The meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee was held on Monday, April 27, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner McKiernan, Chairman; Commissioners Walker, Townsend and Walters. Commissioner Murguia was absent. The following officials were also in attendance: Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Jody Boeding, Chief Legal Counsel; Melissa Mundt, Assistant County Administrator; Greg Talkin, NRC Director of Operations; Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager; Erin Downing, Code Enforcement; and Wayne Wilson, Code Enforcement.

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

There were no standing committee minutes to approve.

COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS

Item No. 1 – 150092...COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS

Synopsis: Communication requesting consideration of the following applications, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager. The Land Bank Advisory Board has recommended approval of the applications:

Applications for yard extension
2053 Springfield Blvd. – Ja Mia Development, LLC
2248 Quindaro Blvd. – Stephanie Dickens
357 Quindaro Blvd. – Rose Washington
2947 N. 35th St. – Linda Puentes

Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager, said first we have four applications. They are all yard extensions and those addresses are: 2053 Springfield Blvd., 2248 Quindaro Blvd., 357 Quindaro
Blvd., and 2947 N. 35th Street. If there are any questions I’d be happy to answer them. Chairman McKiernan asked if there were any questions or discussions on any of these properties.

**Action:** Commissioner Walters made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Townsend. Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Walters, Townsend, Walker, McKiernan.

Best & Final for yard extension:
3530 N. 35th St. – Michael Jackson and Maria Flores
(The Land Bank recommends Mr. Jackson receive the property based on geographical boundaries)

Mr. Slaughter said next we have a Best and Final for the address 3530 N. 35th Street. If you look at the map, the shaded green property is the Land Bank property in question. The first
applicant is Ms. Flores who owns this property right to the north. That is 3539 Bell Crossing Drive. The other applicant, Mr. Jackson, owns three properties to the south. This one here, 3518 as indicated on your packet and I believe that’s 3455. I’m not certain, can’t read it, it’s a little blurry.

When we sent these out I do believe that this property here was still two properties. It has since been combined. In fact I believe this half was a Land Bank property that was sold to Ms. Flores sometime last year. In doing that, in all honesty, I’m about 50/50 on this one and so the recommendation is just based on the fact that Mr. Jackson had first applied back in I believe February. He was one of the applicants when we had that large batch of applicants. Ms. Flores came in about a week before the final approval so that’s why we pulled it out.

Again my recommendation is this kind of fits more in line with the other two properties right here which gives Mr. Jackson even a bigger footprint. I still understand the argument for the joining properties. Again, the Land Bank recommendation would be for Mr. Jackson, but I’ll entertain any questions or discussion on that as well.

**Commissioner Townsend** said in the packet that was submitted to us, Ms. Flores made a statement that she has gotten permission to place a mobile home somewhere in the vicinity of these properties. I’m not exactly sure from her statement. Apparently there were some fires in this area some time ago. She doesn’t identify exactly the address of her house and where the fire was. I’d like to hear from Ms. Flores, if she is here tonight, with regard to her intention to live on the property. My thought is if she is going to purchase this property with a plan to live on it or place some residence on it, and the other applicant Mr. Jackson is not, notwithstanding the recommendation of the other committee, I would just as soon see the property go to someone who is going to reside on it and that might deter further arsonist. I’m not going to say arsonist because I don’t know what the cause of the fire was, so let me be clear, but the likelihood that there’ll be vandalism or trash or something like that.

**Mr. Slaughter** said I will point out on Ms. Flores’ property the dots on this map indicate where an existing structure is or at least was at some point. There is an existing house here. This dot here represents a barn and Mr. Jackson’s house does reside down on this parcel down here very close to that property line.
This is not a house, there is something here; in fact, it does kind of go here but that’s not a Land Bank issue at this time. I just wanted to point that out that even though there’s a dot here representing the 3530, there is currently no structure or maybe there was a small little shack, it’s been a long time since I’ve been up in this area. Yes, if Ms. Flores wants to put a mobile home, I believe it definitely would have to be on that property. **Commissioner Townsend** said and this does say mobile home. I recall that in one of the Board of Commission meetings some months ago, but it’s been in the calendar year 2015 is my recollection, that on the Administrator’s Agenda one night, there was approval for a mobile home. They did not identify who the applicant was so I’m wandering if they had any correlation to this. I would like to table this if Ms. Flores isn’t here tonight, to get more clarification on her intentions with regard to the use and also give Mr. Jackson an opportunity to comment as well.

