

CITY OF MISSION, KANSAS
FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 2021

7:30 P.M.

(or immediately following 6:30 p.m. Community Development Committee)

Meeting Held Virtually via Zoom

In consideration of the COVID-19 social distancing recommendations, this meeting will be held virtually via Zoom (<https://zoom.us/join>). The public may participate with comments by using the “chat” feature, please note all statements are made visible to the group.

Information will be posted, prior to the meeting, on how to join at <https://www.missionks.org/calendar.aspx>. Please contact the Administrative Offices, 913-676-8350, with any questions or concerns.

PUBLIC HEARINGS / PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS / INFORMATIONAL ONLY

ACTION ITEMS

1. Acceptance of the December 2, 2020 and December 9, 2020 Finance & Administration Committee Minutes - Audrey McClanahan ([page 3](#))

Draft minutes of the December 2, 2020 and December 9, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee meeting are included for review and acceptance.

2. Resolution - Destruction of Certain Records - Audrey McClanahan ([page 25](#))

Annually, Council adopts a resolution outlining those records that may be destroyed during the coming year. The records listed in this resolution are identified in K.S.A. 12-120. Ordinances, resolutions, minutes, Council and commission packets, and records of historical value are kept permanently.

3. Surplus Property Resolution - Brian Scott ([page 28](#))

City Council Policy No. 111 defines the process and procedure for the sale and disposal of real and personal property by the City of Mission, which is also outlined in K.S.A. 12-101. The City Council will be asked to consider a resolution identifying surplus items that include police patrol cars that are being rotated out, old patrol car mobile terminals, desktop computers, and office furniture.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

OTHER

4. Department Updates - Laura Smith

Debbie Kring, Chairperson
Hillary Parker Thomas, Vice-Chairperson
Mission City Hall, 6090 Woodson St
913-676-8350

City of Mission	Item Number:	1.
ACTION ITEM SUMMARY	Date:	January 6, 2021
Administration	From:	Audrey McClanahan

Action items require a vote to recommend the item to full City Council for further action.

RE: December 2, 2020 & December 9, 2020 Finance & Administration Committee Minutes.

RECOMMENDATION: Review and accept the December 2, 2020 & December 9, 2020 minutes of the Finance & Administration Committee.

DETAILS: Minutes of the December 2, 2020 & December 9, 2020 Finance & Administration Committee meetings are presented for review and acceptance. At the committee meeting, if there are no objections or recommended corrections, the minutes will be considered accepted as presented.

Draft minutes are linked to the City Council agenda packet so that the public may review the discussion from the committee meeting in advance of the Council action on any particular item.

CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS: N/A

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	NA
Line Item Code/Description:	NA
Available Budget:	NA

MINUTES OF THE MISSION FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

December 2, 2020

The Mission Finance & Administration Committee met virtually via ZOOM on Wednesday, December 2, 2020. The following committee members were present: Hillary Thomas, Trent Boultinghouse, Arcie Rothrock, Nick Schlossmacher, Kristin Inman, Sollie Flora, Debbie Kring and Ken Davis. Mayor Appletoft was also in attendance. Councilmember Kring called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

The following staff were present: City Administrator Laura Smith, Assistant City Administrator Brian Scott, City Clerk Audrey McClanahan, Assistant to the City Administrator Emily Randel, Public Works Director Celia Duran, Public Works Superintendent Brent Morton, Parks & Recreation Director Penn Almoney and Interim Police Chief Dan Madden.

The Committee considered a revised Agenda to consider Discussion Item number twelve. **Moved by Davis, seconded by Flora** to approve the revised Agenda as presented. Voting AYE: Boultinghouse, Davis, Flora, Inman, Kring, Rothrock, Schlossmacher, Thomas. **Motion Carried.**

Public Comments

Councilmember Kring explained that this meeting is being held virtually via Zoom and participants can make a comment through the chat feature.

There were no public comments.

Public Presentations

Acceptance of the November 4, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee Minutes

Minutes of the November 4, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee Meeting were provided to the Committee. There was a modification that was made to recognize the correct chair of the meeting. Councilmember Davis recommended the modified minutes be approved, there being no objections or corrections, the minutes were accepted as presented.

2021 Legislative Priorities

Ms. Smith reported that the City's Legislative Program, which outlines priorities and areas of interest or concern to be communicated to our state legislators, has been updated with the modifications and input received from the Councilmembers at the November 4, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee meeting. The City's legislative advocate Stuart Little of Little Government Relations (LGR) has assisted staff in preparing the final 2021 Legislative Program for review and approval.

Councilmember Davis asked for clarification on items that had been removed from the program, specifically the issue on selling tobacco, and asked if that was removed because of the Federal Government's Tobacco21 legislation? Mr. Little explained that when the Federal government increased the age to purchase tobacco to twenty-one, that it made it unnecessary to address similar policy at the State level, however, Mr. Little acknowledged that the Federal mandates did not not address the vaping products or the flavored cigarettes. Councilmember Davis hoped there could be something addressed in the legislative priorities regarding the issue of vaping. Councilmember Schlossmacher disagreed, adding that as legal adults they should be able to purchase tobacco products and thought that including this issue in the priorities should be brought to a vote.

Councilmember Davis also asked about the removal of the safe use of bicycles and scooters on public streets. Ms. Smith replied that this topic has not been a priority for the City, and it had been removed by staff in preparing the 2021 Priorities. The goal is to narrow the focus and more effectively address and communicate the key priorities and issues of concern. Mr. Little confirmed that LGR didn't make any recommendation to remove anything from the platform, the recommendations came from staff. Mr. Little added that there were several things that needed to be updated based on actions taken last session as well as conversations with legislators and bills that were being introduced.

