I. **Call to Order / Roll Call**

II. **Approval of standing committee minutes from October 29, 2012.**

III. **Committee Agenda**

**Item No. 1 - 3 RESOLUTIONS: CMIP PROJECTS**

**Synopsis:**
Resolutions submitted by Lew Levin, Chief Financial Officer.

1. A resolution amending R-99-11, CMIP 970-1090, 98th Street, State Avenue to Parallel Parkway, for project scope of work; no change in fund authorization amount.

Two reimbursement resolutions. The UG expects to make capital expenditures after the date of these resolutions and the UG intends to reimburse itself for such expenditures with the proceeds of bonds, notes or a lease purchase agreement.
2. CMIP 942-0113: Emergency Bridge Repair 2013, maximum reimbursement $250,000
3. CMIP 941-0513: Guardrail Replacement 2013, maximum reimbursement $100,000

Tracking #: 120312

Item No. 2 - 2 RESOLUTIONS: CNIP

Synopsis:
Authorizing certain improvements as part of the Community Neighborhood Infrastructure Program (CNIP)
Tracking #: 120323

Item No. 3 - RESOLUTION: 2013 ANNUAL BONDS AND TEMPORARY NOTES

Synopsis:
Tracking #: 120313

Item No. 4 - RESOLUTION: AUTHORIZING THE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS P...

Synopsis:
A home rule resolution of the Unified Government authorizing the acquisition and construction of an emergency communication system to service the County; and authorizing the issuance of general obligation bonds for the equipment acquisition. Submitted by Bob Evans, Director of Emergency Management.

*It is requested that this item be fast tracked to the December 6, 2012 full commission meeting.*

Tracking #: 120314

Item No. 5 - RESOLUTION: REQUESTING FINANCING THE RADIO COMMUNICATION...
Levin, Chief Financial Officer

*It is requested that this item be fast tracked to the December 6, 2012 full commission meeting.*

Tracking #: 120315

**Item No. 6 - RESOLUTION: TARTAN RESIDENTIAL SECTION 42 TAX CREDITS**

**Synopsis:**
A resolution of support for Tartan Residential, Inc., for the use of Section 42 tax credits for the Buchanan’s Crossing project located at 706 N. 65th St., submitted by Charles Brockman, Economic Development. This $2.5M project, a 100% accessible community, will consist of nine three-bedroom/two bath and three four-bedroom/two bath single-family homes that will serve disabled military veterans and the mobility impaired in Kansas City, KS.

Tracking #: 120320

**IV. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

**Item No. 1 - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

**Synopsis:**
Environmental Trust Fund

Tracking #: 120137

**V. ADJOURN**
The meeting of the Economic Development and Finance Standing Committee was held on Monday, October 29, 2012, at 6:14 p.m., in the 6th Floor Human Resources Training Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Holland, Chairman; Commissioners Kane, McKiernan, Barnes, and BPU Board Member David Alvey. Commissioner Maddox was absent.

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

II. Approval of standing committee minutes from September 10, and October 1, 2012. On motion of Commissioner McKiernan, seconded by Commissioner Kane, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

III. Committee Agenda:

Item No. 1 – 970146…Quarterly Investment Report and Budget Revisions

Synopsis: Third quarter investment report and budget revisions $10,000 or greater, submitted by Lew Levin, Chief Financial Officer.

Lew Levin, Chief Financial Officer, said I’ll handle the first part of that item. This is just our standard quarterly report— no action required, for information only— as well as the budget revision, also for information only. The total investments at the end of the third quarter was just under $120M. Our average interest rate remains below 1%. Earnings year-to-date $300,000; our projection through the end of the year is less than $1M. With the attached graphic that you see, it’s significantly less than prior years, but it was expected in our budget forecast. The second piece, Reginald can answer any questions, is third quarter budget revisions of $10,000 or greater that occurred during third quarter of this year. Chairman Holland said in our grey packet there are four sheets, a cover letter and three pages of numbers. The budget revisions of $10,000 or
more are reported on the fourth page. There are seven of them. **Commissioner Barnes** asked what’s the tracking number on it. She just gave it to me. I didn’t quite understand the purpose of this. I thought we have dealt with this issue once before. I don’t know. I was confused by that. **Chairman Holland** asked which issue. **Commissioner Barnes** said the synopsis says third quarter investment report and budget revisions $10,000 or greater submitted by—is this right here that we’re talking about. **Mr. Levin** said no. **Commissioner Barnes** said so how did this come about, the revision. **Reginald Lindsey, Budget Director, said** every month sometimes we have budget revisions that are over $10,000 which is. It’s just kind of routine for departments to move money within their departments. Budget revisions that are neutral so it’s not like we’re adding money to the budget or anything, it’s just coming from another line item within a department. **Commissioner Barnes** said so these are all neutral just from one location within the department itself. **Mr. Lindsey** said there are two of them on there that were done for contingencies and usually we use contingencies for emergency purposes. One of them done for contingencies was within the Legal and that was done to pay attorney fees and appraisers for a COTA. Then there was one to refund our health care trust account for $200,000. It was done from reserves come **Mr. Levin** said to add just a brief comment on the later item. The report indicates that transfer was done on July 20th. It subsequently approved with the adoption of the budget by the commission.

**Commissioner Barnes** said my issue is that for a $6,000 issue, we have to come before the commission and have a long drawn out discussion. That’s what I’m confused about. You stated that third quarter investment report and budget revisions $10,000 greater or if it was less than $10,000, it wouldn’t be on this list. Is that correct? **Mr. Levin** said that’s correct. **Commissioner Barnes** said we had a one hour discussion last Thursday about a $6,000 issue. I don’t know if there is a staff member here that can let me know what’s going on there. Why we would get off into an open discussion on a $6,000 issue and here we are making revisions of $200,000 to a budget. If I hadn’t said anything, it would just be what did you say—a FYI. **Mr. Levin** said yes. **Mr. Bach** said the item you were referencing last week, we did not put that on the commission agenda. You had a travel item that was put on the commission agenda which was commission travel. The budget revision was a memorandum sent to you outside of the agenda from Administrator Hays that shaid should you approve this item, then he will make the
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necessary budget modification to it so he didn’t put the budget revision on the agenda. Commissioner Barnes said you don’t have to go through all that because I understand that. You understand what I’m saying though. We need a better process for $6,000. Chairman Holland said I do think the other issue is, and this is the only other thing I can think of because I agree with you, the absurdity of it all. We spend more time talking about someone for a special use permit to have a third dog than we do on a bond issue of $20M. I think the other issue is it was our budget; it was a commission budget specifically that was at order which is the only budget technically that we manage as a commission. I think that was a part of the issue. The $6,000, you’re exactly right that we could have spent our time better.

Commissioner Barnes said I just take this opportunity to ask and make a request, and I don’t know what the exact procedure would be, Mr. Chairman, but I would hope that our administration could look into that and avoid such a fiasco in the future. It has to be a better way to address that, and the way we’ve addressed in the past is not the proper way to do it. Do you understand what I’m saying and can we do something about it? Mr. Bach said so noted. Chairman Holland said I’ve spoken with the mayor. John Mendez and I as the at-large and the mayor have talked extensively about this very issue. I want a policy change in how we handle all this because the way we’re handling it it’s ridiculous. In my mind it’s ridiculous. Mr. Bach said I believe the mayor is looking at a special session for you all to talk about the policy and a way that can be addressed maybe the middle of November if that works out with the other scheduling items. Chairman Holland said we should never have that conversation that we had last Thursday again. Commissioner Barnes said and this is just an example to say how we deal with issues.

Chairman Holland said no action is required. This is a budget report. Thank you very much. .

Action: No action required.

Item No. 2 – 120287…Resolutions: CMIP Projects for 2013 and Ongoing Projects
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Synopsis: Requesting approval of various resolutions submitted by Lew Levin, Chief Financial Officer.

Schedule A: 2013 CMIP projects approved to be funded in the 2013 CMIP budget.

Schedule B: Ongoing projects per the CMIP budget requiring an increase in authority and/or additional financing for the 2013 issue.

Debbie Jonscher, Finance, said the projects listed before you tonight are the project authorizations for the 2013 bond and temporary note financing. All of the projects on those lists have been approved in the CMIP. There are two schedules in your packet. The first one is Schedule A which is a list of projects that are receiving financing for the first time. Projects could have been in the CMIP for several years, but this is the first time we’ve actually went up for financing on these projects. Within that schedule, you will see the amount that’s being requested for 2013 along with the total project authority for that project.

The second schedule in your packet is the ongoing projects that have already received financing either in 2012 or in a prior year and they are requesting an additional amount and authority or an amendment to their resolution. On that schedule you will see what the 2012 authority was and then the amount of the increase that’s being requested. Chairman Holland said these have all been previously approved in our budget. Ms. Jonscher said that’s correct.

Commissioner Barnes said going forward or even on this issue here, I would hope that we could get—This is $21M is that the total on this Schedule A? Ms. Jonscher said that’s the total project authority. The amount that’s going to be issued on Schedule A is the $9.5M. Commissioner Barnes said I just think it’d be interesting to see, once these projects are completed, how much of that money stayed in Wyandotte County. I’m looking at $21M there and then another we have authority for the existing projects I believe on Schedule B. These are the ones that’s probably happening already? Ms. Jonscher said right, those are the ongoing projects. Commissioner Barnes said at $17M on the authority portion of it. I’d be concerned about how much of that money stays here and who got the contract as to where because I think we’re contracting out far too much. Go ahead.
**Commissioner Kane** said I agree 100% that we need to look closer to home than we do somewhere else. I’m going to use that basketball court thing where we had three bids, two of them were the same, one of them was drastically different although all three of them were in Wyandotte County. There was a reason why that one was drastically different. They wasn’t going to do the same quality work and he’ll end up coming back. One, I think we need to do more searching here in Wyandotte County. Two, just because it’s $1,000 cheaper from somebody else, if we have our people working, I think we’re better off in taking a bid from outside the community.

**Chairman Holland** said this is an interesting policy question because when we do the bidding process right now, is there preference given in points. It’s a point system is it not? Is there a preference given for local? **Doug Bach, Deputy County Administrator**, said no, sir. We don’t have any kind of local—the local vendor preference comes to winning in the case of a tie. It’s one of the issues we’ve got into a few different times over the years and looked at it. One of the main reasons we haven’t put a local vendor preference in terms of percentage points is because of the reciprocal laws that are in place in all the surrounding states. You could do something that would make an advantage to other counties. I’m not saying it’s not a reason you can’t do it, but a large part of the reason that came in the last time we evaluate it, and it’s probably been 5, 6, 7 years ago. It’s been a number of years. It’s based on the fact that a business that is located in Kansas City, KS. if they’re bidding for projects outside and we don’t do any business with them, then they could have a percentage put against them because we have a local vendor preference pact and I think commissioners at the time heard from several that had that and concern coming put it back at them and that’s one reason we didn’t do it. Like the Board of Public Utilities, they have it in place over there. I don’t think they have to deal with that same issue, but it’s been successful from that standpoint. **Chairman Holland** said it’s probably time to key that up again and take a look at it and see what that would look like.

**Commissioner Barnes** said that study also said we looked, we searched for anyone that had that reciprocal action within the region that was studied and we found not one case but we still refer to it. I don’t know why we keep referring to something that doesn’t exist. Someone attended the American— whatever group you belong to Administrators. **Mr. Bach** said actually it’s the
National Procurement. **Commissioner Barnes** said that study came back. It hadn’t happened they were not able to find one case where a reciprocal action was taken. I think we’re fighting a ghost and we need to move forward and make certain that we do something.

NSP originated, Neighborhood Stabilization Program started because they wanted it to be a neighborhood stabilization program. The federal government implemented that. They wanted the money to stay in the neighborhood. They talked about vicinity hiring because they wanted the money to stay in the neighborhood.

We really need to rethink how we go about doing. Every time I see $17M going out of our neighborhood, that’s money that’s not going to rollover in our community. It’s not going to benefit our community and this is just a small slutch out of the $259M budget that we pass every year and we’ve got a mentality to— in fact, one report came back, and I say this and I want to keep it on the record, that you, I don’t care who you are, what color you are, it doesn’t make any difference, you have a one in four chance to get a contract from Wyandotte County. It’s better to live outside of Wyandotte County and get a contract yes. Your chances are greater if you live outside of this county rather than living inside of this county. Something is wrong with that process. I just want to keep that fire burning that we need to keep that issue out there that we need to think about some way to retain those dollars in Wyandotte County. We spend too much money and give too much money to outside people. Whatever we need to do to make it work, we need to do something about making it work.

**Chairman Holland** said this issue is before us. Do we need to vote on Schedule A and B separately or can we vote on both of them together? **Ken Moore, Deputy Chief**, said if your vote is going to be the same on every item, then you can vote on them together. **Commissioner Barnes** said when we get that report on what is happening, the money is already spent and we’ll do the tracking on what’s going to be spent— **Chairman Holland** said we can ask for that to come back to this committee.

**Action:** Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Barnes, to approve Schedules A and B. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Alvey, Kane, McKiernan, Barnes, Holland.

---
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Item No. 3 – 120288...DEVELOPMENT/LEASE AGREEMENTS: Industrial Realty Group

Synopsis: Communication recommending approval of a development agreement and lease agreement with Industrial Realty Group (IRG) relative to assuming management responsibility of the Public Levee along with a phased redevelopment of the 46-acre site, submitted by George Brajkovic, Economic Development Director. The $30M redevelopment would consist of up to three new industrial buildings with a minimum total of 315,000 sq. ft. The project contemplates the use of TIF and subsequent IRBs, signage and a commitment by the UG to direct $10k of an annual lease payment toward park use.

Mr. Bach said we brought this project to you last month to introduce a potential redevelopment for the Public Levee property. At that meeting, we presented the project, talked a little bit about it. During that time, we’re to go back and finish working through the development agreement that had the parameters that we set out at that time. The commission also asked us to go through and do a little bit of a proposal analysis which is on the back side of the RFA, which we will walk through in a little bit. At this point, I would like to introduce the developer who’s here with us and his team. They’ve been in town. They’ve had some meetings with some of the tenants down there and going through different projects. At this point, I would like to bring forward Stu Lichter who is the owner of IRG who’s here. If you want to introduce your team and talk about your project a little bit, and then I’ll go back into the executive summary portion of the development agreement.

Stuart Lichter, President of IRG Industrial Realty Group, said first of all I’d like to thank you all for having me here tonight. We’re really happy to be here. I have four other members of my team here: Tom Messmer, Bruce Haas, Peter Yancin, and Jerry Brown. They represent different aspects of our organization from leasing, to construction, to legal, to management. To give you, not to delabor the point, but just a little bit about our company, we have real estate in about 23, 24 states. What we specialize in is we’re the guys that redevelop industrial property when a big company closes the facility. That’s what we’re most known for. We’re the people who buy the closed GM plant or Ford plant, caterpillar; we’ve been very successful doing that and bringing new jobs back to the communities. We’re real happy to be here.
We have involvement in your community now on the Levee with— **Commissioner Kane** said I hope this GM plant doesn’t close, brother. **Mr. Lichter** said this one is expanding. It’s the reason we’re excited about it. **BPU Board Member Alvey** said we should have warned you not to say GM. **Mr. Lichter** said we’ve acquired some closed GM and Ford plants and we we’ve done very well bringing a lot of jobs back in fact in Ohio, we’re about to announce a big deal that’s close to 1,000 jobs in a closed Ford plant. Here, we have the property on the Levee now where we lease it from you folks and we’re really excited about the prospect of redeveloping the additional piece. Our plans basically are on the vacant parking lot at one end of it. We will immediately by next spring or summer start construction on a spec industrial building which we would hope to lease or sell to a manufacturer through with the GM plant or just another industry. As time goes on, we would consolidate some of the tenants that are in there into the remaining space and start a demolition program on some of the older existing buildings and add a second building and then a third building. We’re currently, as part of that, already starting some renovations in our existing building in expanding one of the tenants in that building and converting more older spaces into traditional freezers and coolers to accommodate a growing business that’s in our present facility. We’re investing a large amount of capital to help that company grow.