**Commissioner Walker** asked, what is the history on Mr. Jackson and his maintenance of the properties that he currently has? **Mr. Slaughter** said he currently has no outstanding violations for any code. **Commissioner Walker** asked, what does he do on that property? Is it just vacant? **Mr. Slaughter** said the terrain up there, there’s some wooded areas, there’s some I would describe as rugged terrain. I haven’t inquired of what he’s doing. I know a lot of property owner’s up there do have animals up there like horses and stuff like that.

**Commissioner Walker** said my concern, Commissioner Townsend, with the Flores’ application is that I would not be in favor of anything but a temporary mobile home. If there’s not realistically a means or she can not demonstrate the ability to finance the construction of a new home on that site, I would rather it go to someone who is at least maintaining the property as opposed to having one of these mobile homes that go in temporarily and then somehow ends up being a permanent addition.

I would not oppose the motion to table it if neither party cares enough to attend the meeting. I’m more inclined to give it to Mr. Jackson than Ms. Flores. **Commissioner Townsend** said I agree Commissioner. I think that request for the mobile home is only temporary because I too would not be in favor of that as a permanent residential structure. I was under the impression it was temporary for some specific purpose. I think that just goes back to, I for one, don’t have enough information.
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Commissioner Walker said the problem is once we approve this and the deed transfers the property to her name even if it’s a temporary, if she then does not fulfill the commitment to build, then we have the problem of 1) getting the trailer off of the property through court action and then we have to deed another piece of property that once again will have to go to the Land Bank and be processed through it eventually. I think more than her ability to get a trailer she is going to have to demonstrate—the application does not suggest her financial means one way or the other. I would want to know that I’m only doing this because she is actually going to build a house and has the ability to show us that she can build a house on that property, not some pie in the sky wish. Commissioner Townsend said I agree with that. Commissioner Walker said I will second your motion to table it.

Commissioner Walters asked if he could ask another question. There seems to be quite a disparity between the offers of these two people. Could you explain a little bit more about why the recommendation is to give it to the low bidder as opposed to the high bidder? Mr. Slaughter said generally we don’t have to accept a best and final based on price and most of the time we don’t. We basically try to get the best end use for it. Now I will say that the offer that Ms. Flores has offered is the general $10 a square frontage foot offer. Mr. Jackson’s is below that because he was part of that campaign back in January when we offered Land Bank property at $150.00. I don’t feel there’s a need to ask him to increase his bid nor would I expect to not offer the same kind of enticement to Ms. Flores. They wrote those offers on the form. I didn’t tell them what to write or how much to put on there. Now she may think by offering a higher bid—neither knows what the other has bid until maybe now but that’s why there’s the disparaging bids. Commissioner Walters said well I understand that, but I guess I’m trying to answer the question why would we not get the highest price that we could get in the best interest of all the taxpayers of Wyandotte County? There must be a reason. Mr. Slaughter said it’s just been my experience, I mean I agree with you 100%, let’s get the most we can but, I also just from experience know that some of this stuff people are begging me to give it to them for free. Commissioner Walters said there was an analysis of these two side by side and when one offers 10 times what the other one does but it’s turned down I’m just searching for an explanation. Mr. Slaughter said the explanation I would give you is that there’s more merit to what they’re going
to do with the property than what they would give us for it if that makes any sense. **Commissioner Walker** said okay.

**Chairman McKiernan** said I’ve been asked to remind everybody to get close to the microphone. For whatever reason we’re not being picked up as well tonight as usual.

We have a motion and a second to table this matter until such time as effectively Ms. Flores and Mr. Jackson can be here to make a case. Is there any further discussion on that motion? **Commissioner Walker** said I would ask Mr. Slaughter to contact these individuals and emphasize the importance of them, if they want the property, to be here at the next committee meeting to answer the kinds of questions we’ve raised. **Mr. Slaughter** said sure.

**Action:** Commissioner Townsend made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters to **hold over to the next meeting on June 1, 2015.** Roll call was taken and there were four “Ayes,” Walters, Townsend, Walker, McKiernan.

