The meeting of the Administration and Human Services Standing Committee was held on September 28, 2015, at 5:45 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Markley, Chairman; Commissioners Philbrook, Johnson, Kane; and Bynum. The following officials were also in attendance: Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Ken Moore, Interim Chief Counsel; Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning & Land Use; Chris Cooley, DOTS-GSS; and Wilba Miller, Community Development Director.

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

Chairman Markley said a blue sheet has been distributed this evening providing additional information for an existing item on CDBG.

Approval of standing committee minutes for June 22, 2015 and July 20, 2015. On motion of Commissioner Philbrook, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Agenda:
Item No. 1 – 1579…REMOVE USER LOGIN REQUIREMENT

Synopsis: Recommendation to remove the user login requirement for owner name search and display of real estate information on the UG website, submitted by Christian Cooley, DOTS-GSS.

Christian Cooley, DOTS-GSS, said this is a for information only item. I wanted to bring a policy change before you. Staff has had this discussion with administration, administration recommended we make the change. Legal has suggested that we at least vet it with the
Administration Standing Committee to let you guys know of the policy change that’s occurring. The current policy is that users using our public website when they’re doing searches and inquiries on real estate and similar information must have a user login and be logged into the system in order to see owner name and address of that public information. They see that when they’re doing a search from outside of the UG.

A future policy that we’re recommending with this is to remove that login requirement. Currently the login is kind of a barrier, kind of cumbersome to the occasional or casual user. My staff and the staff of the Clerk’s Office frequently get questions for who owns this property and the question that comes with that is can I do this online. Well, the answer to them is yes, but you’ve got to jump through these hoops and create a username and login. Further reasoning for doing this, making this policy change is that in review of other agencies around us, other counties, other cities that provide information like this on a public website; they no longer have this requirement as well. You can do a search by owner name, you can search by parcel number or address and see who the owner of the property is on those other agencies’ websites.

I’m recommending that we make the same change here as well. This also will save staff time that we can refer people that are so willing to self serve and many people are happy to do that in today’s age. We’re certainly willing to help those that call us that don’t have the computer savvy or the time to deal with the computer maybe, but those things are the positive benefits of it.

What does this policy impact? It impacts the searches that the public is making on the UG website. What it doesn’t impact is the standard Freedom of Information Act Request or the Kansas Open Records Act request, those are still handled in the same way, same manner and somebody would need to submit us a request, explain the record that they’re looking for and we’d provide it to them in a timely manner with our standard policies that we do that with. This also doesn’t impact those individuals that have opted out under Kansas Statute; members of law enforcement, judges, city attorney’s, other members of public safety that has sensitive jobs that would be concerned about their privacy. Their information is removed from the public search on the website if they have requested it. We’ve recently, I believe in January we received about 200-250 requests from our Police Department and there are other people that have made a request that have been you know—the appropriate person under this statute to make the request to be removed from the public search. That’s the impact of the policy.
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I wanted to once again inform you, the Commission, that we’re making this change unless there’s a strong heartache or concern that’s raised here at which point we would go back and reconsider it, but at this point I’ll give it to you guys to see if you have any comments or questions.

Commissioner Philbrook said I have a comment. It’s wonderful, thank you, because back, not too long ago we talked about this a little bit and expressed to you that we would really like the public to be able to get to this information. Thank you very much for following through.

Action: For information only.

Item No. 2 – 1587…REVISE FARMER’S MARKET PROCESS

Synopsis: Request authorization to develop an ordinance to simplify the farmer's market process and fee structure, submitted by Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning & Land Use.

What does our current Ordinance say?

Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning & Land Use, said this is a request for approval to move forward and develop a new ordinance and administrative policy related to farmer’s markets. The current ordinance has two different sections that deals with farmer’s markets, one is under the special use permit and the temporary use of land section, so you all see several special use permits or temporary uses of land for commercial or industrial purposes. I know you’re familiar with that.
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The second is under the accessory uses in the agricultural district. If you raise products on site you can sell them on site. That’s common across the state. Secondly, in the commercial districts as accessory uses, you can have exterior sales. It doesn’t specifically say agricultural products but they would fit in that category.

What is the identified issue?