We had a meeting with the tenants earlier today to reassure them that we view ourselves as partners of theirs and service providers and that we will work with them as the government will as the years go by to make sure that their needs are accommodated either by in our premises there or to help them in their future business plans. In the meantime, we volunteered to meet with them one-on-one to talk about their expansion plans and what we can do to help them in the present place since I think our plan is a mid-term to a long-term plan other than the first building. I think those meetings went real well. Tomorrow morning I believe Tom is going to try to meet with a couple of the tenants who had specific issues to try to resolve those issues going forward. We also met this morning with a representative of the park. Part of our plan is to improve and make a nicer access to the park and to work to preserve that park and help it grow into the future. With that I don’t want to belabor the point so I’ll just open it to whatever questions you guys have or whatever you want to ask.
BPU Board Member Alvey asked when you met with the existing tenants, was it favorable. Is there a pattern of problems they may be having or some concerns they might have? Mr. Lichter said I think they were somewhat grateful. Basically right now they’re all on month-to-month leases so I think they were grateful to have a plan identified that will give them time and a group there that was willing to invest money even in the interim period for 4, 5, 6, 7 year period to up that their businesses can be there. I think one of the problems we’ve had there is people are uncomfortable having their business on month-to-month leases so there’s been a natural tendency for people to aggregate out of there to let me find someplace I can be more secure. I think in the short and medium term, we’re going to add security to their own business this situation and I think in many cases, actually help them grow and invest in that interim period where they are so I was very encouraged by that.

Commissioner Barnes said so you say they’re month-to-month leases. How long has that been going on, Doug? Mr. Bach said we’ve been moving to that category for the last couple of years where we’ve been trying in to move into the redevelopment plan. Commissioner Barnes said that really detours people from wanting to be there is that right? Mr. Lichter said I think it does. Commissioner Barnes said so we’ve been doing that and disencouraging people not to be there for three years. Now where’s the public input when we call it a public levee. Going forward in the future, where is the public part to the levee? How would you identify this being public? Where is the partnership; the agreement between us, where is that in this development agreement? Chairman Holland asked who are you directing that question to. Commissioner Barnes said the young man I’m looking at. I’m trying to be nice I like you. I didn’t get your name. Mr. Lichter said Stuart Lichter, Stu. Commissioner Barnes said Mr. Lichter. When we talk about a public levee, I’m trying to see after you’re finished with whatever you’re doing, is there a public part to this at all? Mr. Lichter said basically you folks would continue to maintain to own the land and we’re signing a long-term lease with you, so on the redevelopment portion of the project we hope to bring jobs. To answer your question, the real public portion is that we’re going to provide access to the park and work with the park and hopefully besomething that contributes financially to the future maintenance of things in the park from what’s there. This is essentially an economic development project with new buildings for private companies but that’s what it really is now other than the park component. It’s just operated by the
government. Commissioner Barnes said and the other part is that we’re going to be providing some portion of dollars for this project ourselves going forward Mr. Bach. Mr. Bach said the dollars that’s coming from the public consented portion is this is a TIF project. Going into it we’re not fronting any money into this deal. In fact their covering our deficit costs we’ll have now to pay for any outstanding debts that we have on this site. They’ll write a check for $300,000 a year but the TIF will come from the tax increment portion that you know when they create a new building and they will be required to build a 100,000 sq. ft. building to start off on this site. There will be an increment that comes back from that and they will get that all TIF into the project except for what is held harmless from the school district portion through the state statute piece of that, but that’ll go back into the project and in all phases of it we’ll be into it.

Now they anticipate and the development agreement contemplates that they’ll build out in the phases. The first couple of phases will cover what they anticipate being the TIF eligible expenses being the demolition really that takes place which has always been the greatest iterant to the redevelopment that happens down here and then they’ll start to build up one or two buildings in the middle section and there’s a site plan that can reference this on page 3 of your document. The middle buildings we would come back and probably do an IRB on them. What’s key to this is we’re not issuing bonds so we’re not fronting any money and we’re really as a government not going to risk at all. In fact, they’re alleviating from us because they’re entering into an agreement to pay us an annual amount of money which is going to cover our debt service. They are fronting the money to build their projects and then as they pay taxes that’ll go in the TIF that goes back to them or issue an IRB in the future. Commissioner Barnes said sum it out if you could. Tell us what the function of a Public Levee is, that’s one thing, and I’m just talking about this because I have trouble dealing with. Mr. Bach said I think the function of the Public Levee has probably changed somewhat from what was the original intent when it was called a public levee when an operation was done to bring in the commerce that went up and down the riverway. That really is no longer a viable activity that happens a lot so the public activity we now have is the commerce that moves through. When you’re still talking about public commerce our transportation is not really done by the river anymore but its more by the truck and rail. That’s something that this business will add to. So probably when you look at what was the original intent of the Public Levee and public commerce it’s now just changed the
methodology to which is uses that. This group is proposing a redevelopment plan that will enhance that a great deal.

**Commissioner Barnes** said lastly there is $10,000 by the UG to direct $10,000 of annual lease payment towards park use and that’s for that park down there in particular. There’s a public portion of this and I just think that it should not be solely directed at that particular park and I don’t think they should be authorized to spend $10,000 just because they have it. Our park system is in need of much repair in many things and for this to be exclusively designated for that particular park and that particular park only I have some issues with that. **Mr. Bach** said there is no restrictions by the developer on how that money is directed. You as the governing body can redirect that if you so desire.

**Chairman Holland** said the advantage —my thought is on that part needs help and $10,000 a year is a lot of money and we have a $5M annual park budget. The last thing I want to see is $10,000 get lost in our budget and what historically happens is our budget then gets reduced by $10,000 and that money backfills it so I don’t want that to happen. I think that park can use $10,000 annual investment as a historic park. The thing I think in the terms of the cost of maintaining parks generally, it’s not that much. My other piece is Commissioner I think you raise an interesting issue about the public use and the public benefit. The way I view this Public Levee is in some respects it’s just a piece of history the way it was deeded to the Unified Government that keeps us from selling it like any other property that we hold in our inventory the Unified Government buys and sells property with some regularity based on our needs so if we need a new parking garage we buy property. If we are done with a piece of property we sell it for —it’s a whole Land Bank issue. We hold a lot of properties that we would prefer not to hold. The levee is in such a pitiful state of disrepair that I would think that if they were here to buy it and we didn’t have this deed restriction on it, we’d sell it to them and then think I would prefer to sell it to them then do a long-term lease. From my perspective that it’s been on the public rolls that doesn’t bother me at all. I think we need to unload this property. I think this is a terrific development deal. Really it’s the entryway into Fairfax from the road which is blighted right now. I’d really like people as they come in —there’s nothing we can do we can do to improve the image of Fairfax and develop this particular piece of property so as people drive in
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to Fairfax they see an up and coming industrial area rather than a falling down industrial area. So that’s my view on it, I think it’s a good idea. 

**Commissioner Barnes** said I agree with you 100% on that portion of it. We have a lot of not-for-profits that were benefitting as a result of that levee. I don’t know how many are still down there now and since we’ve been on a month to months and we’ve agreed on record that the policy ran a lot of people away and that concerns me. Why would we adopt a policy that’ll run a lot of people away over a three year period and I know that there were not for profits that utilized some of the storage facilities down there and at one time they utilized the refrigeration down there. The last time the question came up the gentlemen that were here before you when you had the problems getting in town, plane flight or something, and he said they would look into the possibility of having some type of public access available and they don’t know what it would look like. I still don’t know if that opportunity still exist. We do have some not-for-profits that do some great work in our community that sometimes need a little assistance in aiding them in moving forward with their programs whether it’s storage or whatever. I don’t know what’s all down there right now. The whole issue was taking the public out of the issue and I agree. If we were dumping the property this conversation would not be had but because we can’t do that process then we have this discussion to go even deeper than we would like to get into. The only thing I mentioned the last time is that we again, this is not you, it’s a lot of internal working. This is a privatization. We’re privatizing that area.

**Chairman Holland** said thank goodness. 

**Commissioner Barnes** said well yes that’s according to who you are to say thank goodness. I don’t have a problem privatizing it but give me a process and this is not a process. This is just you came and asked for it and they gave it to you. 

**Chairman Holland** said but we—

**Commissioner Barnes** said no let me finish. 

**Chairman Holland** said I want to speak to that because I totally disagree with that. 

**Commissioner Barnes** said its okay for you to disagree. Direct it to him and not me, okay, because that is the podium up there so don’t argue with me about what I’m saying. If you disagree you just disagree but the bottom line is that we haven’t discovered—we haven’t done a privatization policy. If somebody came to you and you gave them access to that property, this happened with a grocery store at 10th & Parallel less than three months ago and they sent him in a different direction. They did not treat that person with the grocery store the same way they are treating this person. They engaged this individual but they did not engage the grocery store operator. We don’t have a unified policy that allows us to privatize it. If we had a uniformed policy that allows us to do that, I’d
say the same thing thank you hallelujah and the whole nine yards but we just haven’t identified that process and it’s almost when we pick and choose what we want to utilize and how get to where we want to get to. This doesn’t have anything to do with you. Thank you for coming to town. I’m looking forward to the jobs and the whole nine yards. This is us, watching this is internal. Go ahead. **Chairman Holland** said I think we’ve actively been marketing this piece of property because we want to get out of the—since I’ve been on this commission there has been a consent to say get rid of this property. We don’t want to be in the management business of this. It’s a bit dilapidated; we don’t have the capital to invest to make it the kind of industrial center it should be.

Since I’ve been here we’ve been actively trying to market this property to unload it and to find this kind of lease agreement that’s why I support the policy of moving people month to month because if you have years long leases you’ve tied up the development opportunities indefinitely. By allowing all those contracts to expire and to get month-to-month you’re giving the new property leassor complete control over the property which makes a development—I don’t know that this group is here if they have a bunch of leases tied up that they can’t get out of and control. If they’re all month-to-month then they set the terms. **Mr. Lichter** said you’re exactly right. The positive of the month to month is that it facilitates a redevelopment and the negative of the month to month is that it does tend to make the people who are there less secure in their occupancy. It’s like everything else in life there’s trade-offs so you guys made a decision which was a totally appropriate decision if what you want was redevelopment but the down side of that decision is the people who are there feel less secure about their existence there. It’s like everything else in life its plus and minuses. **Chairman Holland** said I’ve been excited about this project because we’ve been waiting for this. We’ve been talking about this since I’ve been here so I’m glad to see it coming to fruition.

**Commissioner Kane** said you are aware of the prevailing wage portion, of this correct? **Mr. Lichter** said yes. **Commissioner Kane** said I don’t know a whole lot about GM. I spent 35 years there. Have you guys already contacted them telling them what you’re trying to purchase? **Mr. Lichter** said GM is aware of what we’re doing. We know the people at GM. We have been in touch with the raise of trust people with GM so we know them quite well. We actually bought a GM plant from the raise of trust people in Lorain, OH. **Commissioner McKiernan** said I just
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want to go back to this thing for non-for-profits who were benefiting from the public part of the Public Levee. So they were receiving pro bono. Commissioner Barnes said I don’t know. I know they were there and I’ve heard from them. That’s not a discussion really. It’s just the fact that if they’re not going to accommodate them they’re out and that’s the end of it. Commissioner McKiernan said who was accommodating them before. Was it us, was it a private entity? I’m just not sure how they were being accommodated before. Commissioner Barnes said Doug would have to speak to that arrangement that they had with them down there. Mr. Bach said over the years there have been various agreements with non-for-profits that have come into the levee site. A few years ago the commission gave us directive that we should start to be a little more competitive in our rates. We did then move away from just giving away the free leasing space. A lot of the times what’s out there for the non-for-profits would be some of the lower basement space, the less utilized, so we would have either low rent or give them significantly reduced for areas. There are two non-for-profits that are still currently in there. Our development agreement speaks to that point that they would maintain while they have those structures there that they would maintain this space for them and allow them to continue to be tenants in that similar fashion going forward. That doesn’t secure that they’ll have a place for the next 20 or 40 years particularly when they build in the new because this is a redevelopment plan, but as they go through these phases they’re not just going to take and move them out.

Chairman Holland said I remember with mixed feeling driving by Indian Springs and they had that huge banner up that said lowest rates in the metro. I’m thinking that’s not I’m sure a sign I want on our Kansas City, KS properties but I think that’s been a big reason why those non-for-profits were there is cheap rent and we’re going to the Cross-Lines facilities Saturday with my church to bag groceries for the needy at the Cross-Lines area. I hope that rents cheap because I’ve been in that building and I hope they are not paying much to be there because it’s in pretty despicable conditions. Commissioner McKiernan said there has been some steps taken to try to mitigate any undue hardship on the people who are already there. Chairman Holland asked what’s it Cross-Lines and Habitat are those the two in there. Mr. Bach said Kaw Valley Habitat and Big Brothers. Chairman Holland said and Cross-Lines, Cross-Lines is one as well are they not. Mr. Bach said I think Cross-Lines moved out. Chairman Holland said I hope they’re there Saturday because we’re bringing a whole group of people.
Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes” Alvey, Kane, McKiernan, Holland. Commissioner Barnes said “no.”

Mr. Bach said this item will appear on November 15, 2012 on the public hearing for the TIF project.

Item No. 4 – 120289…AMENDED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT: Argentine Betterment Corporation

Synopsis: Communication recommending approval of an amended development agreement with Argentine Betterment Corporation (ABC) for Project Area 1 of the Metropolitan Avenue Redevelopment District, submitted by George Brajkovic, Economic Development Director. ABC has requested consideration of TIF structure changes. The $3M grocery store project, located at 21st & Metropolitan Ave., includes a property tax TIF, Home Rule agreement for sales tax generated by the grocery store and existing Dollar General, a 1% CID on the grocery store and underdeveloped pad site, and a possible RLF loan.

Mr. Bach said I put together a term sheet in association with this for your review. I think we’ve gone over this in the past. I wanted to give you an updated one. This is the amendment of the TIF district in relationship with the grocery store project. We’ve been back before the committee several times. The developer and the representatives are here if you would like for them to present the project. I told them we’ve talked about it several times. The objective here is to amend the terms of the TIF agreement. BPU Board Member Alvey said Doug just to speak on the amendments, is it brief? Mr. Bach said well the big one is with the number one point that’s on this TIF the sheet I just passed to you seeking us to issue the bond to monetize. When we went through this project initially they thought they were going to be able to go out borrow the money and do a repayment of the project as the money came in. While there are many different things listed that is the biggest one that comes to us. BPU Board Member Alvey said is it of the are you looking for action? Mr. Bach said we would issue bonds. Chairman Holland said General Obligation Bonds. Mr. Bach said Lew is recommending and thinks that’s probably the
best way. They weren’t specifically saying General Obligation. You can do Special Revenue or whatever and Lew’s point back to that was, I think you looked at it and said since we’re somewhat taking a risk on the project if you do the General Obligation Bonds we’re able to get the lowest interest rate and secure that going forward based on the revenue that’s coming in. **Mr. Levin** said we would actually have two financing that we would split between a General Obligation financing and a Special Obligation sales tax. The General Obligation side would be backed by property tax revenues. The sales tax would be backed by sales tax revenues. What that allows us to do, one part of it we’re going to be able to set property valuation for the future and that part of it will be taxable and we’ll have a slightly higher interest rate but it will be insured there’s an inability for the developer to lower property tax and it will give us confidence that the increment generated for the project is on property and sales tax and pay for debt service on the bonds. **BPU Board Member Alvey** said right now you’re coming for action, this has already been presented as of September 10th correct. There are no changes since time. **Mr. Bach** said no we just went through and finalized some things that we had to clean up in the agreement. From what we presented to you last month I would say there’s not any subsidy thing that you’re looking at. We’re issuing bonds for the total amount that goes into the project, the incentives that were increased or decreased going through. We went through and looked at different ways to efficiently finance the project. We’re making different things to try to secure ourselves the best we could knowing that it is a project but there’s a certain level of risk coming into it based on the coverage level that comes into the project. We think it’s a good project for the neighborhood. **Chairman Holland** asked what are the total risks that we’re involved in. **Mr. Bach** said $1.6M and that’s secured by the sales tax. **Commissioner Barnes** said so you say it’s a great project. Are we going to archive this in any kind of way where we can use this as a model going forward and how would we have access to it going into the future. That’s my main concern. How do we go about doing that or do you want to forget it after we do it? **Mr. Bach** said no it’s a good one that this group has brought forward to show us and that’s why we’ve tried to point out as we go through it there are different levels of risk that we have to look at and understand what we’re taking versus the more other development projects that we’ve done. The one that we just sat here and presented on earlier where we really are not taking any risk on and different levels of projects like when we did
Wyandotte Plaza where we do a bond issuance but we have full guarantees and securities back from that developer to cover cost. I think basically we have guarantees in place and that’s some of the items I think we’ve worked through the last month of how we would get guarantee of knowing the money was in place to see the project built and in place and as much as we can get out of the final Sav-A-Lot that’s going to put that grocery in, their years of operation and that has security. So yes it’s a good model. It’s one that we’ll work off of I’m sure as we move on additional projects. Commissioner Barnes said I know we’ll say that but there are a limited number of people that will have access to that good model. I’m trying to say how can we archive this in a fashion that people will have easy access to it rather than trying to remember the date it was on the agenda or the time that we voted on it. How do we get this document or make it available. I have people approach me and I’m like hey this is a little bit over my head. I can get the minutes for you but I don’t want to be responsible for having to try to walk somebody through the process. How can we archive this in some kind of way or model it where they would have this access to the process.