Councilmember Schlossmacher asked LGR to explain where and how they had used the 2020 Priorities to develop or influence policy. how the data, from last year, was used to establish the priorities for this year. Councilmember Schlossmacher followed-up by asking if LGR approached anything differently for the City of Mission, based on our Legislative Priorities, than with other cities. Mr. Little answered that very rarely was there something so unique in a city's platform that a specific approach is taken. Most cities all over the state are having the same conversations about preserving and protecting local authority and local control.

Councilmember Flora asked about the language for the explanation that the City should have the same responsibilities as lobbyists since private lobbyists need to register. Ms. Smith replied that it has been a fairly consistent practice for us to look at the League's statement of policy and mirror that language which is what was done for this priority. Mr. Little added that any Councilmember can testify on a bill, in a personal or professional capacity, and they do not have to register as a lobbyist.

Councilmember Flora asked about the position related to increasing the Municipal Court's usage of videos for trials, emphasising that she has concerns and disagrees with widespread use of this practice as she believes it does not necessarily afford defendants the same opportunities. Ms. Smith answered that with the pandemic, this year, and in an effort to adjust and continue municipal court services that the flexibility that can be provided through audio and visual technology can be beneficial for the system.

Councilmember Thomas posed the question to Mr. Little that last year he had mentioned a couple of conflicts between the City's platform and their lobbying capacity and wanted to see if

that would be the same for this year. Mr. Little answered that last year he noted the issue with regard to legalization of marijuana. Since they represent an organization called the Behavioral Health Association of Kansas that is composed of substance use disorder treatment providers, that was a potential issue, however, they are not opposed to legalization but want to ensure that resources are invested in treatment.

Councilmember Davis asked to discuss again the issue of tobacco products and distribution, in an effort to see some of it remain in the policy even though it has been included in Federal legislation. Councilmember Schlossmacher said that according to the Federal government, on the FDA site, it reads that it's illegal for any retailer to sell any tobacco product, including cigarettes, cigars, and e-cigarettes to anyone under twenty-one.

It was determined that more information and a staff recommendation was needed on the issue of tobacco sales and the Municipal Court video trials. The usage of the word "responsibility" for the lobbyists would be adjusted after consultation with the League of Kansas Municipalities. Finally, the word "rapidly" will be removed from the priority dealing with "Recognition of Financial Risks Posed by Climate Change" as it was subject to interpretation and the goal was continued progress toward decarbonization not necessarily speed.

Mission Bowl Project

The Developers of the Mission Bowl property have requested the City to consider using a variety of economic development tools to establish a public-private partnership which would be mutually beneficial for both the City and the Developer. Ms. Smith explained that there would be continued discussions around project incentives at a second Finance and Administration Committee meeting on December 9, 2020. There will also be two public hearings held on December 16, 2020 regarding creation of Rock Creek TIF District 3A, and consideration of a TIF Project Plan for the same. Ms. Smith noted that during tonight's Committee meeting the additional steps or components of the project would be reviewed should Council or the public have questions.

In 2006, the City established the Rock Creek Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District which contained approximately 71 acres of property and generally follows the Rock Creek Floodplain from Roe to Lamar. The Rock Creek District included four (4) redevelopment areas within the larger district and was amended in 2009 to include five redevelopment project areas. Areas 1, 3 and 4 remained as previously established, and within area 2, a separate redevelopment project area (2A), which included the Capitol Federal property, was created. In November 2019, the district was further divided into five redevelopment districts to provide for separate calculation of TIF increment in each redevelopment district. Mission Bowl Apartments, LLC (the "Developer"), seeks to subdivide Redevelopment District No. 3 into two redevelopment districts (3A and 3B) to provide for separate calculation of TIF increment at the Developer's project site.

Following the two public hearings, the Council will consider an Ordinance that will provide for the removal of two parcels from Redevelopment District No. 3, the division of the remaining area of Redevelopment District 3 into Redevelopment District Nos. 3A and 3B. It will also adopt a redevelopment project plan for Redevelopment District No. 3A and approve the execution of the Redevelopment Agreement between the City and the Developer. Passage will require a 2/3 vote of the Council. If the Ordinance is passed, the 20-year TIF clock for the single project site within Redevelopment District No. 3A would begin upon publication of the Ordinance.

In a separate action, the Council will also be considering a Resolution of Intent to Issue IRBs. The Developer made the request for IRBs for the sole purpose of a sales tax exemption on construction materials and the Resolution establishes the intent and authority of the City to proceed with the transaction. The IRBs and the associated interest shall be special, limited obligations of the City payable solely out of the amounts derived by the City under a Lease Agreement. The bonds are not a general obligation of the City, and are not backed by the full faith and credit of the City. The bonds are not payable in any manner by taxation, but shall be payable solely from the funds provided for in the Indenture. The Resolution anticipates the issuance of bonds in an amount not to exceed \$30,000,000. Ms. Smith explained that the issuance of the bonds does not directly, indirectly or contingently, obligate the City, the State or any other political subdivision to levy any form of taxation or to make any appropriation for their payment. The City is in no way responsible for the repayment of these bonds.

Finally, the Redevelopment Agreement is the document which captures all of the “deal points” of the project as negotiated and serves as the formal contract between the Developer and the City. It includes points of interests such as affordable housing requirements for twenty years after completion, funding with pay as you go reimbursement, and events and remedies if the Developer was to go into default and not able to complete the project or requirements.

Councilmember Flora wanted to confirm that since the Ordinance asks the Council to make “findings of fact,” that in Section Two of the Ordinance, specifically where it addresses the percentage of the land area as opposed to the whole district, had been properly evaluated. Mr. Wempe of Gilmore & Bell explained that the 15% threshold relates to the base value of the TIF district. So, if you remove an amount of land above that 15% then it resets the base or below and the base stays the same. For the two parcels being removed, the 15% threshold relates to what TIF district three is currently. Mr. Wempe indicated he could provide the spreadsheet calculations to Councilmember Flora.