Discussion of Land Bank Hold Areas:

![Diagram of land bank hold areas](image)
Mr. Slaughter said this doesn’t have to be a lengthy discussion, but we have generally at this time of the year brought forth recommendations about our Hold Areas.

On the map that I passed out are the locations of our current areas of the county that we’re currently holding Land Bank property for. Generally what that means is if I receive an application in that area for a piece of property, the process is to contact the developer, the non-profit, to see if they still have those in their plans for future development. If they do, then we send them a letter saying it’s on hold and sorry it’s not available. If they don’t, then it’s business as usual and we try to sell it.

We have some areas that are steadily moving along, some areas that aren’t, and that is why every year we come forth and offer recommendations. Should we keep this one on hold, should we not keep on hold, should we take a new area, or if we have a new project? There’s also been discussion about what we would expect these developer’s to do in return for holding this property for them. There’re been recommendations about keeping the property maintained, being good stewards, keeping them cleaned up and everything like that. They also pretty much get these properties at zero cost to help them get their projects up and running and successful.

One of the lines I think we also talked about is do we charge them a fee for getting the property out of maybe they don’t want to…or help with the maintenance and stuff. What I was just hoping tonight was to just kind of set the framework, the foundation for a future discussion, hopefully; at the next meeting of saying here’s kind of some recommendations we’d like to see. I also want to say what works in one area may not necessarily work in another.

I would really like to have some bullet points that I could present in the future to groups that want hold areas. It may not necessarily be these large patches of land. It maybe smaller sections but at least to sit there and say here are the things we expect of you and here’s what we will do in exchange and if you’re not, here are some of the other things that you’re then going to look at if you still want to make this process go through.

If we want to discuss it further tonight, I’d more than happy to. I know we have some other things on the agenda and in the event of keeping time rolling, we can stop here and proceed but that’s kind of my sentiments on that issue.

Chairman McKiernan said at the very least you’d like us to consider the concept of Hold Areas; the current areas that are designated as Hold Areas and then to be ready to either
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hopefully forward to you prior to the next meeting so you can assemble them, either questions or comments or suggestions about the concept or the practice of holding Land Bank properties for particular developers or particular developments. **Mr. Slaughter** said I would just say, we don’t necessarily need you to comment on if this specific area should stay on hold or not. I figured that’s what we need to recommend to you based on a performance evaluation or based on the current market.

If there’re things that you feel that need to be at the table during those discussions, I would be interested in seeing that. Then I’ll compile some information, some recommendations from us and then we can have a good hardy discussion. Give you guys some time to digest that when the packets are submitted. I know you guys get them a little bit earlier than for the meeting so then once we sit down, we have a good hardy conversation about this, and then we can move forward. **Commissioner McKiernan** said then for us to get—we should get that information back to you within the next two weeks so that you then have a chance to compile it and have it ready for the next agenda review…**Mr. Slaughter** said the deadline for the June 1st meeting is May 21st. So I would say anytime before the 21st.

**Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator**, said, Commissioner, could we possibly consider in these Hold Areas if there are projects, we don’t have to necessarily name the developer but it would be interesting to know the status of development projects in each of the areas and where they are. If someone’s been a developer and they’ve been holding a parcel of ground for 10 or 15 years, I’d like to know what their intent is in the near term. **Chairman McKiernan** said I totally agree with that. It would be a good idea to get a little bit more information about the individual hold areas.

We’ve always talked about the right of first refusal that whoever it’s on hold for would have the right to say no we have a plan for that. I would like to see a time limit on that. We have a plan for that in this amount of time and if it’s more than an month, a year, whatever it might be, that we give somebody who’s got an immediate plan the option on that property. I don’t like this idea of holding things in perpetuity when somebody else is willing to come in and make a positive development right now. You already have one of my feedbacks, but yes if we could get some more information on each of the areas as well.
Commissioner Townsend said I would also like to see included in the information that will be presented to us for discussion what the current criteria are so we know where we’re starting out with; how properties come to be on hold or not. Mr. Slaughter said that may be difficult to find because a lot of these areas were well into existence before I even came on board as the Land Bank Manager. Through doing research over the past years, some of these things have been hard to find. I’ll do my best to go through the catacombs of information but some of this stuff there may not be any existing criteria out there. It may just been—I know that’s just kind of how it’s always been. Commissioner Townsend said well, whatever it is so we’ll know where we’re starting from and I meant generally not area by area. Just so we kind of know…Mr. Slaughter said what I can find I’ll kind of list out as some of the areas.