I know you’ve referenced to 39th & Rainbow many times. It’s almost like we have to go back and rebuild and reinvent ourselves every time we run into we run into an urban core project. I just don’t think that’s the best way to do it. I think we should be able to go back and say hey this is what we did there. I think that more than just the Administrator or the person that involved in the job should have access to that information since its public information anyway. Mr. Bach said I think when we come through and we see things like our term sheet that’s a better model put out there when we try to advertise. Here’s some of the things and the ways this work than handing someone a development agreement and say guys here’s the package go through and read this see what we have. One thing to remember though in reaching this point, that’s a couple of years work to get this figured out and while I appreciate it’s a model there so every project has its own unique tendencies or unique things that come about that you’re going to have to address and work through. It’s not like we can take this one and say boom this one and say that will work great on the next project that comes but there certainly are tools and different things we’ve been able to come up with in this deal that will work well with another project that comes.
**BPU Board Member Alvey** said my understanding is that this was something that was generated by the community there and they kept trying to find ways to move a project forward and they opened up doors and tried other doors until they were able to come up with this kind of agreement. **Mr. Bach** said I certainly don’t plan on putting it on the shelf. I mean, to hang it out there, I’ll go to a degree. We’re out there with projects. As you know with the RFP that we’re working, that we know we have some tools here and fully expect as we go through this one will be different aspects of this one that will work and some that won’t work for that project.

**Commissioner Kane** said MBE/WBE and prevailing wage—it’s in there? **Mr. Bach** said it is in here because this is a TIF project. **Commissioner Kane** said you say it’s in here? **Mr. Bach** said it’s in here. It’s on this summary sheet on the front. **Commissioner Kane** said even no matter where the projects are at this needs to be in there along with what you said earlier. **Commissioner Barnes** said absolutely. **Commissioner Kane** said do we need to make a motion on this?

**Action:** Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Barnes, to approve and forward to full commission.

**Chairman Holland** said one of the things that I do want to follow up with before I call for the vote is Commissioner Barnes I think you are exactly right. This is a policy decision tonight. When we issue General Obligation Bonds for a grocery store, I want to be specific that we’re not issuing General Obligation Bonds on just any development that comes in. We have General Obligation backing at the Sun Fresh on 18th Street is that right? General Obligation—what about Happy Foods? General Obligation on the one on Shawnee Drive, the Sun Fresh. Not on that deal. CID. The 78th Street project, while we’re issuing bonds, we have guarantees in place to protect us. **Mr. Bach** said in relation to the magnitude of the project, we did a small bond issue to start it which we restricted what they could draw the money down on. All their guarantees are in place.

**Chairman Holland** said one of the things that I think is a policy issue that I’ve seen evolve since I’ve been up here is that we’re willing to issue general backing on grocery stores because our
community needs grocery stores and they have a value to the community beyond just the tax revenue that they bring. In fact, when we come to this RFP that we’re working on in the northeast, we don’t need to make tax dollars off of that. Our community needs a grocery store. We can put all the tools we have into it to get it in the ground. I think the policy that we’re making tonight is in continuation with our policy to put general obligation backing which is pretty grocery store specific. When you talk about putting this out as a template, I want to be clear that my intent from a policy perspective is for grocery stores. I’m not going to put general obligation out for a shoe store or for other programs. I want to see it for grocery stores. Commissioner McKiernan said but having said that, I think the second piece to that is it’s not just issuing a General Obligation Bond ad hoc, it’s that there are contingencies. The developer brings to the table those things that will limit our exposure and mitigate our risk. Mr. Bach said yes. We have a good partner. Obviously when you’re dealing with a not-for-profit agency you’re restricted somewhat in what you can get for a guaranty on the backside. What we do know in this project is when we put our money into the deal, there’s enough money coming from the private side that gets us a good deal and they have a lease with an operator that will keep that thing going for the next ten years. We know it’s built and we know it’s operating for a number of years. Many things can come into play, but you don’t have somebody that has $50M in the bank that you can say we’re going to go after them if they don’t do it. Chairman Holland called for the roll call. Roll call was taken on the motion with BPU Board Member Alvey and Commissioner Kane voting Aye. (Chairman Holland stopped the roll call.)

Mr. Levin said I just wanted to clarify one thing. I think what you’re voting on is the development agreement. I won’t come before you if you approve that next month on financing authority or the debt financing which will occur with the larger issue that we presented earlier this evening. Mr. Bach said and then we’ll have a public hearing on this project as well. Chairman Holland said with those clarifications we’ll start over with our role call and the vote.

Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes” Alvey, Kane, McKiernan, Barnes, Holland.
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Chairman Holland said that brings us to the blue sheet first and then our goals and objectives. Can we pass out the blue sheet please? This is a blue sheet. It’s new. That’s why you haven’t seen it. I talked to Mr. Bach today. He asked me if it was okay to add this to the agenda. I authorized adding this to the agenda, so I’m going to turn it over to him to give us the update.

Item No. 5 – 120293…UPDATE: PQ/Zeolyst International EDX Abatement

Mr. Bach said a year and one-half ago or so we brought before you a project with PQ/Zeolyst. They were moving forward on a development expansion project at their plant and I have the representative from that company here today. We can talk about it if you don’t remember what their plan was to do. Basically what we approved was an EDX, which is a constitutional amendment formula that allows somebody to go through and do tax abatement for the incremental increase in the value of the plant. What they were not able to get due to the structure of the lease agreement was to get that done. In keeping with that, we’re coming back to do an IRB. Really, the nature and structure of the deal and everything we approved back then is still intact. We’re just changing it from an EDX to an IRB. We told them we would try to move this project right along and that’s why it kind of developed quickly last week. We didn’t have all of this put together and that’s why I called the Commissioner today and said if we could take this before the Committee the first of the month, it’s the same deal you had already approved and then bring it for the IRB on the 15th, we could certainly do that. Chairman Holland said Zeolyst is from not Switzerland…Mr. Bach said I tell you what, I can bring up their representative and let him talk about this project. Robert Barnes is with PQ/Zeolyst.

Robert Barnes, PQ/Zeolyst. said we are located at 1700 Kansas Avenue. We’ve been there since 1950 operating continuously. Zeolyst is a joint venture that PQ took on with a division of Shell Oil to develop zeolites that are used for catalysts. Currently, we are expanding that operation in Kansas City, Kansas. The technology leads the world in what it does. We are currently exporting over 50% of our products, including to China. There are lots of uses for the product, but the primary growth engine is catalytic applications for diesel engines. Basically it’s a material that is used in SER catalytic reduction devices that are put on trucks, put on tractors,
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locomotive engines. Zeolite is a component in that that’s an active ingredient. That active ingredient is very critical for the operation of the catalytic reduction that’s used for environmental control. Our technology is proprietary. There is a lot of demand for environmental regulation in the United States, Europe, Japan and even in China there is a lot of demand for the project. So, we’re expanding.

We are along maybe a five to six year expansion vision. We’re about 50% through that right now. In the last two years we’ve hired 14 people. These are good jobs. We intend to hire at least double that. These are the sort of jobs that vary from engineering to mostly wage roll. It’s a unionized plant. The typical wage is over $22/hr, that’s a starting point. There are growth opportunities. Typical requirement is high school education and a little bit of pure knowledge. We are hiring locally.

We are trying to use contractors, we do have an agreement with the City in terms of trying to go out and invite local contractors. That’s our obligation to invite. We have been using some local contractors. I heard your comment earlier. I think we’re ahead of that curve. Most of the contractors are all from the metropolitan area, not so much all from Wyandotte County, but there’s quite a few from Wyandotte County as well. We have a target for minority local business enterprises/woman business enterprises. We are reporting that to the City.

Chairman Holland said my understanding is EDX is a financing tool and because this venture is not 51% owned by PQ that it didn’t qualify, so we need to switch it to an IRB. It’s the same development agreement, same investment, it’s just a different tool that gets this done, is that right? Mr. Bach said yes sir.

Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Barnes, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes” Alvey, Kane, McKiernan, Barnes, Holland.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Item No. 1 – 120137…Goals and Objectives
Synopsis: The Unified Government Commission conducted a strategic planning process resulting in specific goals and objectives adopted by the commission on May 17, 2012. Commission has directed that the goals and objectives appear monthly on respective standing committee agendas to assure follow-up and action toward implementation.

1. Economic Development:  Foster an environment in which small and large businesses thrive, jobs are created, redevelopment continues, tourism continues to grow, and businesses locate in the community. Home Builders’ meeting


This brings us to our goals and developments-economic development and public building commission structure are our two items. Mr. Bach said we have a couple of items to present on tonight. I think one, we wanted to give the update on the homebuilders’ meeting. I don’t know if you all received this, but this is the advertisement that’s going out. This is the meeting that we’re doing in conjunction with the BPU and Wyandotte EDC. That’s an invitation that has gone out to everybody. That event is coming along later in the month. As we reported in the last previous meetings, we put the incentives on dropping the permits, the BPU put the incentive there to back off the connection fees for the water and some reduced on the electrical. That’s the piece of that side.

The other two we’re going to report on, one is an updated survey that is being done by the Planning Department that they’re working on to make ourselves more user friendly. Then, we have a report on the Public Building Commission by Lew Levin which I think he’s come to the last two meetings and we haven’t been able to get to that item. Those are the items, so I’ll start with Greg and Rob to present on the survey tool that they’re working on.

Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning & Land Use, said the first thing I’d say is this is really a survey for both Greg and I relating to the development and building permit process. I’ve got a draft of what we’re sending out here so that you can kind of see the scope of what we’re looking at. We feel like we have some fairly defined processes and procedures that the two of us
use that impact the development community. We’ve developed what’s a fairly limited scope of a
survey that really deals with our issues based on recent feedback that we’ve received. You can
go through the survey and see what we’re asking. If you have comments on what we’re asking
or how we’re asking a certain question, then we’d be happy to take that. We really want to get
this out into the community, get it back and start working on it. I think from my perspective I
don’t want this to be a onetime thing because I think I want to be able to track progress over
time. I’m working on stuff that will follow up just within my department that would be doing
more continuous survey work. I had the good fortune of having my assistant invite me to a
presentation that the Administrative Assistant’s Association that was done by KU Med and they
talked about how their continuous improvement has kind of taken them from worst to first. I
want to try using some parts of that model. I think in general we’re pretty good. We’ve got a
lot of work to do and I think we’re falling short on returning phone calls and emails and I know
those two things are happening because I’m getting those complaints. I’m working on making
sure that ceases, but I think people will generally be friendlier if they know they’re being
surveyed every time they talk to somebody. I want to make sure that we’re always as friendly as
we can be.

BPU Board Member Alvey said I make a suggestion here. Question 6 do you separate
electric from water. Those are two different functions, so you might have a great experience
with water and not so great an experience with electric. That might be helpful. Commissioner
Kane said that’s very cool. I didn’t know this. Mr. Richardson said I would agree that might
be the case.

Chairman Holland said is this also going to be available online or is it going to be written only?
Mr. Richardson said I don’t know how we’re going to deliver it exactly, but we’re really going
to use our contact list with our recent customers who we have all their emails and send it out by
email. Greg Talkin, NRC, said on the continuous part of it I think we need to find a way to get
it on the Development site. Chairman Holland said SurveyMonkey could do this in a minute.
This is a very quick and easy survey and it would compile the data for you. You talk about
human resources, it’s going to take human resources to read this. Mr. Talkin said I think
additionally we need to send it out by email and by mail in some instances because we’re going
back and tracking past buildings and people may not be visiting our site. From this point forward it would be good to have it on our website.

**Chairman Holland** said I agree with that. Even to have--I’ve seen this in footers of emails that when you send an email back track your service today. People can click on it and it takes them to a survey. It also throws out the outliers. There’s a handful of people that you couldn’t make happy if you delivered them a turkey pre-baked on Thanksgiving Day. Statistically, you can throw out the outliers of people who are going to complain about everything no matter how good the service is and get the legitimate feedback. I think this is great and I’m all over this. I want to see this scope expanded immediately to a lot of our departments that are touching people because it becomes a policy issue. If we’re not delivering quality customer service in Codes, when we were complaining about code enforcement, I heard that we had cut the department and people couldn’t do it. When we’re having trouble with the different departments, I want to know from a policy perspective, are these problems—a lot of it is training for customer service. You have to teach people that deal who deal with the public how to deal with the public in a constructive way. That’s an educational process. Are we providing training opportunities for our employees to be successful with the public, are we staffing our offices at a level that they can be successful. I think this becomes policy questions. This is great information for the Commission when we’re doing budget to say look, if we want to increase customer service, it’s the same thing that I hear when we talk about the Fire Department. Fire Department says you want to keep your service times down, you’ve got to fund at a certain level. If we want our customer service at a certain level, it’s a Commission decision to fund at a certain level and to provide the training opportunities and the training resources for our people to be successful. I think this is critically important data that can support our people on the ground who are getting eaten up at the front desk by angry customers which hurts morale. I think we could do a lot. This kind of feedback has a great opportunity to benefit our staff in a lot of departments. I hope this will be a model that we can accelerate through our organization because there are a lot of places that touch the public—vehicles, vehicle licensing, a lot of that problem is state generated, but I think there are a lot of different departments that could benefit. Then it’s got to come back to us to hear the feedback because some of it might be we need a personality change at a front desk. Another
piece might be we need more personalities at the front desk so that someone can take a vacation once in a while.

**Commissioner Barnes** said I want to say this right here, the information is good. The data becomes good, but I think what’s even better is that when we do get someone that is disgruntled, I think there is nothing wrong with people criticizing us. I think we should hear people that do criticize us. It derives from the word critique. When someone is critiquing us, we should understand what it is regardless of how slanderous it is. Having that information available to us for us to interact with that person I think becomes most valuable. I get some of my best advice from people that I know that are way out on the other end, but its good critiquing. I think we should not be afraid of that, afraid of addressing it in some kind of way. I think we should have an opportunity to visit them and say okay how can we make ourselves better. There’s nothing wrong with listening to people. It gives them an outlet to say okay I fill out this appraiser survey and that’s the end of it, that’s all I can do. It gives them a sense of empowerment that hey my comment does count. I think we should hear it. It’s a two-way street. We can take that information and use it to our advantage. I’m really mostly looking at what I call the contractors. I run into a lot of contractors that have issues. Regardless to how wild they are, we should not just say okay they’re crazy, let’s leave them alone. I think we should say okay, what if we could accommodate this guy in some kind of way, form or fashion. We might discover the fact is that we need a remedial class for you if you’re having problems understanding what is going on. So that becomes very valuable. We should have some way of logging that information so that if we should say I want to have a training class for entry level contractors that trying to get into the business and just tell them how they can negotiate through the process and make it a little bit more friendly.

**Commissioner McKiernan** said I want to absolutely commend this. I spent several hours Friday afternoon walking on Central Avenue and just stopping in and chatting with business owners. A lot of the things that are on this page came up in my course of conversation with them. I think they would be all over the opportunity to be able to provide feedback. I’d offer two suggestions. For example, on No. 4 you ask about how positive was your experience and they can reply on the ordinal scales. In addition to other, I’d suggest a place where there’s an
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open ended comment box where they can give you details of what was very good or not so good, so they can provide more details about how was our customer service excellent or they can provide more details about where did we fall down. What I see is there is other on all these. No. 7 has it. I’d suggest putting something similar to that on 4, 5 and 6. BPU Board Member Alvey said I would agree. You will get numbers back, but if you are really trying to track the pattern of what is not working well and what is working well, people really have to get into it and say we had a problem with this and this is bad. Commissioner McKiernan said you and I are surveyed all the time. In addition to trying to support the numbers we’re trying to look for the little keys that say okay why did we get those numbers. Oh, this might be it and we can drill down deeper there. I assume this will be primarily an anonymous survey. I know some people are concerned about revealing who they are, they would prefer to be anonymous. Mr. Richardson said right now it’s supposed to be anonymous; however, I might suggest that we give people an option to give us their name if they wish because it might allow us to get to the bottom. Commissioner McKiernan said perfect, that was going to be what my suggestion is. I think it’s great to start anonymous but I totally agree that if somebody wants to—and you’ve got Mike as a contact person here, but it seems to me that’s just the survey issue, that there might be somebody else who’s a contact person if somebody wants to follow-up and talk a little more in length about their experience. I cannot commend you more highly on this. This is fantastic.