Councilmember Boultinghouse asked about the affordable housing section and what happens if a tenant is coming into the building at the end of the twenty year life cycle, emphasizing the importance of having some protection for those tenants so rents could not be raised with little or no time to prepare. Mr. Heaven replied that can be addressed in the next draft of the redevelopment agreement.

Councilmember Flora also had concern about the one-sided termination where the Developer can terminate the agreement and specifically what would happen to the sustainability and fair housing commitments if it was terminated early. Mr. Heaven replied that the sustainability commitment will mostly be completed after they have finished building and the affordable housing requirements survive termination of the agreement.

Councilmember Flora also asked and Mr. Heaven verified that the City will have a one-year period, after a certificate of occupancy has been issued, to inspect and insure everything was completed properly. Councilmember Flora indicated she had several other questions that she would provide to staff and Mr. Heaven following tonight's Committee meeting.

Personnel Policies and Guidelines Update

Ms. Randal reported that each year staff conducts a review of the City's Personnel Policies and Guidelines. The review ensures that the City's personnel policies conform with the most current federal and state regulations and accurately reflect the organization's current policies and practices. Changes to the policies are approved by ordinance, which incorporates them into the City of Mission Municipal Code.

The recommended changes for 2021 include the addition of paid parental and caregiver leave at 100% of the employee's regular, straight-time pay. The leave is recommended for a maximum of six weeks, to be taken all at one time or intermittently, for those employees who are FMLA eligible, having worked for the City for at least 12 months and who have worked at least 1,250 hours during the preceding 12-month period. Other modifications include an update that requires a subpoena for non-police personnel information as well as clarification on occasions when work from home may be granted and the addition of books and technical supplies to be reimbursed in relation to educational advancement.

Councilmember Thomas noted that she was pleased to see the parental leave included in the recommended policies for 2021 as it has been an important issue for her for the last several years. She thanked staff for working to include it as a part of this year's policy updates.

Once finalized, the City Council will consider and adopt an ordinance which, following publication, will incorporate the Personnel Policy and Guidelines as a part of Mission's Municipal Code with an effective date of January 1, 2021.

Councilmember Flora recommended the ordinance adopting the changes proposed to the City of Mission's Personnel Policies and Guidelines effective January 1, 2021 be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the non-consent agenda.

KERIT Workers' Compensation Insurance Renewal

Mr. Scott reported that the City has been a member of the Kansas Eastern Regional Insurance Trust (KERIT), a workers' compensation pool, since 2009. The Trust comprises eighteen member cities and counties. The 2021 premium for workers' compensation coverage has been estimated at \$149,859, which is paid in two installments, the first in January and the second in July. Premiums are based on the City's annual payroll, the level of exposure to risk that certain jobs may entail, and an experience modifier that reflects past claims. The 2021 premium is 57% higher than the previous year.

Natural payroll growth and new positions will always influence workers' compensation premiums, but this year's increase is primarily due to a very high experience modifier of 1.38. The experience modifier is a reflection of the claims that the City has incurred. An experience modifier of one is considered standard. The experience modifier is a rolling three year average so that the City is not suddenly hit with a high premium in one year. The City has experienced some pretty significant claims over the past couple of years resulting in surgery and time off for injured employees. These claims are now showing up in our experience modifier.

The City will undergo a payroll audit after the first of the year to review current year actual payroll expenses. Mid-year premiums are adjusted to reflect the results of the audit. Given the salary savings that the city has experienced in 2020, it is expected that the premium will be adjusted downward, helping to bring the overall premiums in-line with budget. The balance will come from salary savings elsewhere in the budget.

The Trust continues to maintain a strong emphasis on loss control, and all member entities are actively engaged in proactive risk management activities. Because of this, members routinely receive a dividend from the trust when prior claim years are closed out. This year the City received a dividend distribution of \$6,547 from the trust. Funds in the amount of \$109,600 were included in the 2021 Adopted Budget for workers' compensation premiums.

Councilmember Kring asked if there had been a higher amount of claims this year. Mr. Scott replied that there had not been, however, over the past five years claims expenses totaled approximately \$300,000. Ms. Smith added that it's not necessarily the number of claims but the severity of claims that influence the increase in premium. Councilmember Kring asked and Mr. Scott confirmed that there are currently no liability issues with the City as it relates to workers' compensation.

Councilmember Davis recommended the City's 2021 workers' compensation coverage through the Kansas Eastern Regional Insurance Trust (KERIT) for an estimated annual premium of \$149,859 be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the non-consent agenda.

DTI Contract Renewal

Mr. Scott explained that since 2011, the City has maintained an agreement with Johnson County to provide information technology (IT) services and support for the various City departments. The partnership provides Mission with cost-competitive access to the County's specialized IT staff. IT services include application and data management support; network monitoring, security, and support; help desk; and general IT project support. The 2020 agreement was for \$56,026. The 2021 agreement is \$59,562, a 6% increase. The cost is broken out between the Police Department, which has specific technology needs and the rest of the City.

This year Johnson County Department of Technology and Innovation (DTI) assisted the police department with implementation of their new video system and deployment of laptop computers for the new patrol cars. They are currently assisting with deployment of the Microsoft Office upgrade and new computers purchases for city departments. The 2021 budget includes a total of \$100,000 for Computer Services. This budget typically covers both technical support and software/hardware upgrades that may be necessary, as well as other computer related services beyond what the County provides. The total estimated costs are within established budget parameters.