Commissioner Walker said I can tell you back years ago in my other life, these things came about because someone of influence from that area or a neighborhood group in that area, came in and basically in order to protect that particular neighborhood from the development they did not want, they asked for these to be set-aside. The criteria was pretty much—I don’t ever recall Legal, I could be wrong and if I am Jody and Kenny will find it and show it, but I don’t recall there being an A, B, C, D criteria. It was pretty much St. Peters Waterway for example. CHWC was going to buy—we held all these properties and gave them all these properties to redevelop because that’s where their area was. As I recall we ended up taking a bunch of them back because they ran out of money.

Douglass Sumner, a very active neighborhood group and have done much in that area; they didn’t want someone scarfing up property that would prevent either future development or the wrong kind of development occurring. Commissioner, I don’t really think he’s going to come up with an A, B, C, D list which may be something that, we as a committee, would need to work on but these were more or less kind of this neighborhood, Strawberry Hill; I mean obviously there are a lot of people who have an interest in Strawberry Hill. I think you’re going to find it was pretty much a neighborhood generated request to the Commission and the Commission agreed that we’d hold them and give them the right of first refusal. If there was a developer that wanted to acquire it for future activity and I don’t think we’re going to get anything more specific, honestly. Chris, if there is, look for it, but I think that’s a fertile ground for us to explore and develop if we want to have criteria for this particular type of request.
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Peregrine Falcon East ran into a problem because of the lawsuit that tied up real estate in that area with the Indians claiming they owned the whole of—the Wyandotte tribe claiming they owned the whole of the titles were therefore, endowed and it stalled midway through the project. Of course there are people with substantial investment in the housing that’s built there so you wouldn’t want, unless it was similar in value and style, to be built there. I think this was pretty much if they stepped forward and requested it, we did it in the past and maybe it’s time to do something different.

Mr. Criswell said one more thing, Commissioner, I know at least one of these properties the governing body has, I guess for lack of a better word, eliminated or discontinued the TIF designation. It would be interesting, Chris, to see where these are in terms of their TIF designations.

Chairman McKiernan said alright any further feedback goes back to Mr. Slaughter by the 21st. He will compile that. He will look for documentation if it exists, that guided the development of some of these. Bring all of that back to us at our, I guess it’ll be the first of June, June 1st Standing Committee meeting and we will continue this discussion then.

Action: No action.

MEASURABLE GOALS
Item No. 1 – 150090…PRESENTATION: DEMOLITION & ABATEMENT PROGRAM
Synopsis: Presentation on the Demolition and Abatement Program by Erin Downing, NRC. This is a follow-up from March 20, 2015 standing committee meeting.

For discussion only.

Chairman McKiernan said we do have one more item on tonight’s agenda and this is an item that is for discussion or for presentation only. Just to set the stage, we have had several continuing discussions about efforts from the Neighborhood Resource Center and our Code Enforcement Division to effectively, well one of the measurable goals we’ve set is to write more
code violations but, also to increase our ability to successfully resolve them. We have the administrative citation that was brought a couple of months ago that we discussed and then voted on. About two meetings ago we had a discussion about what we might be able to do to become maybe a little more aggressive in terms of those people who are chronic or habitual violators of the codes and whose properties are a continual blighting influence on the neighborhoods in which they exists.

At our last meeting Mr. Moore brought forward some information about eminent domain and the ability to condemn as a part of the continuing discussion of what can we do to stop these properties from sliding too and that brings us to today; from sliding to demolition.

After our last meeting, Greg Talkin and Erin Downing thought it might be a good idea for them to give us a presentation about our existing demolition program. This is where we would love buildings not to end up but we’re not 100% successful on that and unfortunately we do demolish on an annual basis a large number of structures. They are just going to give us some background information on how that process works so we can incorporate that in our future discussions.

Greg Talkin, NRC Director of Operations, said well thank you for having us this evening. Appreciate the time and opportunity to give kind of an overview over our demolition program. As you mentioned at the last standing committee there was a presentation on eminent domain
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and after reviewing that through the video noticed that there were several questions that we were hoping that we could answer maybe some of those questions that are out there.