Commissioner Barnes said there will be an option to build (inaudible) That’s what I was talking of, the collection of the information, will anybody be able to interact with them. Commissioner Kane said this is great. We just need one more that says where the Commissioner can analyze this data. That would be one that would be quite interesting. Chairman Holland asked what is it? Commissioner Kane said we should have another one for us so that we can analyze the staff and I’ll put my name on it.

Mr. Richardson said I am looking at the email tag with the SurveyMonkey. I could really do a daily tracking of where we are and I’ll share that with whoever wanted to see those. Our goal is that people come in and get good service and that they are responded to quickly and that we’re polite to them. We’re in pretty rare position where we have to tell a lot of people no you can’t do that. We have to do that with a smile in a nice way. It’s not always just no, but sometimes its no, but you might be able to do it like this and sometimes there’s no answer to that. We’ve got
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some issues that we’ll work through and be happy to have feedback. **Chairman Holland** said I think this is a great start. I’d like to keep this on our agenda in terms of reporting back on how this is going. **Mr. Richardson** said it may be the month after next before we get it all back and tabulated since we’re doing hard copy the first time.

**Mr. Bach** said Commissioner Kane I saw the look on your face. We didn’t have the document here, but this is one of the items we’re working on where it’s fostering an environment small and large businesses thrive, jobs are created. That’s a pretty open goal that the Commission set or a strategy. This is just one task. **Commissioner Kane** said here’s what I like about it. If somebody complains, I’ll be able to call Rob and say hey did you get something back from this guy. Right now, they just shoot across the bow 90% of the time and give you one name or a first name. We don’t know who they are talking about.

**Chairman Holland** said this is key and this would be helpful for me. If I have access to this tool, and I get a call complaining, I can shoot them out a survey and say here’s a survey, I’d like you to fill this out and get it back to us so we can crunch that data. That would be great for me rather than just what. **Mr. Richardson** said online I’m going to say who’s the staff member you had contact with because if you are in a position where you know something’s a fact but you can’t actually prove it, I’m going to alleviate that role.

**Mr. Levin** said you might note that the date that appears on this document is May 14 and I’d like to say I have been anxiously awaiting this opportunity. You might remember during the 2011 budget process the Commission approved I’ll say reinitiating the Public Building Commission, especially for financing, building improvements and county facilities where we really don’t have the ability through traditional financing to do debt financing of county facilities.

Simply this evening I’m looking for direction from this Committee as to the structure of a Public Buildings Commission. I’ve indicated 3 points of emphasis. The PBC is the legal authority that authorizes the financing. It does not really take away any authority from the Commission as to approving the policy, rather it still remains the entire Commission’s responsibility to approve the CMIP as part of the budget process. I think earlier, or last year actually last December, bond counsel recommended that the PBC’s role really is the technical
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authority that signs the lease, that’s the language that I’m going to use here. Again, the projects that are comprised of the CMIP are determined by the Commission.

I see two different alternatives. One, and we discussed this one with you previously, is sort of a smaller group that would serve as the members of the PBC, and that could include elected officials. In this example we’re saying the Mayor, the Chair of this Committee and then three staff members. The second alternative would be going towards a full blown citizen group. We would view that option as being less efficient, remembering that really the primary role is just to sign the lease, it’s not to determine which projects make up the CMIP. The last statement, if the Commission really prefers to engage citizen input, maybe we could do that through an advisory committee. I think when we had discussions with the Mayor he is really looking for a recommendation from this Committee as to the structure of the PBC.

Chairman Holland said I’d like to weigh in. As I’ve learned more about this looking at state statute, when we unified the government we unified our city/county budgeting process. Though we have to maintain two separate budgets by law, we really have kind of a unified budget that we consider both equally at the same time. There’s a lot of thought that goes into how to do that. Originally, my understanding of the Public Building Commission was that it would apply in a county that has three commissioners and would have a need to build something rarely, whether they’re going to build a courthouse or to do something, they would form a Public Building Commission. We have an active CMIP projects that we separate out County and City. What happens is we have the state tools by statute to go out as a City and issue debt. On the County side we don’t have that authority. We have to go through in my mind this archaic process that is outlined by the state that says you have to have a “Public Building Commission.”

What I think we have the option of doing, and I think Option B is a lesser option because Option B simply adds another layer. It does the same thing that we’ve done to the Park Board. The Park Board has no taxing authority anymore. It used to. Now it’s an advisory group. All we would be doing is setting up another Commission appointed advisory group, not necessarily with people who are engineers and policy setters, but would be citizen folks that we don’t engage. We engage citizens in the public hearings on our budget and in setting the priorities generally for the budget, but in terms of just doing debt service to do locks on the jail doors. That was a very expensive item that we’ve had to fund, we couldn’t debt fund it because we don’t have authority through this. The kinds of things we need to do, we need this authority just
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like we have on the City. I think a small group. It’s an administrative task and I think this
group’s fine. I’m not married to that group but I think it’s the group that makes the most sense.
I would think there needs to be someone from the budget office in there. I think our CMIP staff
ought to be on that board. I think it just needs to be the normal staffing projects that bring forth
CMIP projects just like on the City side and not encumber ourselves with another layer of
bureaucracy.

I think letter A accomplishes the mission from the State’s statute and it gets us moving
forward in an expedited way that we can actually do the work we need to do. I feel pretty
strongly that we need to go with A. I think five or six people is plenty. I think we can decide
who we want to do that.

Commissioner Kane said I agree with most of that. You know how they have the Ethics
Commission and stuff like that, I think we ought to have everybody that you just said and then
maybe two or three citizens that the Commission as a whole adds to the list. I don’t think we
should just do it ourselves and I think somebody that thinks outside of our box might help us.

Chairman Holland said would you recommend doing that for our City side CMIP as well?
Commissioner Kane said no, I want to keep this to a minimum. Chairman Holland said this is
my question. My point is the state statute just happens to break up city and counties because in
our state it’s mostly counties. Commissioner Kane said well then, the same group does one that
does the other. Chairman Holland said my point is I don’t know why we would change the
process from how we’re doing the City side. Commissioner Barnes said because it’s screwed
up too. I’m saying it is. Right now we have no prioritization process. Staff brings to us a list of
CMIP projects and we wrestle with it every year. Then we get this wish list. We have no way to
advance a project on the list and then it’s just according to how a particular staff member is
feeling on a particular day as to what’s going to make the list.

Chairman Holland said I think we do have input in putting things on the list. We all set
through that CMIP project. We all looked at the priorities. We all looked at what needed to be
done. Frankly, there wasn’t anything on it that I saw that we funded that was exciting and new.
It was all patching up broken down stuff is my experience in my CMIP meetings. The staff
knows very clearly what’s the most broken and they bring it to us. I think we do have option to
say you know what we want to build a new fire station out in Piper. We’re going to tear down
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the pole barn and we’re going to build it. I think if that’s a priority and you’ve got six votes to do it, then we can put it on the CMIP at the top of the list. **Commissioner Kane** said here’s what’s going on. People are saying that we don’t ever tell them anything. We hide everything from them. You guys aren’t being transparent because I know everybody wants to be transparent. But I think if you take applications for two or three people that are willing to help, and yeah they can be on both sides if that what it needs to be. To throw it back on staff and a handful of people, then they’re going to say well how did you know about it. Hell, I didn’t know about it, nobody told me. Because that happens a lot. I just think it’s smarter that a very small group, two or three at the most.

**Commissioner McKiernan** said if the issue is transparency to the broader public, I don’t know how putting two or three people on this helps that in anyway. Because those two or three people know about it but everybody else still doesn’t. **Commissioner Kane** said you’d be surprised. **Commissioner McKiernan** said no I don’t think I would. I think that we need to look for other strategies to increase our transparency. **Commissioner Kane** said obviously you’ve had better luck than I’ve had with staff lately.

**Chairman Holland** said here’s the reality folks and I think this comes down to it. We are elected by the public to oversee this corporation. That’s why we’re elected. We are the board that oversees this public entity. We are the voice of the public. The public elects us to oversee the CMIP process and to set those priorities. Not one thing should be funded in that CMIP, City or County, that we don’t approve and that we don’t approve of and that we don’t think is important. I think we have that responsibility, ultimately, to see that it’s managed well. The other thing is all of our budget hearings are open to the public. Very few people attend. All of our CMIP meetings were open to the public because they’re Committees of the Whole. Very few people chose to attend. For me, transparency is not that everybody knows what’s going on but that everybody has the opportunity to know what’s going on. I work full time at an organization where people want to know what’s going on. People who don’t come to any meetings get mad because they don’t know what’s going on. Well, friends, we publish months in advance our budget hearing schedule, our CMIP schedules. everybody has an opportunity to come or to send a representative. If they chose not to come or to pay attention, and I will say if I
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have a question about the budget poor Lew gets a phone call. If I have a question about a project, I have to find out because there’s a lot of stuff I don’t know. I called the other day, people were calling me. There’s ground being broken somewhere people want to know what’s going in. I don’t know so I have to call and find out and people tell me.

I would say we don’t have—and we just won an award for transparency in our government for our budget process. I think we have a very transparent budget. I don’t think we need to add a layer of bureaucracy if we have done all the proper steps to get the word out to people. There are people that will not be happy and that we can’t fix. I think what we’re talking about, all I want to do is bring this in line with the rest of our process. If the rest of our process is screwed up and you believe it is, then we need to talk about a broader discussion about how to fix our whole budgeting process. Because if that’s screwed up we need to fix it. I think this is an administrative check off that we just do so that we can get on with business. Commissioner Kane said I disagree. Commissioner Barnes said this will come up for discussion at the full Commission is that correct? Chairman Holland said absolutely. They’re looking for a recommendation from us to take to the full Commission.

Commissioner Barnes said there will be another bite at this right here and we’re just recommending a process. What Mr. Kane was talking about is this might be the skeletal plan to go forward, but he would like to see some type of citizen involvement, whether that’s one person, two persons or three people. I agree with you 100%. What I really hate is that every time we get ready to do something we’ve got to go outside and get advice on this, that and the other when that’s what we’re paid the huge bucks to do. Then we keep adding additional. I’m torn between both worlds because we keep saying keep on making the same amount of big bucks that you’re making and we’re going to add another responsibility to you. We’re going to add a land bank and we’re going to add a standing committee and we’re going to add two standing committees and then we’re going to have some special sessions and then we’re going to add some more meetings and I want you to keep making the same amount of money. I’m just using that as a complaint. What I’m saying is I hear you loud and clear Mr. Kane in what you’re trying to do, but if this is going to be a full Commission discussion I think we can all agree that A is not a bad issue at this table with some modifications. Those modifications will be presented at a later date if we don’t have them here tonight. Again, my issue is not A, my issue is not the
budget process because I think we did a wonderful job last time starting early, identifying issues early and giving us time to deal with it. I compliment all involved in the process. But it still did not solve the lifelong issue of how a project makes it from hello I’ve got some water seeping out of the street at 12\textsuperscript{th} & Quindaro and its ponding in this particular area. How do I get that project on a list of priorities? We haven’t identified that. One thing that Fred Bachus, because I think he had the sweet job when he was here, Fred could come here and talk all of this technical crap over our heads and we wouldn’t say no to him because we couldn’t say he was real or not. He would give a technical, expert analysis of what he was recommending and you couldn’t challenge him on it. We were not able to be able to get a system of prioritizations. Then we’ll sit here and say how did this project make it when I’ve been sitting here waiting on some kind of flood mitigation in this area here for almost 10 years. What Mike is saying is even if they pull the over our head talk conversation about it, at least we were there, we had a citizen representative there, or somebody representative there to deal with it. I’m torn both ways and I look forward to an open discussion with the full Commission. To make certain it doesn’t turn into this type of discussion it might be best that we have a third option on the table where it’s not a full blown 11 representatives but how can we involve the public, whether it’s one person, two persons or three persons. Rather than have Mr. Kane sit down and say this is the way the flow chart is going to look, give us some help and offer us some options.

\textbf{BPU Board Member Alvey} said I’m just going to speak as a citizen. On the south side one of the complaint I know that when we were annexed in 1966-67, there was concern at that time that some of the capital improvements needed to take place to upgrade the township didn’t take place for a long time. What I will say is the capital improvement projects, upgrading the streets to curbs and drainage sewers from ditches and sidewalks, those areas that had been improved that way 55\textsuperscript{th} Street, 47\textsuperscript{th} Street, Shawnee Drive, those have been the high priority areas. Those absolutely had to be done. Now there is certainly more to be done. Metropolitan definitely needs to be upgraded. There are plenty more to be done. From my experience, I don’t know how the process has gone on. It seems to me, at least in my neighborhood, that part of Turner, the right priorities have gotten taken care of.
Chairman Holland said they’re looking for a recommendation. It takes four votes to move this forward. We may not have a consensus of four votes to move this forward. I think the recommendation of A, I think this is an administrative task and I think if this process is wrong, then we need to evaluate our entire budgeting process. In my mind all this is is an administrative task for budgeting. So how do we replace the locks in the jail doors, that’s all this is in my mind. For me, I’d like to see No. A and I’d make a motion to that effect. It might not pass, but I make a motion for letter A to take to the full Commission for consideration. There’s no second it won’t go far.

Commissioner McKiernan said wait, is there a possibility of an A, a B and a C. What you have suggested is effectively a halfway point where there is the group proposed in A with a community representative, someone who gives a perspective. Chairman Holland said from who’s district? Commissioner McKiernan said I don’t care. Commissioner Kane said I don’t care. Well, we had to pick a judge, right? There was x amount of applicants for the judge from Moe and those guys. Commissioner McKiernan said a lottery system. Everybody who’s interested and we pick one by lottery. Commissioner Barnes said identity the process later, but that’s the motion right there. I think that should be the motion. If Mr. Kane says one representative from the community and I’m territorial when it comes to representatives at the table. Chairman Holland said should it be the Public Building Commission that gets that representative or should it be the CMIP project or should we do that for the budgeting. We’ve got to issue debt in order to build a street. We have to issue debt in order to do some things in our parks. It’s the same government. If it’s broken on one side, we need to fix on the other. I think tying this together with the Public Building Commission is making a bigger deal out of it than it is. Commissioner McKiernan said let that be a lesson to you. Don’t give us any alternatives, just bring one thing.

Mr. Levin said I just want to clarify again the Public Building Commission is the body that’s going to approve the lease that goes before it. The projects that comprise it are going to be approved by the Commission. Commissioner Barnes said derived from where? Chairman Holland said the same CMIP process we have now. So if that’s broken, we need to fix that. Mr. Bach said this doesn’t have anything to do with that. The projects you’re picking this
doesn’t have anything to do with it. The process is the same. If you say you want to pick somebody from the public to come in and say that’s the best bank or leasing tool to go with, so be it. That’s what you’re doing. Commissioner Kane said they’re only one voice. Commissioner McKiernan said that’s the key right there. Chairman Holland said the key is right now if we bond out who determines the lease agreement when we bond out a city street, who makes that decision. You make a recommendation to us and we vote on it right? Mr. Bach said we have a financial advisor if it gets complicated or we use our bond counsel and we use our finance experts.

Commissioner McKiernan said I think I need to more fully read. Go back to point No. 3. Bond counsel recommends that the full Commission’s role is determination of –what you said just triggered this Doug—is the Commission’s role is determination of the final projects included in CMIP. Same process as we have now. The Public Building Commission functions as the technical authority that assigns the lease to the government. Having read that now, yes, second. Chairman Holland said it’s just administrative. Commissioner McKiernan said that clarifies the entire thing right there. You still have the same CMIP process as we’ve always had. This is just meeting a state technicality.