There are a number of smaller communities throughout the metropolitan area that struggle with maintaining IT support on a small budget. Following a regional interview and selection process conducted by the Mid American Regional Council (MARC), Civic ITC was selected as a vendor available to all local governments in the MARC region. Civic ITC offers a "turnkey" solution whereby they own all of the network infrastructure (servers, switches, etc.) and are responsible for licensing, warranties, and on-going maintenance. All equipment is housed at their network facility in downtown Kansas City and cities would have access to their network through an internet service provider. Their service would include a help desk to assist employees with minor computer issues that can be handled over the phone or through remote access.

As a comparison, staff sought pricing from Mission from Civic ITC, and they submitted a proposal for \$112,000 annually and did not include any actual time at the City assisting with on-site IT issues or projects. An additional quote of approximately \$8,000 for on-site IT support was provided as well.

Currently, the City owns all of its own IT network equipment. In addition, the City pays for software licenses and maintenance agreements on this equipment. If the City were to pursue an agreement with Civic ITC, it could sell the existing network equipment which could eliminate some of the ongoing licensing and operational expenses, but then the City would have to pay for an internet service provider (currently included with the County's agreement) and support for specific IT projects. Based on the quote provided by Civic IT and a comparison of value for services provided, Staff recommended renewal of the agreement with Johnson County for IT Services through December 31, 2021 in an amount of \$59,562.

Councilmember Flora asked if the County gave an explanation for the six percent increase. Mr. Scott replied it's usually five percent each year, so this is a typical increase.

Councilmember Davis asked if DTI assisted with cyber security as an aspect of their contract. Mr. Scott confirmed that they run a program called SharePoint which scans for security issues and they also provide daily data backup.

Councilmember Davis recommended the Interlocal Agreement for IT Services with Johnson County through December 31, 2021 in an amount not to exceed \$59,562 be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the consent agenda.

2021 Special Alcohol Tax Fund Allocations

Mr. Scott reported that by statute, the State of Kansas imposes a 10 percent Liquor Drink Tax (aka Alcohol Tax) on the sale of any drink containing alcoholic liquor sold by clubs, caterers, or drinking establishments. Revenue derived from this tax is allocated 30 percent to the State and 70 percent to the city or county where the tax is collected. The statute further stipulates that for cities of Mission's size, the portion allocated to the local jurisdiction be proportioned in thirds, with one third to the General Fund, one third to a Special Parks and Recreation Fund, and one third to a Special Alcohol Tax Fund.

The Special Alcohol Tax Fund is to support programs "whose principal purpose is alcoholism and drug abuse prevention or treatment of persons who are alcoholics or drug abusers, or are in danger of becoming alcoholics or drug abusers" (KSA 79-41a04 1997). Alcohol Tax funds allocated to the City of Mission are estimated to be \$210,000 for 2021. A third of these funds - \$70,000 - will be proportioned to the City's Special Alcohol Tax Fund. Of this amount, \$15,000 will support Mission's DARE activities, \$30,000 will support the mental health co-responder program, and \$50,000 will be provided to agencies designated by the Drug & Alcoholism Council.

The anticipated revenue for 2021 is less than prior years due to reduced sales because of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Another third will be proportioned to the Special Parks and Recreation Fund and the remaining third is proportioned to the City's General Fund. The Drug and Alcoholism Council (DAC), a program supported by the United Community Services of Johnson County, offers grants each year to various organizations within the county that provide alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment programs. The grants are structured in such a manner that the awarded organizations have access to funds from multiple participating jurisdictions. The total amount available to the DAC for allocation in 2021 is \$2,024,200, a 6% reduction from the previous year due to reduced revenues. Approval of this recommendation is approval of the DAC's recommended allocations.

Councilmember Flora inquired whether organizations receiving funds were required to comply with each individual city's non-discrimination policies. Ms. Guidry replied that compliance was required.

Councilmember Boultinghouse thanked Interim Police Chief Madden and Captain Lane for a productive meeting and asked to discuss the allocation of funds for the mental health responder program and the future plans for the program. Interim Police Chief Madden replied that there is a need for this program, explaining that whenever a report is taken then it needs to be documented if mental health was a component. Ms. Smith added that a report of those statistics could be incorporated in future discussions to assess needs for next years' budget.

Councilmember Kring commented that the City is so fortunate to have great community policing which is hopefully futuristically preventing victimization in crime.

Councilmember Davis pointed out that the nominee that represents the City of Mission at the Drug and Alcohol Council of Johnson County is actually the vice chair for the Grant Review Committee membership.

Councilmember Davis recommended the City of Mission's 2021 Special Alcohol Tax Fund allocations as recommended by the Drug and Alcoholism Council be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the consent agenda.

2021 Budget Ordinance

Ms. Smith explained that as part of the annual budget process, the City takes formal action to adopt the 2021 Budget by ordinance. This ordinance represents one of two ordinances that are considered each December to finalize the City's annual budget and to provide expenditure authority. There are no changes to the budget that was approved by the City Council in August 2020.

Councilmember Thomas asked if the City still has employee freezes in effect for the remainder of the year and how that can affect the 2021 budget. Ms. Smith answered that the City is moving forward with positions on a case by case basis. Some of the positions that are critical to operations and services have been filled, however, there are some positions that are still being evaluated.

Councilmember Kring recommended the ordinance adopting the 2021 Budget of the City of Mission, Kansas be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the non-consent agenda.

Ordinance Directing City Administrator to Spend According to Budget

Ms. Smith reported that as part of the annual budget process, the City Council takes formal action in December to authorize and direct the City Administrator to spend according to the adopted budget and in compliance with City Council Policy 102. The ordinance will authorize the City Administrator to spend in accordance with the approved annual budget. Ms. Smith added that it still contains the same guidelines for spending limits and items that would need to be brought forward for Council approval.