The unfit process that we currently have is an ordinance that’s on our books and it’s parallel to the state statute. We use this ordinance twofold. One is upfront. We use it as a code enforcement process to try to hold ownership or parties of interest to repair their property by bringing them in and holding a hearing and trying to find out what the resources are in their plans and trying to hold them accountable to take care of the problem. Just because a property is unfit in this situation does not mean that it meets the demolition criteria. Currently there are about 1,400 structures on the code enforcement unfit list.

On the demolition program, basically these properties have went through the codes process. All of them are tagged unfit under the code enforcement definition but to get in the demolition program they have to meet a specific criteria, a financial economic criteria, which I will touch on the next slide; no owner or financial resources to remedy the problem. Generally when they’re in the demo, the majority of them we can’t find ownership. Then the ownership we can find generally doesn’t have the funding or resources to take care of the problem.

We currently have 252 structures on the demolition list. Out of that, 226 are residential in nature, meaning one or two family, not apartments; 26 commercial, if there was an apartment
that would be listed as commercial. The commercials vary in size and previous use. The costs of razing those sometimes significantly differ from the residential.

On average we get four to six structures referred every week. That doesn’t mean that four to six go into the program. After the evaluation, a certain percentage of those go in the program. If they don’t meet the program criteria, Erin will generally refer those to the Delinquent Tax Office to see if they might meet the criteria to go on the tax sale because they might be worth investing in considering they’re not bad enough to be on the demolition list yet.

Chairman McKiernan said may I ask you a question. There are 1,382 structures on the unfit list. Roughly what percentage of structures that are posted as unfit, reverse that at some point and time? That sticker is taken down, the violations are addressed, and the structure is back to habitable status. Mr. Talkin said it’s going to be a difficult one to answer. The reason is because a lot of those properties sit on the list and some of them eventually trickle down to the 252 in the demolition. A number of them are a simple unfit. That means that it may be the fact that people are living in the house and they don’t have water on meaning they don’t have sanitation for washing their hands and flushing the toilet. Those usually get remedied. Sometime we have to reach out to other parties like United Way to get somebody some help. I would ask Wayne, do you have any idea on that. Wayne Wilson, Code Enforcement Supervisor, said we have no statistics.

Chairman McKiernan asked, four to six structures are referred every week for demolition. What’s the number on unfit? Any idea how many structures are referred for posting as unfit on a—cause that’s 200 plus structures that are coming for demolition. Further up the food chain what is it on unfit? Do we know? Mr. Talkin said I don’t know what the average is but the fact of the matter is most properties that get tagged unfit, placarded unfit, there’s basically a ten day process before they officially become unfit that occurs after the hearing. I would say 90 to 95% of those eventually get the official tag of unfit after the hearing. Once again as far as the numbers that get remedied compared to the numbers that get referred to demo or the numbers that sit out there and don’t get repaired because they don’t meet demo criteria, we don’t have good data.
Mr. Talkin said as mentioned before, we have a local ordinance that parallels the state statute 17-4759 which is known as Urban Renewal. Basically the Kansas State Statute gives a little bit of leeway to the city in that they can establish these percentages that we’ve established. The estimated cost to repair must exceed 100% of the appraised value and in addition it must exceed 25% of the replacement cost of new construction. For an example here, let’s take a property that has an appraised value of $10,000 and a replacement cost of $80,000. Now just looking at those numbers you know the property is not in very good condition. Let’s say the structure is 1,000 square feet and we’re estimating the damage at 50%. The damage assessment is determined by kind of a check-off sheet staff has about what is actually damaged, what has to be repaired to determine whether it’s 25, 50, 75 or 100% damaged.

This one is at 50% so we multiply the 1,000 square feet (x) $50.98 which $50.98 is 50% of the cost per square foot of building a new structure, residential in this case. If you were building a new structure, the average today is about $102 a square foot. We’re taking 50% of that so we’re multiplying 1,000 (x) $50.98, approximately coming up with $51,000 cost in repairs for this structure. Comparing that to the appraised value, it comes out to 510% which far exceeds 100% of the appraised value. Then we take the $51,000 compare that to the replacement costs and come up with 64% which exceeds the 25% appraised value. Both of the values, the appraised value and the replacement cost, we get from the Appraiser’s Office. The cost of rehab,
the $102 I refer to, comes from a national organization called the International Code Council that publishes that information nationally. That’s where we came up with the $102 per square foot.