Chairman Holland said we fixed the budget hearing. Last year we heard a ton of trouble because the budget was too condensed. So we stretched that out and I thought did a fantastic job with the budget, the best ever. I thought this budget process was the best ever. If we need to do a similar process and open the CMIP better so we can get things on the list that you want on the list and so that we can have more public input or whatever, I think we do to the CMIP what we did to the budget and open it up more. I’m totally fine with that, separate from this technicality. Commissioner Kane said I 100% agree with the way the budget went down last year. That is not my issue. My issue is I think we need somebody, a citizen on that board. So you make your motion, you do whatever you got to do. Commissioner McKiernan said community improvement projects, you want somebody to. Commissioner Kane said no just for the building. Chairman Holland said just for the Public Building Commission, just on the County side. Commissioner Kane said well, yeah, if that’s what it takes. Chairman Holland said just for this one thing? Commissioner Barnes said hold on a second. I think this is where we got it,
not that you’ve changed my mind about being torn between two worlds, see my piece still screwed up on priority. Chairman Holland said let’s fix it. Commissioner McKiernan said that’s a different fix. Commissioner Barnes said exactly. But I’m saying if these projects are coming through CMIP, this is the same problem that I’m having with CMIP existing right now.

The whole purpose of my trying to say let’s have somebody on there is because of the problem that we’re having with CMIP. If we are in agreement to say when a CMIP project comes through and we have a prioritization process that we’re going to deal with, then that’s a moot point because we’re still looking at CMIP issues. You see what I’m trying to say. Chairman Holland said let’s separate those issues. Commissioner Barnes said I understand. I have a level of confidence in dealing with it because that person will say hey I see what’s going on. It’s kind of like a second eye seeing the travesty that we’re running into right now. Commissioner McKiernan said before it gets to the technical authority assigning the lease to the government, before that happens….Commissioner Barnes said we deal with it. Chairman Holland said we deal with it all.

Commissioner Kane said did anybody forget last Thursday? Say I made a major mistake in my district and I took one in a very uncomfortable place, staff did not notify the person that was to the east of that property within 200’. That’s why that thing came back. Chairman Holland said I can’t remember what you’re talking about. Commissioner Barnes said the technical issue, the fairgrounds. Commissioner Kane said the fairgrounds. Chairman Holland said oh the fairground, that was a big deal. I remember that now. Commissioner Kane said that’s what I’m saying. I’ve had the Wine Barn, I’ve had the fairgrounds. I’ve had two major things in my district that were fiascos, bad. I am extremely leery of some of the capabilities of staff right now. Chairman Holland said that’s a different issue. For me that’s a different issue still. It’s a bigger issue than this little piece of paper. What I’m trying to say is this piece of paper is small and I want to keep it small and I want to deal with these bigger issues. One is CMIP which is much bigger and one is general staff. I would say for all the mistakes staff makes, they’ve done a lot right too. Mistakes are going to be made. I want to separate out the issues and make sure that the remedy fits the issue. I don’t think sticking a person on here as a token citizen is fixing the issue you’re talking about with staff or the issue you’re talking about with CMIP.

Commissioner Barnes said I think we can accomplish both if we say we’re going to move this
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forward on A with a stipulation that we’re going to address the prioritization issue of a brash CMIP projects. Any building would fall up under the CMIP projects? Chairman Holland said yes it would. Commissioner Barnes said so this designation is not going to change this building from being a part of the CMIP process, so it still has to go there. Chairman Holland said what I thought initially was that they picked the buildings and they did it. When I first heard this I thought they picked the project and they funded it. Commissioner McKiernan said CMIP does. Chairman Holland said and when I understood that this is just a technicality, that it’s still the same process, it’s just a financing tool mandated by the state in all of its wisdom, then it changed my perspective on it. Commissioner Barnes but in past issues like when we wanted to build the jail, we would have to make it a voting issue right. Mr. Levin said on the county side major or significant improvements you have go before the citizens. Commissioner Barnes said so we would have to put this to a vote of the people. On the city side we don’t have to do it. So this right here says since we don’t want to go to a vote of the people, this Public Building Commission identifies that. This is transformed into a CMIP project rather than the voting issue.

Chairman Holland said that’s exactly right. So we have two issues that have been raised here that I think are critically important. One is reviewing CMIP prioritization. The other piece is concerns with staff functioning and staff errors on major projects that are taking chunks out of your hide. I want to drill down on that to see how we can address that because that’s not okay. Commissioner Kane said absolutely. Chairman Holland said I’m right there with you. And those are two trickier issues, but I think we can do it. The CMIP review I think we can do and I think we can do this too. Commissioner Kane said as a matter of record. You got what he just said right. I’m all for that.

Commissioner Barnes moves for approval on A and C. Commissioner McKiernan seconds with stipulation that we review our CMIP projects. Chairman Holland said and talk about how, and I want to phrase this right, it’s big right now so I want to make sure I get it right, quality control with staff projects. Chairman Holland said is that right? Commissioner Barnes said it is a quality control issue when it comes to the administrative portion of it. Commissioner Kane said it could be. I want them to know I’m still upset. Commissioner Barnes said so noted.
Chairman Holland said so noted. Commissioner Barnes said put it in red in the minutes. Chairman Holland said we have a motion and second for A.

Action: Commissioner Holland made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve A and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes” Alvey, Kane, McKiernan, Barnes, Holland.

VI. Adjourn

Chairman Holland adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.
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A resolution amending R-99-11, the description of CMIP 970-1090, 98th Street, State Avenue to Parallel Parkway project scope of work. No change in fund authorization amount.

Two Reimbursement Resolutions: The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas expects to make capital expenditures after the date of these resolutions and the Unified Government intends to reimburse itself for such expenditures with the proceeds of bonds, notes or a lease purchase agreement up to the maximum stated per project.

CMIP 942-0113: Emergency Bridge Repair 2013, maximum reimbursement $250,000
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File Attachment
RESOLUTION NO. ___

A RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION R-99-11 AUTHORIZING CERTAIN STREET AND SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS, AND PROVIDING FOR THE MANNER OF PAYING FOR THE SAME.

WHEREAS, Article 12, Section 5 of the Constitution of the State of Kansas and Charter Ordinance No. CO-03-09 of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City Kansas (the "Unified Government") authorizes the governing body of the Unified Government to make a variety of improvements as further described in CO-03-09 and to issue its general obligation bonds and/or temporary notes for the same; and

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2011, the Unified Government adopted Resolution No. R-99-11, authorizing certain street and sidewalk improvements as described therein; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to amend the description of the improvements as provided by Resolution R-99-11,

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

Section 1. Sections 1 of Resolution R-99-11 are hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Pursuant to the above the Unified Government hereby finds and determines that it is necessary to make the following, 98th Street, State Avenue to Parallel Parkway Program CMIP 970-1090 improvements (the "Improvements"):

Reconstruction of 98th Street, from State Avenue to France Family Drive, with full depth pavement replacement, including milling, resurfacing, utility adjustments, pavement marking, sidewalk and curb repairs, storm inlet repairs, ADA compliant curb ramps, traffic signal and street lighting modifications, construction of sidewalks, curbs and gutters along the north side of State Avenue east and west of 98th Street, and associated construction costs, including any appurtenances related thereto, any necessary land acquisition, engineering, and design.

Section 2. Resolution No. R-99-11, as amended by this Resolution, is hereby ratified and confirmed, and shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 3. This Resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval by the governing body of the Unified Government.

PASSED by the Governing Body on ___ day of ________________, 2012 and APPROVED by the Mayor.
(SEAL)

ATTEST:

Unified Government Clerk

Mayor/CEO
RESOLUTION NO. __________________

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

1. That the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (the "Unified Government") expects to make capital expenditures after the date of this Resolution in connection with the 2013 EMERGENCY BRIDGE REPAIR Program (CMIP 942-0113) (the "Project"), and the Unified Government intends to reimburse itself for such expenditures with the proceeds of bonds, notes, or a lease purchase agreement.

2. That the maximum principal amount of the bonds, notes, lease agreement, or other obligations expected to be issued for the Project is $250,000.00 plus cost of issuance and interest on any temporary financing.

ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS, THIS _____ DAY OF __________________, 2012.

(SEAL)

__________________________
Joe Reardon, Mayor/CEO

Attest:

__________________________
Unified Government Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. __________________

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

1. That the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (the "Unified Government") expects to make capital expenditures after the date of this Resolution in connection with the 2013 Guardrail Replacement Program (CMIP 941-0513) (the "Project"), and the Unified Government intends to reimburse itself for such expenditures with the proceeds of bonds, notes, or a lease purchase agreement.

2. That the maximum principal amount of the bonds, notes, lease agreement, or other obligations expected to be issued for the Project is $100,000.00 plus cost of issuance and interest on any temporary financing.

ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS, THIS _____ DAY OF __________________, 2012.

(SEAL)

__________________________
Joe Reardon, Mayor/CEO

Attest:

__________________________
Unified Government Clerk
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RESOLUTION NO. ____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CERTAIN COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS, AND PROVIDING FOR THE MANNER OF PAYING FOR THE SAME.

WHEREAS, Article 12, Section 5 of the Constitution of the State of Kansas and Charter Ordinance No. CO-03-09 of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City Kansas (the "Unified Government") authorizes the governing body of the Unified Government to make a variety of improvements as further described in CO-03-09 and to issue its general obligation bonds and/or temporary notes for the same; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government has determined that it is necessary to make certain street, sidewalk, pedestrian way, public building, parking, public park, recreation facility, storm water, sewer, and public utility improvements, as more fully described herein.

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

Section 1. Pursuant to the above the Unified Government hereby finds and determines that it is necessary to make the following COMMISSION NEIGHBORHOOD INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM CMIP 970-1294 improvements (the "Improvements"): Construction or installation of neighborhood public infrastructure improvements within the City of Kansas City, Kansas as recommended by the respective district Commissioners, including all appurtenances related thereto as well as any necessary land acquisition, engineering and design. Projects and locations are as follows:

A. SIDEWALKS AND CURBS: Construction of new or replacement sidewalks along one or both sides of the following streets, including removal and demolition of existing sidewalks, curbs and pavements, installation of new sidewalks, curbs, ADA compliant curb ramps, lighting adjustments, utility adjustments, seeding or sodding for restoration, restoration and repairs to street surfaces, pavement markings at crosswalks, and adjustments to signing. Many, but not all, of the following locations will be included:

**District 1**
47th Street from Parallel Parkway to Greeley Avenue
Repairs to other sidewalks in District 1, the locations and amounts of which to be determined.

**District 2**
Gilmore Avenue from 10th Street to Mill Street
10th Street from Pacific Avenue to Ivandale Street
Shawnee Avenue from Valley Street to 14th Street
Osage Avenue from 14th Street to S. Valley Street
Hasbrook Avenue from S. Valley Street to 14th Street
Custer Avenue, from S. Valley Street to 12th Street
12th Street, a portion of sidewalk between Kansas Avenue and Custer Avenue
Scott Avenue from 14th Street to S. Valley Street
S. Valley Street from Scott Avenue to Kansas Avenue
Custer Avenue from 12th to 14th Streets
Argentine Blvd. from 12th Street to Valley Street
Custer Ave from 10th to 11th Street
Barnett Avenue from 14th to 13th Streets.
14th Street, from Ann to alley between Ann and Barnett
North Valley from Orville Avenue to Riverview Avenue

District 3
Lloyd from 42nd Street to 43rd Street
42nd Street from Lloyd to Fisher
Minnie from 43rd to 40th
3900 Block of Springfield
Springfield from 43rd to 39th Streets
Southwest Boulevard/Merriam Lane, from Iowa to 10th Street
22nd Street, from Steel to Ruby on 22nd street.
Streets and parking areas around the Argentine Community Center
at 2810 Metropolitan Avenue.
Streets around Frank Rushton school at 2605 West 43rd Avenue
Streets around Noble Prentis Elementary near 14th and Gibbs Road
42nd Street from Springfield to Mission Road.
Springfield from Seneca to 45th Street
Adams from Seneca to 45th street
Francis, Eaton, Cambridge and State Line Road, each from 43rd to 46th streets.
14th Street, Douglas to Steele Road
Select additional locations in District 3 as selected by the Commissioner

Some of the sidewalk projects in District 3 may be administered under a program
whereby reimbursements are made to individual property owners for sidewalks replaced
within the public rights-of-way, where the work is performed by private contractors
working directly for the homeowners. All such sidewalks are inspected by the Unified
Government prior to reimbursement.

District 4
Everett Avenue, 12th to 13th
Everett Avenue, 11th to 12th
9th Street, Everett Avenue to Walker Avenue
Haskell from 22nd Street to 2300 Haskell
Walker from 7th Street west connecting into city Park trail system.
New Jersey Avenue, 20th Street to 22nd Street
10th Street, Washington Avenue to Walker Avenue

District 6
Shawnee Drive from 42nd to 34th Streets
Shawnee Drive, spot repairs between the east-side ramp of I-635 to 42nd Street
55th Street from the County Line Road to Locust Avenue
55th Street from Locust Street to Oak Grove Road
55th Street from Oak Grove Road to Metropolitan Avenue
55th Street from Metropolitan Avenue to Inland Drive
Gibbs Road from the east side of I-635 to S. 34th Street
S 34th from Shawnee Drive to Steele Road
38th Street from Argentine to Powell
Miami Avenue from 55th Street to 53rd Street

2
53rd Street from Swartz Road to Miami Avenue

District 7
Taurome Avenue from 84th Street to 82nd Terrace, including cross walk upgrades at intersections.
94th Street from State Avenue to Minnesota Avenue and the entrance to St. Patrick’s school.
Repairs or replacements to other existing sidewalks in District 7 as determined by the Commissioner.

District 8
Taurome, 82nd Terrace to 80th Terrace, including cross walk upgrades at intersections.

At-Large District 1
Mission Road from 43rd Street to 40th Terrace, east side
Mission Road, from 43rd Street to the southeast corner of Rosedale Park, west side
Within Rosedale Park interior, from the southeast corner of the park to the parking lots and play areas.
Adams Street, from 43rd St north to dead end
Mission Road from 46th to 47th Streets
Argentine Boulevard from 42nd Street to 34th Street

B. OTHER PROJECTS: Work also includes the following additional neighborhood infrastructure improvements as listed:

District 1
Parkwood Facility Improvements: Repair, replacement or installation of benches, walkways, stonework, recreational and playground equipment, shelters including fixtures, and restroom facilities.

Historic Dunbar School Site Project: Engineering, design and construction of signage, lighting, displays and exhibits reflecting the historic significance of the former Dunbar School located near 6th & Rowland, including any necessary parking areas, sidewalks and related amenities.

District 2
Cross Walks: Cross walk improvements, including new striping, curb ramps, curbs, sidewalks, signage and possibly new warning beacons if warranted at one or more of the following intersections:
Kansas Avenue and S. 12th Street
Kansas Avenue and S. Valley Street
Kansas Avenue and S. 14th Street

District 3
Cross Walks: Cross walk improvements, including new striping, curb ramps, curbs, sidewalks, signage and possibly new warning beacons if warranted at one or more of the following intersections:
42nd Street and Lloyd Street
Southwest Boulevard and Mill Street
District 4

Football Field: Installation of a new football playing field on a to-be-determined parcel east of I-635 and north of I-70 in Kansas City, Kansas. Work will include shaping the land with fill and excavation, placement of a top soil cap, installation of irrigations or sprinkler systems, seeding or sodding, installation of goal posts, fencing and other related equipment, benches, and trash receptacles, installation of bathroom facilities, concrete walkways, and misc. paving, curb work and grading associated with on-street or off-street parking.

Jersey Creek Park Trail: Repair and replacement of existing asphalt trail in Jersey Creek Park, south of Parallel Avenue between 5th Street and 9th Street, as well as the connector from Jersey Creek to the existing sidewalk at 7th and Walker, including demolition, regarding, replacement with either asphalt or concrete surfacing, including base course, ADA accessible ramps and features, sodding or seed for restoration, and signage.

