which saved a lot of money on the front-end for buying salt; however, all that sand that we threw out there we had to pick up. We’re still doing that although this year it should be a little better.

You’ll note that while 2013 wasn’t that much better of a winter and last winter had some problems with it, those springs were wet and a lot of that sand was washed into the storm sewer system which is not good; but at the same time, we didn’t have to pick it up. That accounts for the difference in the numbers.
Street’s tries to sweep all the major arterials once a month during the sweeping season. We try to sweep all the neighborhood streets three times a year. In 2012, we had a real mild fall and a mild start to that winter and we were able to sweep longer. We think that probably 2014, as you look at those numbers at the bottom of the chart, it’s probably closer to what we think is an average year. We’re going to keep track of these numbers and we’ll come back and report to you and let you know how we do with that.

The street cleaning is not an inexpensive operation and when we have to do more of it, those costs are driven up. In 2013 and 2014, street sweeping was reduced a little bit by the fact that the mowing programs fell so far behind because of the amount of rain that fell. We shifted employees over to the mowing program to try to pick up and help out on those sides. Again, we’ll keep track of that and keep you posted. We’ll update you at some point during this year. I’m not sure what that schedule will be yet.

The second chart that we gave you has a graph with it also. When we consolidated all of fleet maintenance and moved into the new building in 2001, one of the things that we implemented was a vehicle management information system. This is a system where every mechanic has a work station and we track all of his work orders. There are two types of work orders that the system tracks, one is scheduled and the other is unscheduled. Scheduled work orders are basically preventive maintenance (PM) or warranty work or the type of work where you would have normal replacement such as the mileage that would wear out tires etc., etc. The unscheduled work orders are the work that’s done by the mechanics where you have an aging fleet. Again, if you look at the numbers, you’ll see in 2007 when we stopped meeting our replacement schedules with the capital equipment purchases, you’ll see that the unscheduled went up and continued to
increase. A good number for your fleet is to try to keep the unscheduled at 70% with the scheduled at 30%. Before the economy crashed, we had achieved that. We’d gotten down to about 69% and actually 67% in 2006. As you can see since we quit buying new police cars etc., etc., the number has increased. Our goal is to try to get back to 70% by the end of 2016. We will keep you apprised and let you know how we do this. By the way, Fleet is a 24/7, 365 operation and their primary function is to keep first of all public safety, police cars and the ambulances mobile at all times.

**Commissioner Markley** said I was just going to say really briefly you outlined some of your goals as you were speaking to us, but I’d like to see just a summary of what are the goal numbers for each of these so that we can kind of have that in our back pockets. When you come back to us next year, midway through the year after that, we can look and say here’s our graph, here is what you said we’re aiming for. Where are we?

**Commissioner Philbrook** said and also along with that 70 whatever percent, what kind of money are we talking to bring it back down to 70%. What do we have to do? What are we talking about in a perfect world? What do we have to do to bring those numbers back down? How many vehicles would we have to buy verses just keeping, taking care of the ones that are falling apart? Questions like that are what would come to our minds.

**Mr. Tobin** said how about if we put that in a communication and send it back to you guys. By the way, Tim did do all the work on this stuff. I want you guys to know.

**Action:** No action

**Chairman Kane** adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.
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Contact Email: lstimetz@wycokck.org
Ref: Department / Division: Public Safety Business Office

Item Description:
The KCKs Police Dept, on behalf of the Unified Gov’t, is seeking approval to apply for the FFY15 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) Grant through the US Dept. of Justice.

The UG currently has a JMHCP grant for the planning and implementation of a law enforcement and mental health collaboration plan. This FFY15 JMHCP grant will allow for the expansion of the already established law enforcement and mental health collaboration between the Kansas City, Ks Police Dept, Wyandotte County Sheriff’s Office, Wyandotte County Detention Center, Wyandot Center, Heartland RADAC, District and Municipal Courts, Community Corrections and the State Dept. of Corrections.

The grant is for $200,000 in federal funding over a 24 month period. There is a match requirement of $50,000. The $50,000 match will be an in-kind match of a certain percentage of salary and benefits of KCK Police Dept. staff and Wyandot Center staff.

Action Requested:
Approval to apply for FFY15 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) Grant through the US Dept. of Justice. Forward request to the Board of Commissioners for approval and adoption of the attached resolution at its April 9, 2015 commission meeting.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $ 0
Source:

[ ] Included In Budget
[ ] Other (explain) In-kind cash match of $50,000 will be a percentage of personnel costs for Police staff and Wyandot Center staff working on the law enforcement & mental health collaboration plan

File Attachment
MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Works & Public Safety Standing Committee

FROM: Chief Terry Zeigler, KCK Police Dept.

DATE: March 5, 2015

SUBJECT: Grant for FFY15 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP)

The KCKs Police Dept, on behalf of the Unified Gov’t, is seeking approval to apply for the FFY15 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) Grant through the US Dept. of Justice.

The UG currently has a JMHCP grant for the planning and implementation of a law enforcement and mental health collaboration plan. This FFY15 JMHCP grant will allow for the expansion of the already established law enforcement and mental health collaboration between the Kansas City, Ks Police Dept, Wyandotte County Sheriff’s Office, Wyandotte County Detention Center, Wyandot Center, Heartland RADAC, District and Municipal Courts, Community Corrections and the State Dept. of Corrections.

The grant is for $200,000 in federal funding over a 24 month period. There is a match requirement of $50,000. The $50,000 match will be an in-kind match of a certain percentage of salary and benefits of KCK Police Dept. staff and Wyandot Center staff.

Your consideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

TZ
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS:

That the Board of Commissioners hereby approves of the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department’s submission, on behalf of the Unified Government, of a grant application in the amount of $200,000 in federal funding, and a $50,000 match requirement, for the FFY15 Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP). Grant funding will be used to expand the already established law enforcement and mental health collaboration plan between the Kansas City, Ks Police Dept, Wyandotte County Sheriff’s Office, Wyandotte County Detention Center, Wyandot Center, Heartland RADAC, District and Municipal Courts, Community Corrections and the State Dept. of Corrections.

ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS,

THIS _____ DAY OF APRIL, 2015

____________________________________
Unified Government Clerk
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