- Currently “Farmer’s Markets are allowed only by Special Use Permit when not on farm Property."
- Farmer’s market is considered the temporary use of land for commercial purposes in non-commercial zoning districts.
- SUP process is 60-90 days
- SUP fee is $350

Most of our farmer’s market operate under a special use permit; and that is that temporary use of land special use permit. We have a little bit of an issue between local and imported foods. Local, we would define that in the future; but it’s somewhere within 100 to 150 miles of us. Not canteloupes from California or grapefruit from Florida. The SUP process takes 60 – 90 days and the fee is $350 every other year to get through that process. Our proposed revisions would be to define both farmer’s market and local food, to amend the zoning code to allow farmer’s markets as an accessory use specifically in agricultural, all commercial, all industrial and the traditional neighborhood design are TND zoning districts.

Proposed revisions

- Amend zoning code to allow farmer’s markets generally
- Create administrative process for approval of local produce
  - Reduce the time frame to be under 2 weeks
  - Reduce fee
- Require Special Use permit for non-local produce
We would create an administrative process for approval of the local produce farmer’s markets, reduce that timeframe to be under two weeks and reduce the fee. The fees are set administratively for these types of processes, but I’m thinking somewhere in the $50 a year range for the fee. Then we would require a special use permit for non-local produce if it continues to be an issue as we work with the local growers. I anticipate that it will. If you are going to do something in a residential zoning district, that’s what I would propose to do. We would work that through the Planning Commission process and it would come back to you after the Planning Commission saw it.

**Commissioner Bynum** said I may not have this right but it was my understanding that part of the issue we were dealing with regarding current farmer’s markets was the need for them to comply with whatever zoning was present on the spot they were in, such as commercial and number of parking spots, etc., etc. This doesn’t fix any of that, does it? **Mr. Richardson** said yes it would. Through the administrative we would have—we’re working on an administrative application that would address those things. Having adequate parking will still be one of those that’s important but certain commercial parking lots, for instance you would know are only full from Saturday’s in the first week of November through the first week of January or something, so there’s extra room; some of them that aren’t. If it’s a restaurant then some of those are full at different times. We can work through some of those issues and this would allow us to have the flexibility to do that, whereas right now we could just say no. All we can do is say no. It think that will give us more flexibility with those and it will give us some better enforcement because there have been people selling at 38th & State and I can tell they probably don’t have a business license. They are probably not collecting sales tax and other things. This would allow us to make sure we enforce uniformly across the city.

**Commissioner Philbook** said I appreciate you doing this. We have a big push to make this community greener and to have a lot more people doing the produce and selling it. This will open it up and actually make it cost effective for them to be able to do it versus having to come before us and pay $350 right off the getgo. Thank you.
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Chairman Markley said, Rob, this says this is for information only but then you have direction to staff. It sounds like there’s consensus for you to move forward. Do you want a motion or are you good to go. Why don’t you do a motion just to be safe.

Action: Commissioner Philbook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve and forward the matter to the full commission. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Philbrook, Johnson, Kane, Bynum, Markley.

Item No. 3 – 1586...UPDATE: DIGITAL BILLBOARDS & REMOVAL OF URBAN BILLBOARDS

Synopsis: Update on digital billboards and removal of urban billboards resulting from the code change last spring, presented by Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning & Land Use.

Status of 8 digital billboard permits

- Why the delay?
  - State permit process
  - Equipment delays from overseas
- Both Companies anticipate completion by the end of the year.
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Rob Richardson, Director of Urban Planning & Land Use, said so we have eight digital billboard permits. Those are listed up on the screen with the addresses. As you’ll recall last spring, we amended the outdoor advertising, technically the outdoor advertising code to allow digital displays instead of static displays under certain criteria. Two of them have been fully completed permits 4 and 5. The others are delayed from a combination of the state permitting process, equipment delays and overseas shipping. Both companies that are doing these anticipate that they will be complete by the end of the year.
One of the requirements was that they remove urban billboards at a ratio of 1:5 or 2:1 and so each permit, and you have this in your materials that were provided in the packet, each permit and the billboards that will come down related to that. You’ll notice that these billboards are already down but it’s really only one sign for each board. If they were double-faced signs and they took down—Lamar didn’t have a lot of urban boards to take down so they took down actual large billboards and they took down two faces of billboards in two different locations. Those are the signs that are to be removed. As I said, you have that information in your packet.
Since the sign companies anticipate being completed by the end of year, I’ll do another update when everything is wrapped up in February or March, depending on when I get the final notices and affidavits that all of the urban boards have been removed based on the digital boards being installed.