The Demolition Process itself. I think there were a lot of questions about the timeframe it takes for the process and we’ll do our best to try to add some insight although it can still be very confusing.

The referral processes we talked before, Code Enforcement unfit cases determines if property is dangerous or unsafe. Basically they’re at the end of their wits on the code enforcement process and they feel it’s bad enough to meet the criteria. At that point the demolition coordinator will visit and do a site inspection to do the assessment. If the demolition case meets the criteria we just discussed, a demolition case will be initiated. At that point we request a title search and it generally takes 30 to 45 days to receive that title search back. Currently the Delinquent Property Tax Office does our title searches for us, so depending on when we request those title searches, they may be knee deep in a tax sale process of doing research for that, so that timeframe can vary. If we hit one of the times when they’re not doing a tax sale or they’re in the backside of a tax sale, we can get it rather quick; otherwise, we have to wait a little bit longer.

Once we have the title search, we schedule a hearing which is called the complaint hearing. We notify all parties with an interest that’s identified in that title search. We schedule
the hearing, we mail to all the parties by registered mail, we publish in the *Wyandotte County Echo* and we post a notice on the structure.

After that hearing either an order is filed or if we have somebody appear that appears to have some type of a plan that is going to remedy the problem and they’re not somebody that consistently is visiting us and have set a track record of not performing, then we will go ahead and file the order of demolition. After that order is filed we have to wait by law 30 days. That gives the owner actually still a chance to take care of the problem or they can file an appeal.

---

At this point the order is filed for 30 days past no appeal and no presence of the owner making any efforts, we start requesting utility disconnects. These disconnects vary in time depending on the utility companies demand or their workload but generally this can take several months. We also request approval from the State Historic Preservation Officer. This is a requirement because of our use of CDBG funds, so we have to request that every property go through this. Nine times out of ten or 98 times out of 100, we never have an issue with this review. Occasionally we do, but we generally receive that approval or denial within two weeks.

We also then start the asbestos and environmental inspection. We send a third party, certified asbestos inspector, out to do an inspection. The report is submitted to identify the asbestos containing material and household hazardous waste such as: fluorescent tubes, oil, pesticides etc. Those reports generally come back to us in 30 days. At that point, provided there
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are no other legal implications that somebody’s filed something on us to restrain us, but generally, the holding point at this point is funding. If we’re later in the year and we’re at this point we’re out of funds, we complete a legal process, we’ve got to wait for the next year’s funding to get in place.

Once we do have funding in place, staff goes to the site, prepares some specific specifications tailored to that property trying to make it look a little bit decent when it’s done. Then we submit that bid out to contractors and once we get the bids back, the low bidder is awarded the contract and they have 60 days by contract to complete that demolition.

There are a few variations in this demolition process. If we have structures that basically are in excess of 75% or 100% damaged and generally those are the ones that are fire damaged nine times out of ten. We can circumvent a little bit of that legal process by sending a ten-day notice to the parties that we know have an interest in the property and, therefore, cutting out some of the timeframes from publication, posting and some of the hearing process. In that notice they still are given an opportunity to contact us for a hearing. This just cuts time off and this can get the process down to around three to six months of getting those properties disposed of, provided funding is in place at the end when we get there.

We also have signed authorization and that’s where we have ownership parties that have an interest in the property that come forward, don’t have the means; we will accept a signed
authorization and basically that helps us get around some financial costs. We don’t have to publish in the paper, we don’t have to file complaints and orders. Depending on when they come in that loop we most likely won’t save any time but we could save a little bit, we’ll just save some money in that process.

We’d like to think that all the properties are first in and first out but that’s not always the case. Like I said we have emergencies that get bumped up, usually those are the fire damaged properties, but we have had properties where a car veered off the road and ran through a property and compromised it significantly or something along that line. We also have some redevelopment that goes on in our community. We have some community partners that it is imperative that they get properties razed so they can move forward and rebuild on that property. We have to kind of do this in a timely manner. It also gives us some points to the CDBG process of using CDBG funds to raze and to also have properties being built on the backside of that.