District 5

Piper Community Center: Renovation and upgrades to a portion of a former grade school building and gymnasium to convert into a community center, with facilities for various community activities, potentially including rooms and space for exercise and fitness, crafts and pottery, indoor basketball and volleyball courts, multi-purpose area for large meetings and dinners, a dance area, kitchen, storage rooms and offices. The existing building is the former Piper Elementary school located on North 122nd Street north of Leavenworth Road. Upgrade work may include rearrangement of interior walls and supports, new bathrooms, new plumbing, electrical, lighting, heating, ventilation, air-conditioning, tile or carpeting, interior wall refinishing, new cabinets and doors, sound-proofing, ceiling, modifications to comply with ADA rules, and interior finishes. Additional equipment and furnishings to be provided, including stoves, refrigerators, sinks, cabinets, counter space, sound equipment, and kilns for ceramic and pottery. Exterior work may include upgrades and repairs to the existing parking lot, restriping, signage as well as provision of additional parking lot lighting.

District 6

Turner Walking Park Lighting: Installation of pedestrian-scale lighting along the walking trail at Turner Walking Park, located 53rd Street and north of County Line Road. Work includes installation of lighting poles and bases, light fixtures, wiring and conduit within and between lights, power source connections, controllers and other appurtenances, including minor grading and restoration work associated with installation.

Turner Walking Park Shelter House and Restrooms: Installation of a single or double-unit restroom facilities and/or shelter house at Turner Walking Park, located east of 53rd Street and north of County Line Road. Work includes sitework, foundations, plumbing, electrical connections, structural elements, walls, roof, windows, and bathroom furnishings, including fixtures compliant with Americans with Disability Act standards. Bathrooms installation may involve connection to sanitary sewer facilities or may involve dry chemical or holding tank technologies. Shelter house may include tables, chair, grill, electrical outlets and other amenities.

Pierson Park Playgrounds: Installation of playground equipment at one or more locations in Pierson Park, including site work and grading, new playground equipment, ground pads and cover, border material, concrete sidewalks and walkways, ADA
compliant ramps and playground features, signage, and landscaping.

School Bus Waiting Areas: Installation of pedestrian waiting areas at various designated stops for school buses in the Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools District (USD 500), including sidewalks, concrete pads for pedestrian standing, grading, pavement widening, reshaping ditches and shoulders, storm sewer and culvert upgrades, pavement markings, signage, lighting modifications, utility adjustments, and ADA compliant curb ramps. Locations may include:

District 6 Bus Stop Locations for
Turner School District (USD 202) Bus Routes:

Crest Dr. & 55th St
Ottawa & 47th St
Sky Line Apartments entrance, along 55th Street north of Metropolitan
Quivira Hills Mobile Home Park, near 71st Place & Forest Drive

District 7

Pedestrian Safety: Traffic calming and pedestrian safety features, possibly including raised speed humps, along Taurome from 84th Street to 80th Terrace, in conjunction with sidewalk and crosswalk improvements.

Wyandotte County Park Softball Fields: Renovation of two existing softball fields in Wyandotte County Park, including grading and fill to level the green space, surveying the playing area for proper drainage, seeding & fertilizing, and installation of fencing, backstop and other equipment for softball and baseball.

Wyandotte County Park Improvements: Repair or installation of shelter houses, bathrooms, playground equipment, and related amenities at Wyandotte County Park, located near 126th Street and State Avenue. Work includes plumbing, foundation work, shelter and bathroom construction, electrical work, installation or repair to benches and picnic tables, as well as repairs to asphalt parking lots and curbs. Installation of playground equipment includes site work and grading, new playground equipment, ground pads and cover, border material, concrete sidewalks and walkways, ADA compliant ramps and playground features, signage, and landscaping.

School Bus Waiting Areas: Installation of pedestrian waiting areas at various designated stops for school buses in the Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools District (USD 500), including sidewalks, concrete pads for pedestrian standing, grading, pavement widening, reshaping ditches and shoulders, storm sewer and culvert upgrades, pavement markings, signage, lighting modifications, utility adjustments, and ADA compliant curb ramps. Locations may include:

District 7 Bus Stop Locations for
USD 500 Bus Routes:
72nd, North of Eisenhower
41st & Georgia to 45th & Georgia
84th & Taurome
72nd & Ridge
72nd & Gilmore
72nd & Kansas Ave
73rd & Kansas Ave
74th & Kansas Ave
76th Terrace & Kansas Ave
81st Terr. & Ella Ave
80th Terr. & Riverview
82nd Terr. & Northrup Ave
72nd & Ridge Ave.
77th & Riverview
75th & Lyon Ave
72nd & Montana Ave
61st Terr. & Oakland

District 8

Georgia and 53rd Storm Drainage: Storm drainage upgrades along 53rd Street from the intersection of Georgia and 53rd to the existing drainage outlet at Rowland east of Georgia, including inlets, storm sewer pipe, grading, outlet rip-rap and downstream channel modifications, pavement and street repairs, utility adjustments, seeding, sodding, and fencing.

Tennis Courts: Rehabilitation of existing tennis courts at several park locations, including demolition and removal of existing court surfaces, resurfacing of the courts, painting, replacement of fencing and backstops, and installation of new posts, nets, and other equipment. Locations would include the existing tennis courts located in Welborn Park, Eisenhower Park, and/or Stony Point Park.

School Bus Waiting Areas: Installation of pedestrian waiting areas at various designated stops for school buses in the Kansas City, Kansas Public Schools District (USD 500) and Turner School District (USD 202), including sidewalks, concrete pads for pedestrian standing, grading, pavement widening, reshaping ditches and shoulders, storm sewer and culvert upgrades, pavement markings, signage, lighting modifications, utility adjustments, and ADA compliant curb ramps. Locations may include:

District 8 Bus Stop Locations for
KCK Public Schools (USD 500) Bus Routes:
63rd & May Lane
63rd & Farnscheid Rd
65th & Farnscheid Rd
58th & Edith
57th & Parkview Ave
57th & Farrow Ave
58th & Yecker Ave
57th & Webster Ave
57th & Roswell Ave
57th & Lathrop Ave
63rd & Longwood
63rd & Yecker Ave
62nd & Longwood Ave
62nd & Yecker
62nd & Webster
63rd & Waverly Ave
65th & Everett
66th & Garfield
65th & 66th Dr.
67th & Donahoo Rd
77th & Riverview
61st Terr & Oakland
61st Terr & Freeman Ave
60th & Freeman Ave
60th & Oakland Ave
61st & Everett Ave
Arcadia St. & Arcadia Ct.

District 8 Bus Stop Locations for
Turner School District (USD 202) Bus Routes:
College Park entrance at 71st St. & Armstrong
Terrace Point entrance at 72nd St just south of Kansas Ave
Taueromee & 65th St
Creekwood Apts, near 301 N 70th Terr. (Bldg #8) which is east of 72nd and Split Log
Creekside Mobile Home Park entrance near 6500 Kansas Ave
69th St & State Ave

Pedestrian Safety: Traffic calming and pedestrian safety features, possibly including raised speed humps, along Taueromee from 82nd Terrace to 80th Terrace, in conjunction with sidewalk and crosswalk improvements.

Playground Equipment: Installation of playground equipment at Eisenhower Park, Thompson Park, and/or Stony Point Park, including site work and grading, new playground equipment, ground pads and cover, border material, concrete sidewalks and walkways, ADA compliant ramps and playground features, signage, and landscaping.

Walking Trail: Resurfacing of the walking trail at Wellborn Park, including new concrete and asphalt surfacing, ADA compliant ramps and other associated grading.

Softball Fields: Renovation of the softball fields at Wellborn Park, including grading and fill to level the green space, surveying the playing area for proper drainage, seeding & fertilizing, and installation of fencing, backstop and other equipment for softball and baseball.

At-Large District 1
Cross Walk Improvements: Cross walk improvements, including new or modified traffic signal or warning beacon equipment, new striping, curb ramps, curbs, sidewalks, and signage distributed amongst one or more of the following intersections, or at a mid-block location between these intersections if determined advisable by traffic safety studies:

Mission Road at W. 43rd Avenue, existing signal
Mission Road and W. 42nd Avenue
Mission Road and Rosedale Park Drive

At-Large District 2
Playground Equipment: Installation of playground equipment in Unified Government parks, including site work and grading, new playground equipment, ground pads and cover, border material, concrete sidewalks and walkways, ADA compliant ramps and playground features, signage, and landscaping. Between four to eight playgrounds would
be constructed in several of the following parks:

Mac Park, near Glendale and Garfield
Wyandotte County Lake Park, near 91st and Leavenworth Rd
Thomson Park, near 59th and Nogard
City Park North, near 32nd and Ford
Wyandotte County Park, near 126th and State Ave.
Quindaro Park South, near 34th and Sewell
Klam Park, near 22nd and Cleveland
Northrup Park, near 10th and Grandview
Stony Point Park, near 86th and Elizabeth
Rosedale Park, near 41st and Mission Road
St. Margaret’s Park, near 7th and Holmer
Edgerton Park, near 3rd and Edgerton
West Height, near 22nd and Wood

Soccer Practice Fields: Renovation of two existing practice softball fields at Wyandotte County Lake (located near the ADA fishing dock) to also serve as practice soccer fields. The work includes grading and filling to level the green space, surveying the playing area for proper drainage, seeding & fertilizing, and installation of one set of soccer goals and nets.

Section 2. For the purpose of providing funds for the Improvements, all as approved by the governing body, the Unified Government hereby authorizes the issuance of its general obligation bonds pursuant to Article 12, Section 5(a) of the Constitution of the State of Kansas and Charter Ordinance No. CO-03-09, in an amount not in excess of $1,920,000, plus capitalized interest and costs of issuance. Temporary Notes of the Unified Government are hereby authorized to be issued from time to time by resolution in an amount not to exceed the amount of general obligation bonds herein authorized.

Section 3. The Unified Government expects to make capital expenditures in connection with the Improvements and intends to reimburse itself for such expenditures with the proceeds of general obligation bonds and/or temporary notes in an amount not to exceed $1,920,000, plus capitalized interest and costs of issuance. Any general obligation bonds and/or temporary notes issued under the authority of this Resolution may be used to reimburse expenditures made on or after the date that is 60 days before the date of adoption of this Resolution pursuant to U.S. Treasury Regulation §1.150-2.

Section 4. This Resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval by the governing body of the Unified Government.

PASSED by the Governing Body on ___ day of _________________. 2012 and APPROVED by the Mayor.

(SEAL)

Mayor/CEO
ATTEST:

Unified Government Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.________

A HOME RULE ORDINANCE OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY KANSAS, AUTHORIZING THE MAKING OF CERTAIN GRANTS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES (COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS); AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS TO PAY THE COSTS THEREOF.

WHEREAS, the governing body of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City Kansas (the “Unified Government”) has considered the needs of the City of Kansas City, Kansas (the “City”) for the stimulation of expansion and retention of business and commercial activities within the environs of the City in order to enhance and provide for the general and economic development and welfare of the City and its citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government is authorized by Article 12, Section 5 of the Constitution of the State of Kansas (the “Home Rule Amendment”) to determine its local affairs and government, and provides that such power and authority granted thereby to cities shall be liberally construed for the purpose of giving to cities the largest measure of self-government; and

WHEREAS, there is no enactment of the Kansas Legislature which prohibits the Unified Government from making a grant to certain individuals and corporations, for economic development purposes, and the issuance of general obligation bonds or notes to finance the costs thereof; and

WHEREAS, the governing body of the Unified Government hereby finds that pursuant to and in furtherance of the purposes of the Home Rule Amendment, it is in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare of the City to authorize the issuance of general obligation temporary notes and/or bonds (the “Obligations”) for the purpose of financing the cost of making certain grants to individuals and corporations to fund the following community and neighborhood improvements:

a) Quindaro Homes Water and Sewer Treatment: Provide for the repair, replacement, and installation of water and sanitary sewer service lines including all necessary design and engineering in The Homes Inc., a cooperative development consisting of approximately 350 units and located generally - North of Quindaro Boulevard, West of 7th Street Trafficway, South of Kansas Highway 5, and East of North 10th Street in Kansas City, Kansas.

b) Fiber Optic Service Connection Payments: Provide for the installation of fiber optic cables and connection to fiber optic infrastructure to residential households in Commission District 1

c) Water Service Payments: Provide for payment of the connection costs associated with connecting newly constructed residential households in Commission District 1 to public water mains and the public water supply system.

(collectively, the “Projects”), all for economic development purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY KANSAS:
Section 1. Project Authorization. It is hereby authorized, ordered and directed that the Unified Government proceed with the making of the grants to fund the Projects at a cost not to exceed $80,000.00 plus costs of issuance and interest on any temporary financing.

Section 2. Financing Authorization. The costs of the Projects may be paid, in whole or in part, from the proceeds of general obligation temporary notes and/or bonds of the Unified Government (the "Obligations"), which are hereby authorized to be issued for such purposes pursuant to the authority of the Home Rule Amendment in an amount of not to exceed $80,000.00 plus costs of issuance and interest on any temporary financing.

Section 3. Further Authority. The Unified Government shall, and the officers, employees and agents of the Unified Government are hereby authorized and directed to, take such action, expend such funds and execute such other documents, certificates and instruments as may be necessary or desirable to carry out and comply with the intent of this Ordinance and to carry out, comply with and perform the duties of the Unified Government with respect to the Projects and the Bonds.

Section 4. Effective Date. This Home Rule Ordinance shall be effective from and after final passage by the governing body, approval by the Mayor and publication once in the official Unified Government newspaper.

PASSED by the Governing Body of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City Kansas on December ___, 2012.

ATTEST: Mayor/CEO

Unified Government Clerk
Staff Request for Commission Action

Type: Standard
Committee: Economic Development and Finance Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 12/3/2012
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 12/20/2012
Confirmed Date: 12/20/2012

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Department / Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2012</td>
<td>Lew Levin</td>
<td>5186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mschrick@wycokc.k.org">mschrick@wycokc.k.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Description:
A resolution authorizing the offering for sale of Municipal Temporary Notes and General Obligation Improvement Bonds of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas. Please see supporting document for a complete listing of all projects included in the following Series 2013.

**TEMPORARY NOTES**
Series 2013-I  $55,007,973.33
Series 2013-II $2,000,000.00
Series 2013-III 7,302,769.37

**GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS**
Series 2013-A (Tax-Exempt) $12,254,909.56
Series 2013-B (Taxable) 5,200,934.60

Action Requested:
Please adopt resolution.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

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

File Attachment
File Attachment
File Attachment
RESOLUTION NO. ____

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE OFFERING FOR SALE OF MUNICIPAL TEMPORARY NOTES AND GENERAL OBLIGATION IMPROVEMENT BONDS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of the laws of the State of Kansas applicable thereto, by proceedings duly had, the governing body of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (the "Issuer") has heretofore authorized certain internal improvements described as follows (the "Improvements"):