**Commissioner Johnson** said, Rob, are these the only eight billboards that we’ll have in Wyandotte County. **Mr. Richardson** said these are the only eight that are currently permitted and the two companies that were most interested in those digital billboards indicate that these are the only ones that they anticipate for sometime. There are a couple of other companies around, but it would be a challenge for them to meet the takedown requirement. They would have to give up space to be able to do that, now they might do that but they haven’t informed us that they will. **Commissioner Johnson** said I’m sure you’d know the criteria that is utilized to determine where signs are established. I’m just wondering what criteria basically is utilized to justify these spots versus other spots. **Mr. Richardson** said that’s based on the marketing information of each individual company of where they would put the digital display. They will tell you that sometimes they get it wrong and they’ll put one up and it doesn’t work there and they’ll take it down and move it somewhere else. It’s just the companies marketing and it also has to meet our—you know they’re converting an existing board, so all the existing boards are either legal or legal nonconforming and they have the right to change one of those boards if they meet the other criteria related to the takedown and the business license fees.
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**Action:** For information only.

**Item No. 4 – 1597…DISCUSSION: CDBG REALLOCATION AND GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS**

**Synopsis:** Discussion of CDBG Reallocation and Grant Application Process, submitted by Melissa Mundt, Assistant County Administrator.

**Commissioner Kane** said for the record, I do not believe this belongs in front of this committee and I want everyone to know it.

**Wilba Miller, Community Development Director,** said during the budget process the Commission asked me to come back before the commission to talk about the allocation of funds, the application process and to give you updates on the current acquisition, rehab and reconstruction activities that are going on. In your packet you will find that there are five items and I’ll just kind of really quickly go through the first three that are informational only, starting with the project that’s considered now to be called Highland Crest. In the budget process you might have heard it called District 6 Project.

The timeline that had been given to Commission has now been updated to include all of the 2015 information. Wells Fargo has donated a piece of property through the Land Bank and we’ve accepted it and we’ve gotten keys for it. Last week Mario Escobar of Argentine Betterment Corporation (ABC) came in and picked up the keys and is starting this scope of work to get on that project. That’ll be the first house for that project. We’re still in the contract phase of that. We have a couple of agreements over at HUD that they need to review for HUD, lease purchase and purchase of those properties.

The second project is the Argentine Betterment Corporation Project, located at 1351 S. 26th St. This was originally an acquisition rehabilitation of a multi-family structure that was changed to a acquisition possible demolition of the structure. During the budget process we did amend our Consolidated Plan, unfortunately this project had some environmental issues, the main one being noise from the railroad tracks and from the highways. We’ve with HUD, we’ve worked with commissioners, we’ve met with environmental people and we could mitigate the noise,
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however; it would be so costly that it would not be an effective use of CDBG funds. We sent a letter and met with Mario Escobar on the 18th of September and told him that we would deny the project because of reasonableness of cost.

The next one was the Argentine Highland Crest Economic Development Project. It was discussed at the last two Budget Workshops for the UG. We had received an application in February, the CDBG Committee at that time put some money aside in June for that activity. The full commission reduced that fund, that $500,000 fund to $400,000 with $100,000 moved to the Home Repair Program. At the July 30th meeting they reduced it an additional $50,000 for Doing Real Work for a total of $350,000. Those funds do need to be allocated because they were reclassified from the ABC project to redevelopment housing, economic development, bricks and mortar to be allocated, which brings us to the application process.

The Budget Department prepared an application form two years ago that was very generic and doesn’t really work for the intricacies of Community Development projects. Staff and I have met and started researching other cities. In your packet you’ll see a draft of an application with various cities listed on page 2 that says that we’ve checked with cities in Wichita, South Dakota, just different cities that had these online and available to us. This particular draft application is nice in that it contains five sections for different eligible activities under CDBG; housing, economic development, public services so if someone was to come in and wanted to apply for something specific they could and only fill out the generic parts and then that particular section of the application.

Secondly, in that same packet we have an attachment called Managing CDBG. It is the actual HUD document about preaward assessments that we should do on any proposals we take as well as application information on what we would need for their review. The last thing is a proposed CDBG application calendar. We do have the $350,000 from that one that I just talked about available and the $258,000 from the Argentine ABC Project for a total of $608,000 that needs to be allocated. We would like to use the calendar that’s in here and we would need Commission direction tonight on presenting a final version of an application to you in October, issuing a request for proposals in November, receiving them by December the 11th, giving staff until January 16th or the next time you meet in January to vet them and bring a spreadsheet with recommendations.
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One of the reasons why this is important is because HUD does a timeliness evaluation of us every August. We, this year did not meet but hurriedly scrambled to meet our timeliness issue, so we would like to get started early into the process and have these awarded by the end of January meeting.