We also look at properties, for instance, that are around schools or daycares where kids are involved. Then of course sometimes there are some neighborhood needs issues. I’ll put that with the police requests. We have a property that we just can’t secure or secure and people are continually getting in it and it’s in queue but it’s down on the list for demo, but we are continually have to put a lot of resources or calls for service. Police are making numerous calls,
Fire Department is making numerous calls, and sometimes for those various reasons if funding is available, we’ll move those up because of the demand and the concerns in the neighborhood.

As far as the numbers, this shows since 2008 the number of properties we’ve taken down per year. The reddish pink is residential and the purple is commercial. You will see a little bit of variation in 2011 and 2012. The reason for that is, those two years were based upon the final completion date of the demolition. We got our funds very late in the year 2011. We didn’t actually start bidding those until I think the third quarter that year. They got final in 2012 which skews a little bit of our numbers. It’s really not my funding source those two years. Some of the properties that have been out in 2011 are reflected in 2012 numbers. In 2013 you see a significant decrease. That was the year we had a significant budget impact and then a little bit of a recovery in 2014 when the Commission approved some additional funds for that year.
There’re the funding sources and you can see we generally have been CDBG funded; 2014 was the first year since I believe I’ve been involved in the demo process, which is 18-20 years. The General Fund has exceeded CDBG dollars.

As you can see the residential has been somewhat stable across the board ranging probably around $7 to $8,000. It has crept up a little bit in 2014. Part of that is going to be an ongoing upward trend on the residential properties because we’re going to incur about an additional $1,000 to $1,500 cost per residential property, for the most part because our Water Pollution
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Control in the past has done all of our sewer kill. Well now with what they’re taxed with, with a lot of consent degree and meeting the storm water issues, as well as meeting some resource requirements, some of these sewers are 30 foot deep and they don’t have the equipment to not only shore the holes but also to dig down. Pretty much with the resource issues, we’re going to be including the sewer kill in our budget, each bid specifically. We’re already starting to see that in 2014 but it will continue in future years too.

The other thing I noticed, of course, you see the average cost of commercial and of course that’s just the nature of commercial. A commercial demolition job that we do could be a small corner grocery store that’s less than a residential structure, as compared to the large theater we just took down on Minnesota last year, which caused 2014 to spike significantly. Those vary highly in cost across the board.

**Chairman McKiernan** said speaking of funding, it was once suggested to me that at any given time we have the funding to demolish about 25% of the structures that are eligible or in queue for demolition. How close is that to accurate? **Mr. Talkin** said I think if we look there’re 252 on the list now and we’ve probably been averaging around 80 to 85 a year…**Chairman McKiernan** said so pretty accurate. To me this just illustrates, I’d love for you to have fun Erin tearing down buildings, but we have got to find a way to stop these before they slide all the way to demolition. We can not afford either in terms of neighborhood blight or in terms of money in the UG, we can’t afford to tear down this many houses every year.

This is great information but I think what it does is it really gives us a further incentive to stop these houses before they get to the point where they have to be demolished especially given the time lag that can occur with eight months to four years it said there. With that kind of time lag we can’t have that many need to be demolished structures sitting in our neighborhoods and kind of further pulling everything down.

I think this is real good incentive for us to work even harder to work with Mr. Wilson, to work with yourself, to work with all the rest of your staff on finding strategies that stop this slide earlier on. Any other comments or discussions or questions?

**Commissioner Townsend** said thank you for that information. How difficult or easy would it be to find out by district how many houses at anytime are on the demolition or unfit? Is that
something that you normally…**Mr. Talkin** said Erin can, you want to read those off real quick…**Commissioner Townsend** said have access to? **Erin Downing, Code Enforcement**, said in District 1 we have currently 115 structures on the demo list, in District 2 we have 33, District 3 we have 18, District 4 we have 67, District 5 we have 3, District 6 we have 11, District 7 we have 2, and District 8 we have 5. **Commissioner Townsend** said thank you so that wasn’t very hard at all.

**Chairman McKiernan** said maybe I’d be the only one who’d be interested in—of course these are numbers that I’ve already asked both of you for. In addition to the houses that are on the demo list, the number that has been posted as unfit, I think is another interesting number that may give us, and you were able to give me the locations of those and so I’ve been mapping those in my district. Again, looking for factors that compound that problem or looking for areas where there’s a concentration or looking for areas where there’s not and trying to learn what we can from analyzing those data in that way.