Series 2013-I Notes (Tax-Exempt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACD</th>
<th>CMIP</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Project Fund Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>14th Street BD (Douglas to Springhorn Road)</td>
<td>$100,379.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>51st &amp; Rowland Short Span Structure Replacement</td>
<td>300,151.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>55th St. Bridge Over Nearman Creek</td>
<td>722,325.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2139</td>
<td>65th Street Bridge Over Turner Diagonal</td>
<td>281,061.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8181</td>
<td>ADA Modifications - UG Facility 2010</td>
<td>403,687.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0311</td>
<td>ADA Modifications - UG Facility 2011 (969-8181)</td>
<td>302,765.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0313</td>
<td>ADA Modifications - UG Facility 2013 (969-8181)</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0812</td>
<td>ADA Pedestrian Ramp Improvements 2012 (970-1141)</td>
<td>602,275.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0813</td>
<td>ADA Pedestrian Ramp Improvements 2013 (970-1141)</td>
<td>600,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0811</td>
<td>ADA Pedestrian Ramp Improvements, 2011 (970-1141)</td>
<td>504,609.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>5312</td>
<td>Armourdale Storm Sewer Repair</td>
<td>501,896.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0413</td>
<td>Arterial/Collect Resurfacing 2013 (970-1302)</td>
<td>850,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2305</td>
<td>Bridge Repair, Priority (4 Loc)</td>
<td>450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>Center City Traffic Signal Reconstruction</td>
<td>450,948.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Central Avenue Rehab (1-70 to 18th)</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>Central Industrial District Resurfacing 2012</td>
<td>752,844.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>6220</td>
<td>CID Bar Screen(s) Replacement</td>
<td>301,137.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>6190</td>
<td>CSO Water Quality Sampling Update</td>
<td>302,765.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6194</td>
<td>Digester Roof &amp; Gati Structure Repairs</td>
<td>803,305.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>Dodson Street Landslide Repair</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0111</td>
<td>Elevator Upgrades City 2011 (969-8167)</td>
<td>403,687.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0112</td>
<td>Elevator Upgrades City 2012 (969-8167)</td>
<td>200,758.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0113</td>
<td>Elevator Upgrades City 2013</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0212</td>
<td>Facilities Parking Maint &amp; Repair-City 2012 (969-8513)</td>
<td>250,948.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0213</td>
<td>Facilities Parking Maint &amp; Repair-City 2013 (969-8513)</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6042</td>
<td>FID-AID Force Main Improvements</td>
<td>857,849.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8004</td>
<td>Fire HQ Window &amp; Overhead Door Replacement</td>
<td>750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td>9232</td>
<td>Fire Maintenance/Storage Facility - City, Fire Dept</td>
<td>1,028,548.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8071</td>
<td>FS #15 Roof Replacement</td>
<td>152,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8073</td>
<td>FS #18 Roof Replacement</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8070</td>
<td>FS #3 Roof Replacement</td>
<td>115,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>Holmes Road Bridge N. of Puckett Ave</td>
<td>205,709.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Hutton &amp; Leavenworth Intersection</td>
<td>450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Hutton Road - Cleveland to Leavenworth</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6219 IMS Implementation Program</td>
<td>750,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0112 Industrial District Repairs 2012 (970-1113)</td>
<td>501,896.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0113 Industrial District Repairs 2013 (970-1113)</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6216 IOCP Sewer System Repairs (CSO/SSO Compliance)</td>
<td>1,003,792.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1607 Kaw Drive Rehab, 38th to 59th (Phase 1 of 2)</td>
<td>535,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7850</td>
<td>Kaw Point Connector Link (Downtown Pedestrian/Bike Path-Phase II)</td>
<td>78,924.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6062 Kaw Point Disinfection</td>
<td>7,112,985.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6192</td>
<td>Kaw Point Grit Box &amp; Bar Screen Improvements</td>
<td>75,691.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6199 Kaw Point Solids Dewatering Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3,501,137.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>3344 KDOT Message Boards</td>
<td>115,331.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1604 Leavenworth Road Rehab 77th to 38th</td>
<td>652,464.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>3109 Leavenworth Road, 72nd &amp; 55th Intersections (Traffic Signals)</td>
<td>240,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>1198 Meadowlark Lane Rehab</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8667 Memorial Hall Exterior Painting</td>
<td>401,301.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1292 Merriam Lane improvements 10th to 24th</td>
<td>1,202,085.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1052 Merriam Lane, County Line Road to 24th</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8155 Minnesota Avenue to Lot C Walkway Roof Repair</td>
<td>227,074.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6189 Muncie Creek</td>
<td>1,509,219.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0212 Neighborhood Street Resurfacing 2012 (970-1209)</td>
<td>1,505,688.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0213 Neighborhood Street Resurfacing 2013 (970-1203)</td>
<td>1,800,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1174 Oak Grove Rd - 53rd to 55th</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>4428 Parks Facility Roof Rep (Eisenhower &amp; Parkwood)</td>
<td>360,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6196 Phase I SSES Compliance Program</td>
<td>2,707,584.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>4424 Pierson Lake Dam Study &amp; Repair</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6023 Plant #20 Building &amp; Lighting Improvements</td>
<td>577,587.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8390 Reardon Center Facility Improvements</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2140 Riverview Ave Bridge Over Turner Diagonal</td>
<td>321,061.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2112 Shawnee Bridge over 7th Street</td>
<td>300,189.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1162 S. 42nd St. Metropolitan to Argentine</td>
<td>2,585,881.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>4427 Shelter #3 Repair</td>
<td>69,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6198 SS Interceptor Reloc for 4.4 RR Bridge @ Turkey Creek</td>
<td>501,896.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1161 State Ave. 73rd to 82nd St.</td>
<td>2,364,898.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1199 State Avenue, 82nd - 94th Street</td>
<td>2,359,591.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1293 SW Blvd Bicycle Lanes - Iowa to 10th</td>
<td>340,530.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1295 SW Blvd Bicycle Lanes - Iowa to State Line (CMAQ)</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>3345 Traffic Signal Replacements (Priority)</td>
<td>272,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>5005 Turkey Creek</td>
<td>4,400,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>4425 Wyandotte County Lake Waterline Study &amp; Repair</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2013-I Estimated Total Project Fund Deposit = $55,007,973.33**
**Series 2013-II Notes (Tax-Exempt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACD</th>
<th>CMIP</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Project Fund Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>Commission Neighborhood Infrastructure Program 2013</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2013-II Estimated Total Project Fund Deposit = $2,000,000.00**

---

**Series 2013-III Notes (Taxable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACD</th>
<th>CMIP</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Project Fund Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Midtown Redevelopment TIF</td>
<td>$7,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>9238</td>
<td>Livestrong Parking Lot Lighting</td>
<td>302,769.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2013-III Estimated Total Project Fund Deposit = $7,302,769.37**

---

**Series 2013-A Bonds (Tax-Exempt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACD</th>
<th>CMIP</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Project Fund Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>38th &amp; Hagemann Box Culvert</td>
<td>$201,843.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0412</td>
<td>Arterial/Collect Resurfacing 2012 (970-1302)</td>
<td>853,223.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6043</td>
<td>Electrical Switchgear Imprv. @ FID/CID Pumps</td>
<td>50,460.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>8513</td>
<td>Facilities Parking Maint &amp; Repair-City 2010</td>
<td>252,304.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>0211</td>
<td>Facilities Parking Maint &amp; Repair-City 2011</td>
<td>151,382.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>I-435 &amp; Donahoo Interchange</td>
<td>660,132.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6195</td>
<td>Kaw Point Switchgear Improvements</td>
<td>50,460.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6193</td>
<td>Kaw Point Subsurface Structural Repairs</td>
<td>326,639.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>6031</td>
<td>Neighborhood Sewer Renewal (E of I-635)</td>
<td>181,234.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>0212</td>
<td>Neighborhood Street Resurfacing 2012 (970-1209)</td>
<td>1,505,688.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Parallel Parkway - 5th to 9th</td>
<td>250,948.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>0311</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Repairs 2011 (963-6301)</td>
<td>706,453.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>State Ave. 65th to 73rd</td>
<td>1,608,004.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>0111</td>
<td>Storm Sewer Improvements - 2011 (963-5304)</td>
<td>706,453.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>5005</td>
<td>Turkey Creek</td>
<td>4,749,677.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2013-A Estimated Total Project Fund Deposit = $12,254,909.56**

---

**Series 2013-B Bonds (Taxable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACD</th>
<th>CMIP</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Estimated Project Fund Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>7825</td>
<td>EPA Building - 730 Minnesota</td>
<td>$201,843.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave Redevelopment (Taxable Home Rule)</td>
<td>950,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Ave Redevelopment (Taxable)</td>
<td>650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Midtown Redevelopment TIF</td>
<td>3,071,090.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drew v. UG</td>
<td>328,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2013-A Estimated Total Project Fund Deposit = $5,200,934.60**

**WHEREAS,** it is necessary for the Issuer to provide cash funds (from time to time) to meet its obligations incurred in constructing the Improvements prior to the completion thereof and the issuance of the Issuer’s general obligation bonds, and it is desirable and in the interest of the Issuer that such funds be raised by the issuance of one or more series of temporary notes of the Issuer;
WHEREAS, the Issuer has heretofore issued $39,030,000.00 principal amount of Municipal Temporary Notes, Series 2012-I; and $3,360,000.00 principal amount of Municipal Temporary Notes, Series 2012-II;

WHEREAS, all aspects of the Improvements being financed with the temporary notes will not be completed prior to the maturity date of the Existing Notes and it is necessary for the Issuer to provide cash funds to meet its obligations on a portion of the Existing Notes by the issuance of one or more series of additional temporary notes of the Issuer;

WHEREAS, the Issuer desires to issue its general obligation bonds in one or more series in order to permanently finance a portion of the costs of the Improvements and to retire a portion of the Existing Notes which were issued to temporarily finance a portion of the costs of the Improvements;

WHEREAS, the Issuer hereby selects the firm of Springsted, Incorporated, Saint Paul, Minnesota ("Financial Advisor"), as financial advisor for one or more series of municipal temporary notes and one or more series of general obligation bonds of the Issuer to be issued in order in order to provide funds to pay the costs of the Improvements;

WHEREAS, the Issuer desires to authorize the Financial Advisor, in conjunction with the Clerk, Chief Financial Officer, and other officers and representatives of the Issuer to proceed with the offering for sale of said municipal temporary notes and general obligation bonds, and related activities;

WHEREAS, one of the duties and responsibilities of the Issuer is to prepare and distribute a preliminary official statement relating to said municipal temporary notes and general obligation bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Issuer desires to authorize the Financial Advisor, in conjunction with the Clerk, and other officers and representatives of the Issuer to proceed with the preparation and distribution of a preliminary official statement and notice of bond sale and to authorize the distribution thereof and all other preliminary action necessary to sell said municipal temporary notes and general obligation bonds.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS, KANSAS, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Issuer is hereby authorized to offer at competitive public sale one or more series of municipal temporary notes and one or more series of general obligation improvement bonds to fund total project costs of approximately $81,766,000 plus interest and costs of issuance (collectively, the “Obligations”) as described in the Notice of Sale to be prepared by officials and representatives of the Issuer, as authorized below. Such project costs may be paid through the issuance of tax-exempt or taxable Obligations.

Section 2. The Mayor/Chief Executive and Clerk are hereby authorized to cause to be prepared a Preliminary Official Statement, and such officials and other representatives of the Issuer are hereby authorized to use such document in connection with the public sale of the Obligations.

Section 3. The Clerk, in conjunction with the Financial Advisor and Gilmore & Bell, P.C., Kansas City, Missouri ("Bond Counsel"), is hereby authorized and directed to give notice of said bond sale by publishing a summary of the Notice of Sale not less than 6 days before the date of the bond sale in a newspaper of general circulation in Wyandotte County, Kansas, and the Kansas Register and is hereby
authorized to distribute copies of the Notice of Sale and Preliminary Official Statement relating to the Obligations to prospective purchasers of the Obligations. Bids for the purchase of the Obligations shall be submitted upon the terms and conditions set forth in said Notice of Sale, and shall be delivered to the governing body at its meeting to be held on the date of such sale, at which meeting the governing body shall review such bids and shall award the sale of the Obligations or reject all bids for a particular series of the Obligations.

Section 4. For the purpose of enabling the purchaser(s) of the Obligations (collectively, the “Purchasers”) to comply with the requirements of Rule 15c2-12 of the Securities Exchange Commission (the “Rule”), the appropriate officers of the Issuer are hereby authorized: (a) to approve the form of said Preliminary Official Statement; (b) covenant to provide continuous secondary market disclosure by annually transmitting certain financial information and operating data and other information necessary to comply with the Rule to certain national repositories and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, as applicable; and (c) take such other actions or execute such other documents as such officers in their reasonable judgment deem necessary; to enable the Purchasers to comply with the requirement of the Rule.

Section 5. The Issuer agrees to provide to the Purchasers within seven business days of the date of the sale of Obligations or within sufficient time to accompany any confirmation that requests payment from any customer of the Purchasers, whichever is earlier, sufficient copies of the final Official Statement to enable the Purchasers to comply with the requirements of Rule 15c2-12(3) and (4) of the Securities and Exchange Commission and with the requirements of Rule G-32 of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board.

Section 6. The Mayor/Chief Executive, Clerk and the other officers and representatives of the Issuer, Bond Counsel and the Financial Advisor are hereby authorized and directed to take such other action as may be necessary to carry out the public sale of the Obligations.

Section 7. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

[BALANCE OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
ADOPTED by the governing body on December 20, 2012.

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

______________________________
Clerk

______________________________
Mayor/Chief Executive
Type: Standard
Committee: Economic Development and Finance Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 12/3/2012
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: Confirmed Date: 12/6/2012
12/6/2012

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Department / Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2012</td>
<td>Lew Levin</td>
<td>5186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mschrick@wycokck.org">mschrick@wycokck.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Description:
A home rule resolution of the Unified Government authorizing the acquisition and construction of an emergency communication system to service the County; and authorizing the issuance of general obligation bonds for the equipment acquisition. Submitted by Bob Evans, Director of Emergency Management.

Action Requested:
This resolution must be adopted prior to the resolution on RFA 120315
Fast Track to the December 6, 2012 Full Commission Meeting.

✓ Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)

Amount: $
Source:
✓ Included In Budget Radio communication upgrade is included in the budget.
☐ Other (explain) The PBC allows for the lease agreement to be entered by the County government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC1313012-004.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.7 KB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio presentation a</td>
<td>draft finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agenda.pptx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. __________

A HOME RULE RESOLUTION OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM TO SERVE THE COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT TO FINANCE THE COSTS OF THE SAME.

WHEREAS, the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (the “Unified Government”) pursuant to K.S.A. 12-345(l), the Unified Government has all the powers, functions and duties of a county and may exercise home rule powers in the manner and subject to the limitations provided by K.S.A. 19-101a, and amendments thereto, and other laws of the State of Kansas; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government is acting as a county in the exercise of its powers in this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government has determined that it is necessary and advisable and in the interest of public safety to acquire and construct an emergency communication system to serve the county and its environs (the “System”) and to issue general obligation bonds of the Unified Government to pay that portion of the costs of the System constituting equipment only (the “Equipment”); and

WHEREAS, K.S.A. 19-101a (the “County Home Rule Act”) empowers counties to transact all county business and perform all powers of local legislation and administration it deems appropriate subject only to the limitations, restrictions or prohibitions set forth therein; and

WHEREAS, the governing body of the Unified Government now further finds and determines that (i) there are no enactments of the Kansas legislature of statewide concern applicable to the Unified Government, acting as a county, relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds to pay the costs of acquiring emergency communications equipment to serve the Unified Government and its environs other than that set forth in K.S.A. 19-101a(a), and (ii) nothing in K.S.A. 19-101a limits, restricts or prohibits the Unified Government, acting as a county, from issuing general obligation bonds to pay the costs of acquiring emergency communications equipment, and (iii) it is not contrary to any enactments of the Kansas legislature relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds to pay the costs of acquiring emergency communications equipment to serve the Unified Government and its environs; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary and advisable to issue general obligation bonds of the Unified Government, acting as a county, under the County Home Rule Act to pay the costs of acquiring the Equipment to serve the Unified Government and its environs; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS:

Section 1. Acquisition of System and Equipment. The acquisition of the System, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000, is hereby authorized.
Section 2. Authorization of Bonds. The costs of the Equipment is authorized to be paid from the proceeds of the sale of general obligation bonds of the Unified Government (the "Bonds"), which are authorized to be issued for such purposes pursuant to the authority of the County Home Rule Act in an amount not to exceed $14,000,000, and which may be issued in one or more series, in such principal amounts as are determined by subsequently enacted ordinances of the governing body of the Unified Government.

Section 3. Effective Date. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage by a majority of the governing body of the Unified Government, its signature by the Mayor/CEO and its publication in the official newspaper.

PASSED and APPROVED by a majority of the governing body of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas and SIGNED by the Mayor this 6th day of December, 2012.

[Seal]

Attest:

City Clerk

UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY,
KANSAS

Mayor
Next Generation Radio System for Wyandotte County
OVERVIEW

- Owners
  - Unified Government
  - Board Of Public Utilities

- Stakeholders
  - All operating agencies on the current system

- Vision
  - To design and install state of the art countywide radio and data systems to support Public Safety and Public Service Operations in Wyandotte County.
  - The design should include the transition to a single spectrum band meeting new P-25 Standard and provide appropriate coverage throughout the county to provide a safe and effective communications environment with full interoperable access with our metropolitan partners for all Wyandotte County Agencies.
System History

- The BPU/UG operate an 800 MHz trunked radio system comprised of seventeen channels that are simulcast from three sites in the analog FM mode. The three transmitter/receiver sites are 27th & Vernon St., 2106 South 11th Pl., and 610 North 110th Street (referred to as 110th & State) - all in Kansas City, Kansas. The system was manufactured by Motorola. The three sites are linked via an eight DS1 digital microwave radio system.