Councilmember Kring recommended the ordinance authorizing the City Administrator to make expenditures in accordance with the adopted 2021 Annual Budget be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the non-consent agenda.

2021 Cereal Malt Beverage (CMB) License Renewals

Ms. McClanahan reported that according to City ordinance and Kansas statutes there is a requirement that any person wishing to sell any cereal malt beverage/enhanced cereal malt beverage (CMB) at retail must obtain an annual license for each place of business. Renewal applications for 2020 include the following Mission businesses: CVS, 6300 Johnson Drive; Hy-Vee Grocery, 6655 Martway; Hy-Vee Convenience Store, 6645 Martway; Ni Hao Fresh, 6029 Metcalf; QuikTrip, 4700 Lamar; Target, 6100 Broadmoor; and Pauli D's Pizza.

Each applicant will be required to submit their application and fee before issuance of license. Licenses will be issued pending satisfactory background checks for each applicant/store manager and approval by Interim Police Chief Madden.

Councilmember Davis recommended the 2021 Cereal Malt Beverage (CMB) License Renewals be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the consent agenda.

Discussion Items

Discussion of Recent County Public Health Order

Ms. Smith explained that on November 19, the Johnson County Board of Commissioners issued Public Health Order No. 002-20 which went into effect at 12:01 a.m. on Monday, November 16 in an effort to slow the spread of COVID-19 in the County. The order provided social distancing and public gathering provisions and outlined exemptions to the same. Additionally, it affirmed Governor Laura Kelly's Executive Order 20-52 related to face masks.

Staff have been involved in on-going conversations over the past two weeks regarding responsibility and expectations for enforcement of the order and coordination with the County. An agreement between the County and the City would allow violations to be enforceable by

County Code Officers under public health orders. The County would only be enforcing the physical distancing and the gathering limit sizes and not anything specifically regarding mask enforcement. Violations of the mask ordinance would still be the responsibility of the District Attorney's Office to investigate and/or charge.

The City's reopening matrix has continued to provide a conservative approach to responding to COVID and related issues. The City's internal Incident command team continues to meet twice a week to review and assess issues. The City's biggest area of traffic is the Community Center which has had revisions in operations including the closing of the locker rooms. The Center is also still under the County gathering size limits for rentals. Mr. Almoney added that the use of rooms are limited based on a six by six square foot parameter, equating to how many people can fit in a room versus a total occupancy which are the two basic measurements for defining meeting criteria for the health order. In both cases, the Community Center is below the County standards. The Community Center attendance continues to increase which enforces the effectiveness of the protocols and the hard work of staff.

Councilmember Flora commented that she feels very strongly that in order to continue supporting the Community Center operations that masks need to be required at all times. Mr. Almoney replied that they are hoping to get feedback from all the Councilmembers regarding the masks and that while they are not at fifty percent attendance yet, they still have protocols in place that help minimize the risk of infection. Councilmember Flora stressed that staff has done a great job of taking appropriate measures to keep areas protected but it would also be beneficial to take continued precautions to keep the Community Center open. Councilmember Thomas agreed with Councilmember Flora and would like to see the requirement of masks at the Community Center.

Councilmember Schlossmacher disagreed with requiring masks, adding that while he is not in favor of shutting down the Community Center, if they are at the point of requiring masks while patrons are exercising on machines then it should be closed. Councilmember Rothrock agreed and commented that asking patrons to wear masks on the machines could inhibit their breathing.

Councilmember Boultinghouse commented that the CDC announced that this is the worst public health crisis ever in the Country's history. Now through this winter, with the possibility of 300 people entering the building every day, at least some are going to be COVID positive, based on County statistics. By requiring masks it helps maintain the physiological and emotional benefits of working out while protecting patrons.

Councilmember Davis commented that there's a consistency with the policy of the City, with regards to other facilities that are operated and in this situation, it is a preventative measure. We certainly don't want to see loss of activity in terms of the Community Center but there may be individuals that are not participating because there is no mask policy.

A strawpoll was taken regarding if the current practices should remain in effect. Voting Yes: Schlossmacher, Rothrock, Inman and Kring. Voting No: Boultinghouse, Thomas, Davis and Flora. The vote was a tie.

The Committee agreed to continue the discussion at the December 9, 2020 Finance and Administration Committee meeting.

Discussion of SMSD Bond Issue - Rushton Rebuild

Mayor Appletoft explained that the Shawnee Mission School District had started conversations around a bond issue with a goal to rebuild some of the elementary schools. There are five elementary schools that are being considered including Rushton Elementary, making it one of the last to be updated.

Rushton would be set for a rebuild in June of 2023 with confirmation from Dr. Fulton, Superintendent of the Shawnee Mission School District, that the schedule was accurate. Mayor Appletoft indicated that in his conversation with Dr. Fulton, part of the rationale for moving Rushton further down this list allowed the District to use Westwood View as a transition school during the rebuild for Rushton students. The alternative would be to bus them to the Indian Creek Technology Center.

Mayor Appletoft has invited district representatives, including Dr. Fulton, to attend the December 9, 2020 meeting to provide more information. While the school districts cannot advocate for the bond issue, they can educate around the issues. The District's Committee for Excellence has explained there have been delays due to COVID-19 which has inhibited their advocacy prospects but they have started to make fundraising calls in an effort to raise money for awareness campaigns.

Councilmember Kring asked what five schools are scheduled for reconstruction. Mayor Appletoft replied they will be Diemer, Westwood View, Pawnee, Tomahawk and Rushton.

OTHER

Department Updates

There were no Department Updates.