Chairman Markley said that was a lot of information. I’m going to kind of reiterate where we are and what Wilba needs from us. We got an update on a few projects and where those stand but basically for the purpose of reminding us that we now have $608,000 that needs to be allocated. In order to allocate those funds I think everyone agrees we need a better application because the application we were using just didn’t provide enough information to our applicants. Staff has provided us a draft application and they are looking for us between now and the next meeting to provide any feedback we have to make changes to that application so that in October we can get this process rolling because it’s important for our HUD money that we spend it promptly, so we want to award it as quickly as possible. With that reiteration, are there questions about our situation or the application for those of you who may have taken a look at it prior to today or the direction going forward.

Commissioner Johnson said well I’m glad that it’s clarified that this is something that we have a little more time to look at first of all. Chairman Markley said it’s very simple, it’s a little one page, tiny document. For those of you in the audience, it’s quite the packet. Commissioner Johnson said specifically, when we got it I think, just two days ago. I’m not a speed reader. Just for clarity purposes, what we’re talking about applies to this $608,000. Chairman Markley said correct, and I think the idea is it will be used going forward year after year, but we’d like to get it moving in particular to allocate those dollars.

Commissioner Bynum said first of all, yay, Turner Highland Crest, it looks like house number one. That’s awesome and that is the 2014 monies and things are underway and that’s really great. Wilba, I appreciate the application even though I do also understand it’s a lot of paper to slog through, but this is kind of where I was and I appreciate that you’ve gone out and looked at what other communities are doing with their CDBG dollars and how they’re taking in their applications and you’ve made sort of a hybrid it looks like of that so I think that’s great. I had
one more thought and I don’t remember what it was, but maybe we’ll come back to it before we get out of here for the Chiefs game.

Commissioner Philbook asked does this mean that then—I don’t think I heard you say it, but does that mean that we can make the determinations of this CDBG money, take that away from the time that we have to spend on planning for our budget because we know about what we’re going to be making and so we don’t have to spend a lot of time down in the weeds like some people like to call it. Ms. Miller said this will streamline the budget process. Chairman Markley said you’re exactly right. We hope that we would then be doing this application process separately from the budget process. Commissioner Philbook said yay! Chairman Markley said to be incorporated into the budget of course. Commissioner Philbook said no, I understand. I understand, but not the decision of where it goes. Commissioner Kane said and I’m glad you said that because that’s one positive that I’ve seen of this and the rest of it I still think it should go back to a three-person committee and maybe remove one person, put Melissa on the committee and then—because those are the specialists. We’re not a specialist, my district is not going to get this money and I just think this was a bad choice of a committee to put it on.

Chairman Markley asked, Commissioner Bynum, did you remember your final thought. Commissioner Bynum said yes, thank you very much. The only question I had and now I’ve done something to my computer so I can’t see where I was but the timeline was RFP to go out—Ms. Miller said if we brought an application back before you in October and you approved it, we would actually go out the week of November 2nd, start the advertising of the proposal. Commissioner Bynum said so basically a five week window here. RFP out, December 11th applications back in and my question is around the marketing piece of that. Ms. Miller said I brought a list. Commissioner Bynum said Commissioner Kane is volunteering me and I’m volunteering myself. If you brought a list, great. We can talk about it now or we can talk about it later. The marketing is a big deal to me. Thank you. Ms. Miller asked do you want me to go ahead, make a comment or two. Commissioner Bynum said sure. Ms. Miller said we always advertise our public hearings and the regular budget process in the following: Echo, The Call, The Globe, Dos Mundos, KC Hispanic News and we also put it in the eNews and the UG website. We inform Liveable Neighborhoods of it and they send it out and we inform homeless agencies,
however; we’ve decided to add Wyandotte Economic Development Corporation, United Way, the Chambers of Commerce, obviously the commissioners and our housing development organizations.

Chairman Markley said I’d like to say Wilba had that list in mind just for you, Commissioner. She was ready to go.

Action: For information only.

Chairman Markley adjourned the meeting at 6:11 p.m.