- The original channel count was seven (1996) and ten additional channels were added to bring the total channel count to seventeen (1998) when the City of Kansas City's fleet was added to the trunked radio system. The City previously operated a ten-channel single site trunked radio system with the equipment located at 3011 North 53rd Street. Now, the 3011 North 53rd Street site serves as a back-up to the primary system.
County Wide Communications Agreement since 1992

- Agreement in 1992 to consolidate Emergency Communications and Dispatch County-wide
- Covered Police, Fire, EMS and Sheriff Dispatch
- Expenses paid by audited annual payments by cities
- Agreement modified to fund communications from County-Wide Tax Base
- Current Centralized Public Safety Dispatch is countywide and for all cities and Agencies
Project Elements

Proposal

- Full County Wide Digital Radio Coverage
- Capacity to meet need for Public Safety Operations
- Build 2 new towers and attach to JOCO Tower on I-435
- Connect to JOCO Radio Network Computer and Region
- Redundancy for dispatch and 911 operations
- Dispatch Center and EOC upgraded with radios
- Bonner Springs, Edwardsville and Sheriff radios upgraded
- 2600 Radios for all agencies and BPU upgraded
- All Fire Station Alerting for calls improved for dispatch
- Creates Interoperability with Region for Large Incidents
Proposed Public Safety System

- Overview
  - The current radio system has served most Wyandotte County agencies for 15 years.
  - The current system is at its end of life including related facilities such as the Dispatch Center and the Emergency Operations Center/ Backup 911 site.
  - It is shared and operated by the Board of Public Utilities and the Unified Government and serves the cities of Bonner Springs and Edwardsville.
  - It is a trunked 800 MHz system operating on 3 primary towers, 17 assigned frequencies and approximately 100 talk groups.
  - It needs to be upgraded to new national digital radio standards.
  - County will join the MARRS Regional radio system for interoperability.
  - It also has assigned over 2600 radio identities/users to over 20 agencies that have rights on the system.
Radio Project Highlights

- County-Wide Radio System
- Funded by Countywide resources
- Public Safety equipment is new digital APX
- Five Year Warranty and Service Plan
- Standard & Uniform Coverage in County
- Regional Links to KC Metro MARRS System
- Enhanced Backup Dispatch Options
Needs Assessment Results

- Quality Radio coverage throughout Wyandotte County based on Portable Radios.
- In-building radio coverage for large structures including BPU Facilities. (Use amplifiers)
- Emergency button for individual safety.
- Automatic Vehicle Location, including location reporting of portable radios
- Interoperability (primarily public safety) throughout Metro Kansas City (MARRS)
- Updated dispatch consoles, Cad, RMS, UPS and Emergency Power. (Computer-aided dispatch (CAD) linked to AVL, and work orders or dispatch status Audio recording and related features).
Trunked Radio System Concept
Staff Request for Commission Action

Tracking No. 120315

Type: Standard
Committee: Economic Development and Finance Committee

Date of Standing Committee Action: 12/3/2012
(If none, please explain):

Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date: 12/6/2012
Confirmed Date: 12/6/2012

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contact Phone</th>
<th>Contact Email</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Department / Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2012</td>
<td>Lew Levin</td>
<td>5186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mschrick@wycokck.org">mschrick@wycokck.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Description:
A resolution authorizing the design, construction, and equipping a 911 dispatch center and related communications facilities for Wyandotte County, Kansas and requesting the Public Building Commission of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of paying the costs, submitted by Lew Levin, Chief Financial Officer.

Action Requested:
Please adopt resolution.

Fast track to the December 6, 2012 Full Commission meeting.

Publication Required

Budget Impact: (if applicable)
Amount: $0
Source:
✓ Included In Budget
✓ Included in CMIP
✓ Other (explain) The PBC allows for the lease agreement to be entered by the County government.
RESOLUTION NO. ________

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPPING OF A 911 DISPATCH CENTER AND RELATED EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES FOR WYANDOTTE COUNTY, KANSAS; AND REQUESTING THE PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS THEREOF.

WHEREAS, the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, acting as a county (the "Unified Government" or the "County") hereby deems it advisable to design, construct and equip a 911 dispatch center and related emergency communications facilities, including certain communications towers, storage facilities and other related structures and equipment (the "Emergency Communications Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government under the authority of K.S.A. 12-1757 et seq., as amended by Charter Ordinance No. CO-1-98 and Charter Resolution No. CO-1-98 of the County (jointly the "Act"), has heretofore created the Public Building Commission of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, a municipal corporation of the State of Kansas (the "PBC"); and

WHEREAS, the PBC has the power and authority under the Act to issue revenue bonds to provide funds for the purpose of paying all or a portion of the costs of the Emergency Communications Project; and

WHEREAS, the Unified Government deems it advisable to request that the PBC provide for the financing of the Emergency Communications Project.

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

SECTION 1. Authorization of Emergency Communications Project. It is hereby deemed and declared to be necessary to authorize the various components of the Emergency Communications Project at the estimated design, construction and equipping costs of $25,000,000.

SECTION 2. Financing of Emergency Communications Project. In order to pay the costs of the Emergency Communications Project, it is necessary and desirable for the PBC to issue revenue bonds in one or more series in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $14,000,000 plus the cost of any related reserves and financing costs (the "PBC Bonds"). It is hereby requested that the PBC issue the PBC Bonds, in accordance with the provisions of the Act and all other laws of the State of Kansas supplemental thereto or amendatory thereof.

SECTION 3. Leases. The Unified Government hereby declares an intent to enter into a lease or lease-purchase agreement with the PBC pursuant to the Act to provide for the source of repayments of the PBC Bonds and other related expenses of the PBC.

SECTION 4. Reimbursement. The Unified Government hereby declares an intent to be reimbursed for expenditures for the Emergency Communications Project made on or after the date which is 60 days before the date of this Resolution, from the proceeds of the PBC Bonds described herein, pursuant to Treasury Regulation 1.150-2.
SECTION 5. Effective Date. This resolution shall be effective from and after its adoption.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED by the Commissioners of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, on December 6, 2012.

(Seal)

UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

______________________________
Mayor/CEO

ATTEST:

______________________________
Unified Government Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

______________________________
Chief Counsel
EXCERPT OF MINUTES OF A MEETING
OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS
HELD ON DECEMBER 6, 2012

The Commission (the “Commission”) of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (the “Unified Government”), met in regular session at the Commission Meeting Room at 7:00 P.M. The Mayor/CEO presided and the following members of the Commission were present:

The following members were absent:

*********

(Other matters)

*********

Thereupon, Commissioner _________ moved, seconded by Commissioner _________, that the Commission adopt the following resolution:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPPING OF A 911 DISPATCH CENTER AND RELATED EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES FOR WYANDOTTE COUNTY, KANSAS; AND REQUESTING THE PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS THEREOF.

The motion was approved and the Resolution was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye: ____________________________________________

Nay: ____________________________________________

Thereupon, the Resolution having been adopted by a majority vote of the members of the Commission, was given No. __________, was directed to be signed by the Mayor/CEO and attested by the Unified Government Clerk; and the Unified Government Clerk was further directed to cause a copy of the Resolution to be delivered to the Secretary of the Public Building Commission of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas.

[BALANCE OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing Excerpt of Minutes is a true and correct excerpt of the proceedings of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, held on the date stated therein, and that the official minutes of such proceedings are on file in my office.

(Seal)

Unified Government Clerk
**Staff Request for Commission Action**

**Tracking No. 120320**

- [ ] Revised
- [ ] On Going

**Type:** Standard  
**Committee:** Economic Development and Finance Committee  
**Proposed for the following Full Commission Meeting Date:** 12/20/2012

**Date of Standing Committee Action:** 12/3/2012  
(If none, please explain):

<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>11/28/2012</td>
<td>Charles Brockman</td>
<td>5733</td>
<td>cbrockman@wycokck.....</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Item Description:** **ONLY VISIBLE TEXT WILL BE PRINTED**

Tartan Residential, Inc. submitted an application to the Unified Government for a Resolution of Support for the use of Section 42 tax credits for the Buchanan's Crossing project located at 706 N. 65th Street. This $2.5 million project, a 100% Accessible community will consists of 9 - 3 Bedroom/2 Bath and 3 - 4 Bedroom/2 Bath single family homes that will be serving disabled military veterans & mobility impaired in Kansas City, Kansas.

Per the Unified Government's Tax Credit Policy staff has reviewed this project and it has achieved a score over 50 points.

**Action Requested:** **ONLY VISIBLE TEXT WILL BE PRINTED**

Review and recommend to forward to the Full Commission on 12/20/2012 for a Resolution of Support.

- [ ] Publication Required

**Budget Impact:** (if applicable)

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

**Supporting Documentation**

- [x] Supporting Documentation Included  
  # of Documents: 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan's Crossing Overview.docx</td>
<td>Microsoft Office Word Document</td>
<td>13.7 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Document</td>
<td>79.2 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Crossing Location Map.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Document</td>
<td>1.69 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Crossing Petition.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Document</td>
<td>20.5 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution.pdf</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Document</td>
<td>34.3 KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUCHANAN’S CROSSING OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Buchanan’s Crossing is a planned community being developed for special need populations including individuals or persons with disabilities. The property is located at 706 N 65th St., Kansas City, KS, Northeast of the Kansas Expressway and Turner Diagonal. This will be a 100% Accessible community with 12 single family single story three and four bedroom two bath detached homes serving disabled veterans & the mobility impaired in Kansas City, KS, at a rent that is below the Kansas City Area’s Market Rent Median Family Income; Tartan Residential will be partnering with and local companies and non-profit organizations in the development and operation of this community.

Homes in Buchanan’s Crossing will be 1,323 three bedrooms and 1,515 s.f. four bedroom, each with a one car garage. All public and private spaces throughout the entire Buchanan’s Crossing community will be 100% accessible with universal designed homes to meet all applicable accessibility guidelines. Our goal is to build an excellent living environment that fosters independent living and which is thoughtfully designed with high visual appeal and energy efficiency. Homes will be designed for functionality and safety with accessible widths and heights including counters, accessible appliance packages including in unit washers and dryers, and compliant accessories, hardware, fixtures, switches and controls throughout. To assure that parents always have a master sized bedroom and a bathroom that meets their needs whether they have an impairment or not, each home will have two master sized bedrooms on the main level, one with a fully accessible shower and one with an adaptable bathroom. This will also provide the greatest flexibility for families with more than one impaired member.

We will especially be reaching out to disabled military veterans in our marketing efforts. These homes will be leased for the first 15 years and if a home becomes vacant, that home will be reserved for a 90 day period to allow re-marketing and re-leasing of the home to an income qualified disabled tenant and after that, to any income qualified tenant. Buchanan’s Crossing residents will have the opportunity to purchase their home per KHRC guidelines at the end of the 15 year period under a program designed to allow residents to purchase their home at a significantly below market price.

Buchanan’s Crossing amenities will include a generously sized covered pavilion with seating and BBQ grill, an accessible play structure, wheelchair ball court and ½ acre fishing pond which will provide community residents with spaces to gather, eat and recreate. A bus shelter will be provided at N 65th St. for school aged children.
### 1. Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Max. Pts.</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pre-application meeting completed</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ownership clear</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feasible market analysis</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Financing in place</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Zoning and land use compliance</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Environmentally acceptable</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Qualified management team</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Adequate storm shelter</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Master-plan compliance - Master-plan compliance is required prior to the project start date; however, it is not required to advance the review to Commission.*

**Is the developer in compliance with the Master-plan?**

- Yes
- No

**Comment:** None

### 2. Property Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NRA area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conforms w/consolidated plan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Need for housing in area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infill site</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Area part of designated development or planned area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Qualified census tract</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. CDBG low-mod census tract</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1. Neighborhood retail (w/in one mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2. Parks/trails (w/in one mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3. Transit (w/in 1/2 mile)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4. Medical facilities (w/in 2 miles)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5. Employment centers (w/in 1 to 3 miles)</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h6. School impact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** None

**15 points**

### 3. Housing Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Rehabilitation of existing housing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Prevents conversion to market rate or preserves</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preserves historic structures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Removes blighted structures</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Minimal impact to existing market</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. New construction or conversion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** 3.d. - If no blighted structures exist, the developer has an option to fund a UG demolition program. In this case the developer will fund $30,000.00 for the demolition or rehabilitation of structures. Details will be worked through Economic Development staff, Community Development and the Developer.

**5 points**
### Resident/Tenant Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Promotes a mixed income community</td>
<td>2 to 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provides affordable housing for low-income</td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Owner-occupied component</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Units for large families</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Minimal impact upon public housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Set-aside for special needs units or transitional units</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Residential support services</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** None

**Total Points:** 18 points

### Financing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Future maintenance and escrow plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Additional rehabilitation expense</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Low percentage of soft costs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Return part of income stream to community</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Strength of applicant</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Applicant not fully funded previously</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Leverages other local or federal funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Applicant is tax exempt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Local, Minority and Women involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LBE/MBE/WBE Subcontractors or Suppliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) LBE/MBE/WBE Subcontractors or Suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Prevailing Wage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Under $2 million</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) $2-5 million</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Over $5 million</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** 5.g. Developer is paying for a 500 ft. extension of the sanitary sewer at an estimated cost of $150,000.00 and will be working with the UG to create a sanitary sewer benefit district. A neighborhood petition of support is attached.

**Total Points:** 9 points

### Planning and Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Design standards</td>
<td>Max 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1. Brick/stone construction (50% to 100%)</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2. Landscaping exceeded by 35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3. Balconies/patios in units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a4. Carports or garages</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a5. Neo-traditional design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a6. Building articulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** 6.a2 The whole development does not show the 35% required.

**Total Points:** 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Development Amenities (Families)</td>
<td>Max 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1. Swimming pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2. Clubhouse/meeting rm/workout area &amp; kitchen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Max Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3. Sports court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b4. Trails (30'/unit) or connect to system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b5. Play structure w/specific features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b6. Other amenities - Sand vbll, grills and shelters, fishing basin, in unit washer/dryer, hot tub per 100 units, in-unit fireplace, large patio w/seating area</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: 6. b5 - If specifications of play ground are supplied and additional 1 point will be added</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Development Amenities (Senior or Assisted living)</td>
<td>Max 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1. Other amenities - beauty shop, rose garden, community</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c2. On-site nursing</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c3. Alzheimer's ward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c4. Rehab. services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Neighborhood Organization Support</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: 6.d.Communication by e-mails of the proposed development were sent, but no actual letters. If developer can produce letters, up to an additional 5 points will be added.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Attached or Detached Single-Family Development</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Communication with the Developer has been established and the additional information was requested. If the additional information is delivered prior to the 12/3/2012 Economic Development and Finance Standing Committee the possibility of an additional 6 points could be added for a total of 65.</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Buchanan's Crossing Petition

A 100% Accessible Single Family Home Community
Serving Disabled Veterans & the Mobility Impaired in Kansas City, KS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>e-mail</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Sprague</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buddacuts@hotmail.com">buddacuts@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>913-299-1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Sprague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Lohsing</td>
<td></td>
<td>913-299-2310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lohsing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>913-620-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>913-603-1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Lyone</td>
<td></td>
<td>816.564.2781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Rymon</td>
<td></td>
<td>913.788.5664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lemos</td>
<td></td>
<td>913-271-2408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO.

WHEREAS, Tartan Residential, submitted an application to the Unified Government for a Resolution of Support for the use of Section 42 tax credits for the project Buchanan’s Crossing, a 100% Accessible Single Family Home Community Serving Disabled Veterans & the Mobility Impaired in Kansas City, Kansas located at 706 North 65th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66102; and

WHEREAS, this $2.5 MM project includes the new construction of 12 single-family homes, which consist of two floor plans: 1) 9 - 3 Bedrooms/2 Bathroom; and 2) 3 - 4 Bedrooms/2/Bathroom and the related site improvements; and

WHEREAS, this development project meets the policy for Section 42 Tax Credit development as approved by the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas; and

WHEREAS, on December 3, 2012 the Commission of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas forwarded the application for a Resolution of Support to the public hearing date of December 20, 2012, and

WHEREAS, on December 20, 2012 the Commission of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas approved a Resolution of Support for Tartan Residential for the use of Section 42 tax credits for the project Buchanan’s Crossing.

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

That the Commission of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas hereby approves the Resolution of Support for Tartan Residential for the use of Section 42 tax credits for the project Buchanan’s Crossing, a 100% Accessible Single Family Home Community Serving Disabled Veterans & the Mobility Impaired in Kansas City, Kansas to the Kansas Housing Resources Corporation.


UNIFIED GOVERNMENT CLERK