Meeting Close

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Audrey M. McClanahan
City Clerk

MINUTES OF THE MISSION FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

December 9, 2020

The Mission Finance & Administration Committee met virtually via ZOOM on Wednesday, December 9, 2020. The following committee members were present: Hillary Thomas, Trent Boultinghouse, Arcie Rothrock, Nick Schlossmacher, Kristin Inman, Sollie Flora, Debbie Kring and Ken Davis. Mayor Appletoft was also in attendance. Councilmember Kring called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

The following staff were present: City Administrator Laura Smith, Assistant City Administrator Brian Scott, City Clerk Audrey McClanahan, Assistant to the City Administrator Emily Randel, Public Works Director Celia Duran, Public Works Superintendent Brent Morton, Parks & Recreation Director Penn Almoney and Interim Police Chief Dan Madden.

Public Comments

Councilmember Kring explained that this meeting is being held virtually via Zoom and participants can make a comment through the chat feature.

There were no public comments.

Public Presentations

Discussion of SMSD Bond Issue

Dr. Fulton, Superintendent with the Shawnee Mission School District, reported that the District has been working toward a bond issue for about five years, starting with identifying future facility needs. The work continued during the 2018 - 2019 school year when, as a school community, they identified and put together a strategic plan with feedback from parents. The developed mission statement guided the process and emphasized the importance of learning, putting a priority on the educators. He said the District is committed to developing a learning system where every student has the opportunity for a personalized learning plan so they can master important central understandings that lead to college and career readiness with essential interpersonal skills.

The District worked to make sure that this plan also ensured they were keeping the mill levy rate the lowest at Johnson County, to be considerate of taxpayers and allow for a moderate tax increase. The bond issue projects are divided to include the reconstruction of five elementary buildings: Diemer, Pawnee, Ruston, Westwood View and Tomahawk. There will also be renovations at the high-school level and the Broadmoor Early Childhood Center. Another aspect that will be addressed is technology as well as updates to security and replacements for HVAC,

roofs, asphalt and other repairs. There is the possibility of two bond issues which in conjunction with the current plan will cover \$750 million of identified costs.

Dr. Fulton explained that since bonds cannot cover salaries, it's main focus will deal with school facilities. In the past, Shawnee Mission has utilized capital funds for their facility upgrades including construction, maintenance and repair. This will shift and allow the bond to address facilities, they will then add to the capital fund expenditures for maintenance and custodial salaries. Custodial salaries are currently being paid for out of operations. By moving their salaries to the capital fund, it will make 4.5 million available to address the need of additional secondary teachers. The other allocations for the capital fund include technology, equipment, furniture and bond payments. The District will continue to strive to ensure there are policies in place that account for their payroll and operating expenses.

Dr. Fulton's recommendation is to place a bond referendum on the ballot for January 26, 2021 with considerations for community support, creating a fiscally sustainable pathway to reduce secondary teacher workload, maintaining and improving existing facilities, rebuilding schools and managing scope of work. Finally, by committing to the moderate tax increase it will allow the District to increase the number of rebuilds to include all five schools and would give more support to faculty, staff and students.

Councilmember Thomas thanked Dr. Fulton for his presentation and asked why Ruston's timeline was changed from 2021 to 2023. Dr. Fulton answered when considering the Rushton rebuild the issue was where to send the students during construction, they determined that after Westwood View was constructed then Ruston students could then utilize that facility until the building is completed. Also, this will allow the District to do a complete tear down of Ruston without having to accommodate two buildings on one site.

Councilmember Thomas asked if there was a conceptual design for the Rushton rebuild. Dr. Fulton explained that stage of the process is progressing with Diemer and Westwood View which will work with community feedback to finalize design and considerations.

Councilmember Flora thanked Dr. Fulton and asked about the sustainability elements for the designs and rebuilds as well as the opportunities for public input on those options. Dr. Fulton commented that their design teams are looking into incorporating sustainability elements into the plan, also taking into consideration lessons learned from the pandemic such as filtering capacities.

Mayor Appletoft thanked the team for presenting, adding that the City is excited for this project and it will be beneficial for the community.

Ordinance Establishing TIF District 3A, Approving a Project Plan for the Same and Approving a Redevelopment Agreement with Mission Bowl Apartments, LLC.

Resolution of Intent to Issue IRBs - Mission Bowl Redevelopment Project

Mission Bowl Apartments, LLC. is the Developer for a multi-family housing unit project at the former Mission Bowl site. The Developer seeks to subdivide Redevelopment District No. 3 into two redevelopment districts (3A and 3B) to provide for separate calculation of TIF increment at the Developer's project site. The Developer submitted their TIF application in October. The final step in authorizing the TIF is consideration of an ordinance which will approve removal of certain real property from Redevelopment District No. 3 as well as divide Redevelopment District No. 3 into two, adopt a Redevelopment Project Plan and approve execution of a Redevelopment Agreement.

The Redevelopment Agreement captures and controls the terms of the "deal" as agreed to by the City and the Developer. It addresses, among other things, the project budget, the project schedule, the obligations of the developer and the City, the process for certifying and reimbursing TIF eligible expenses, requirements for transfer or sale of the property, and events of default and remedies. Bruce Kimmel, the City's Financial Advisor, presented on the significant deal points for the agreements. Mr. Kimmel explained they began their analysis of the Developer by assessing their financials including project budget, financing assumptions and operating revenues and expenses. They determined they had a valid financing claim with no major gaps or inconsistencies.