I have a couple of requests. Could you send what you just presented to us and make sure that gets sent to all of the commissioner’s. **Mr. Talkin** said yes. **Chairman McKiernan** said beautiful and if you could give me—can you give me addresses for my district in terms of locations of houses on the demo list. **Commissioner Townsend** said and I’d like that as well too. **Mr. Talkin** said if it’s alright with you Commissioner’s, what we’ll do is just give you the complete demo list and we’ll sort it by commission districts…**Chairman McKiernan** said and that way anyone who chooses to can go through and look at that. One of the other reasons that I say that we have to find a way to stop doing this, as I’ve looked at some of the tax records on some of the houses, some of the current vacant lots in my district and you can see, oh there was a structure, oh there was a structure, oh there’s a $10,000 lien and now it’s a vacant lot. I don’t know how many of these where we don’t get that money back. We spend it without ever recovering it and so again if we can stop them from getting to that point, we can save that money on the front side.

**Commissioner Walker** said I’ve briefly discussed this with you years ago. We’re always looking for efficiencies. Efficiencies mean both economical and time. If our past practice is true, we bid these out, we go through a bid process and instead of doing bids in the way we do it,
I have always contended that if we bid this out to where we had two or even one captive demolition crew that knew they were going to get for a one, two or three-year period of time, all of the demolitions that had the resources and the certifications and the various things that are required, we would save money and we would be able to do the demolitions quicker because that would be a condition of their bidding to us that we are a priority to their—we don’t have to wait on them to do it instead of doing it the way we do it. Now I don’t think you have agreed with that. **Mr. Talkin** said well, Commissioner, if you remember when we went through that I think Purchasing didn’t really agree with that because one of the problems we would probably see is the bigger companies would probably rule that bid, kicking out the smaller minority companies that we currently have bidding. The minority companies maybe could ramp up but generally they can only handle three or four properties at a time. If we were feeding all of these to one contractor, they would have to juggle probably 20 to 30 properties at a time. It does add a little bit of time but it does give a competitive bid on every property. I think if you got a general bid across the board of what it’s going to cost for one contractor by square footage, you might have some savings at one point but at the other point some of the properties are simpler. On the other side, you might pay more going through that process.

There were several issues that I think Purchasing kind of came back at that time and so you know maybe we ought to keep it the way it was. Like I said I see benefits both ways. It would save maybe one to two weeks for the most part to that little bidding process. Well actually it’s a week but overall it wouldn’t save a lot of time. **Commissioner Walker** said well obviously the idea of one contractor doing it, I’m looking for a price differential on all the property and there could be criteria developed. Frankly its tax dollars and we have an obligation to spend them as we—at least I think we do try to wisely.

If somebody would give us a flat price on basic demolition and then if it has asbestos and so forth, I can’t believe that we’re not going to save money in total. Maybe spend more money overall but get more demolitions for the buck. **Mr. Talkin** said one other example there, Commissioner, too is Erin brought one to my attention last week; 17th Street right behind the Prescott Development. It’s the fire damaged structure up on the hill. That one is going to cost significant dollars because of the slope of this property. That one to me might be kind of hard to get in a general overall bid. I don’t know you can always put in there the amount of cubic yards you have to move and the silt fencing but I just think, you have these special circumstances.
where you have to get really specific in the bid that you may not be able to do if you’ve got it covered on a general contract. We’ve got a lot of dirt to move on that one but make it manageable after we take it down. **Commissioner Walker** said okay.

**Chairman McKiernan** said unfortunately that was a spectacular fire the day it happened. I know exactly which property you’re talking about. You’re going to give us the information, the presentation, as well as the list of unfit and demo list. We’re going to work our hardest to reduce the number that is on the current demo list and to stop them from getting to demo. **Mr. Talkin** said one clarification. The demo list by commission district is not a problem. The presentation is not a problem. The unfit list if I’m giving that to everybody by commission district, it will take us—I can take the one I gave you which is probably about a month old now; if everybody is fine with that. If not, it would probably take another week to try to renew that list. **Chairman McKiernan** said as far as I’m concerned that list even aged a little bit is better than nothing. **Mr. Talkin** said okay.

**Action:** No action.

Adjourn

**Chairman McKiernan** adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

**cdm**