The analysis also showed a need for assistance from the City which will include the issuing of Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs) and will need to be finalized by a resolution. The purpose of the IRBs is for a sales tax exemption on construction materials. The IRBs and the associated interest shall be special, limited obligations of the City payable solely out of the amounts derived by the City under a Lease Agreement. The bonds are not a general obligation of the City, and are not backed by the full faith and credit of the City. The bonds are not payable in any manner by taxation, but shall be payable solely from the funds provided for in the Indenture. The Resolution anticipates the issuance of bonds in an amount not to exceed \$30,000,000. The issuance of the bonds shall not directly, indirectly or contingently, obligate the City, the State or any other political subdivision thereof to levy any form of taxation or to make any appropriation for their payment. The City is in no way responsible for the repayment of these bonds.

Mr. Kimmel also discussed with the developer possible incentives with the integration of affordable housing and sustainability aspects. The Developer explained they will need to be at a base rate of return of 6% which is measured at year 15 of operations. This 6% is within the range of target IRR which is typical for multi-family housing projects.

The Developer has committed to reserving units for affordable housing for a term of twenty years. They will share the TIF with the City over that period of time with the Developer initially

receiving 90% for the first five years. That will then decrease to 75% with the City at 25%. Along with the affordable housing, the Developer has committed to design, construct and operate to very specific LEED standards. They will incorporate solar ready roof design and radon protection. As of now, the assessed valuation of the project is less than the base value with about 50% of its final value after construction. They anticipate being finished building in fall of 2022, Johnson County will assess the value in January of 2023, with the Developer estimating the value around \$3.3 million. The City's share will average to about 20% of the total TIF over the 20 year period.

The City will only be pledging the TIF revenues as they become available, if at the end of 20 years, even if there is a significant balance on the plan, it will still expire. There is no obligation to the City to make the plan complete or to pay any amount of the remaining balance on that agreement.

Pete Heaven, attorney for the City, next explained the modifications to the Development Agreement. The first change has come with the competitive bidding process which the Developer has agreed to bid for all subcontractors for the project. Mr. Heaven also clarified that the agreement will have an attached budget which will detail TIF eligible expenses. The affordable housing section was updated, with comments from the Council, to include the stipulation that a tenant's lease will expire at the end of their term and not be cut short by the 20 year period agreement. The Council also wanted to include sustainability, the Developer has agreed to obtaining silver certification under LEED. The final change deals with default and has a built in period of thirty days which will allow the Developer time to cure the issue or provide adequate information on when it will be remedied.

Councilmember Schlossmacher thanked Mr. Kimmel, Mr. Heaven and everyone who worked on the agreement, adding that this seems to be a good plan to build back the Mission Bowl site.

Agreement for Enforcement of Johnson County Public Health Order

Ms. Smith reported that on November 13, 2020, the Johnson County Board of County Commissioners, sitting as the Johnson County Board of Public Health, adopted Johnson County Board of Public Health Order No. 002-20 in an effort to slow the spread of COVID-19 in the County. Among other things, the Order established certain social distancing requirements and limitations on gatherings for individuals, businesses, and activities. The Order became effective at 12:01 A.M. on Monday, November 16, 2020, and remains in effect through 11:59 P.M. on January 31, 2020, unless otherwise amended, revoked, or replaced.

The Board of County Commissioners has the power to enforce certain of its "resolutions" by prosecution in the Johnson County Codes Court. Therefore, in an effort to better allow enforcement of its own Health Order, the County adopted Resolution No. 108-20 on November 19, 2020 making noncompliance with the Order a violation of the Johnson County Code. The County has requested that each individual city consider and approve an agreement that would specifically allow for County enforcement of the Health Order. The Agreement has been

developed collaboratively by several City Attorneys and the County Attorney to address the following:

- The County, and not the City, will be responsible for enforcement of the Health Order within the City limits. The City agrees to reasonably cooperate with the County in the sharing of information related to enforcement, and to also assist in educating its citizens as to the requirements of the Health Order.
- The Agreement is limited only to Johnson County Board of Public Health Order No. 002-20. No other orders would be covered by this Agreement. Should the Board adopt an additional order, the City can amend the Agreement if necessary or desirable.
- Either party can terminate the Agreement at any time, if deemed in the best interests of the City or County.

Councilmember Boultinghouse expressed his support for the recommendation and Councilmember Flora agreed, thanking staff for their continued work with the County.

Councilmember Davis asked how complaints are currently handled that come to the City. Ms. Smith replied that initially the complaints were centered around what was an essential business or service. After the reopening, there were limited questions, with occasional reports of non-compliance of social-distancing or mask wearing. They were referred to the consumer hotline that was established by the County. Interim Chief Madden also explained that they have utilized the District Attorney's Office since they are responsible for executing the executive order. They have also assisted in educating business owners to ensure compliance.

Councilmember Davis recommended the authorization for the Mayor to execute the Government Enforcement Services Agreement for Johnson County Local Health Officer Orders and County Board of Health Orders between Johnson County and the City of Mission be forward to Council for approval. All on the Committee agreed, this will be on the non-consent agenda.

Mask Protocols at Powell Community Center

Ms. Smith explained that in alignment with the Johnson County Public Health, there has been discussions about COVID-19 protocols and safety practices at the Powell Community Center. A request was made to consider modifying the current mask protocols at the Center which have included a requirement that patrons must be masked at all times throughout the facility unless they are engaged in vigorous activity. The guidance offered by the Johnson County Health Department was that masks were not required while engaging in vigorous exercise as long as appropriate physical distancing could be maintained between patrons or participants. They also advised that masks should not be worn while swimming.

During the December 2 Committee meeting, there was also discussion surrounding the ability for rental patrons to remove masks while eating and drinking during their scheduled event. Both

issues were reviewed by the City attorney, Dave Martin. Based on legal opinion and interpretation of the Executive Order regarding masks, staff is proposing to follow Mr. Martin's guidance with respect to a requirement for patrons to wear masks at all times while using the Powell Community Center (except while swimming).

Even though Mr. Martin has suggested that masks could be removed - while seated and physically distanced - to consume food or drink, staff recommended eliminating food from all rentals at this time. This recommendation is based on the number of rentals currently where food is being served, and a desire to minimize the need for staff to monitor, educate and potentially enforce compliance with this standard. With the recommendation as presented, staff would not plan to move forward with implementing temperature checks upon entry as discussed at the December 2 Committee meeting.

Councilmember Davis supported the mask requirement, stating that with the increase in cases and upcoming holiday season that it would be a beneficial decision. Councilmember Kring asked how many cases of COVID-19 had originated at the Community Center. Mr. Almoney replied that to their knowledge, there have been no originating cases.

Councilmember Schlossmacher asked if workout machines are spaced appropriately apart, why patrons would still be required to wear masks since those participating in organized sports are exempt if they maintain social-distancing. Mr. Martin replied that exercise equipment is not included in organized sports and according to the order all indoor activities shall require masks unless exempt. Councilmember Schlossmacher expressed that he is opposed to mandating masks at the Community Center and if there is high enough concern then he believes the entire facility should be closed.

Councilmember Boultinghouse commented that Planet Fitness has already implemented masks on their machines, a for-profit entity that determined this to be a correct business decision. He added that he is in favor of the masks and agrees with the legal opinion since this is a risk mitigation issue and the responsible approach to patron safety. This will also allow patrons to continue working out for emotional and physical well-being while knowing the City has addressed as many precautions as possible.

Councilmember Thomas asked what would happen out of default if the Council did not vote on this issue. Ms. Smith replied that if there is consensus around and support for the provided legal opinion from the City's Attorney then there is not a reason to vote. Councilmember Davis commented that by adopting these guidelines that it would prevent debate or discussion within the facility and putting staff in a position where they have to arbitrate disputes. He added that this is not different than requiring masks in grocery stores. Councilmember Kring disagreed, explaining that at an exercise facility, members would be working out heavily and masks can inhibit breathing. Ms. Smith shared that the American Council on Exercise has suggested that wearing a mask while exercising may not be detrimental to safety, and each individual must be diligent in monitoring the intensity of their exercise. By having these requirements in place, it is

an additional protection within our facility. Some patrons that have been surveyed have even indicated they would not return if masks were not required at all times.

Councilmember Flora emphasised that they need to consider the staff recommendation which says the changes should be made by default based on the legal opinion of our City Attorney that this is required under the health order.

Councilmember Kring commented that she consistently wears her mask but believes the exemption should be for exercising as long as they are appropriately social distancing. Mr. Almoney said that with the cases increasing the potential for risk is greater and by agreeing to the order, it allows for more consistency among the patrons and eliminates protocol questioning.

Mayor Appetoft agreed with the staff's recommendation and said the Community Center staff have done a tremendous job at safeguarding the facility.

Councilmember Rothrock commented that she doesn't favor implementing mask wearing while working out but doesn't think they should go against legal advice. She commented that they should go with no action and let the legal expertise and the staff recommendation take place. Councilmember Inman also indicated she did not not necessarily support the need to wear masks at all times, but was not willing to go against the advice of the City Attorney.

The Council did not take action which allowed for the staff recommendation to be accepted and require masks to be worn at all times while in the Powell Community Center, except while swimming, and would not allow food to be provided in association with rentals to minimize the need for staff intervention.

Discussion Items

There were no Discussion Items.

OTHER

Department Updates

There were no Departmental Updates.

Meeting Close

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Audrey M. McClanahan
City Clerk

City of Mission	Item Number:	2.
ACTION ITEM SUMMARY	Date:	January 6, 2021
Administration	From:	Audrey McClanahan

Action items require a vote to recommend the item to full City Council for further action.

RE: Resolution for the Destruction of Certain Records

RECOMMENDATION: Approve a resolution authorizing the destruction of certain records of the City of Mission, Kansas as authorized by Ordinance No. 1143.

DETAILS: Ordinance No. 1143, which was approved on December 8, 2004, outlines the schedule for the destruction of certain City records as provided in K.S.A.12-120. This ordinance also indicates that a yearly resolution should be passed specifying exactly which records are to be destroyed during the upcoming year. The attached resolution specifies the records that may be destroyed during 2021.

Ordinance 1143 also states that it does not authorize the destruction of any records, documents or papers which in their nature should be preserved permanently, and does not prohibit the destruction of records that are obviously temporary. The records outlined in this resolution are only those identified in K.S.A. 12-120. Ordinances, resolutions, minutes, meeting packets from Council, Planning Commission/BZA, and other commissions, and records of historical value are kept permanently. When considering the destruction of other records not specifically listed in State statutes, staff often looks to best practices in other cities.

CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS: N/A

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	Ord. No. 1143
Line Item Code/Description:	N/A
Available Budget:	N/A

City of Mission
Resolution No. _____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN RECORDS OF THE CITY OF MISSION, KANSAS AS AUTHORIZED BY ORDINANCE NO. 1143.

WHEREAS, the City of Mission, Kansas approved Ordinance No. 1143 amending the records destruction schedule provided for in Title I, Chapter 120, Section 120.050 of the Municipal Code of the City of Mission on December 8, 2004, and

WHEREAS, a yearly resolution shall be passed specifically outlining the records to be disposed of in accordance with Ordinance No. 1143,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF MISSION, KANSAS:

Section 1. Destruction Schedule. The City Clerk or other officers or employees of the City, as provided by K.S.A. 12-120, may destroy the following records, documents, or other papers hereafter stated during calendar year 2021:

1. Claims (and any purchase orders thereto attached) presented and allowed by the Governing Body of the City dated prior to January 1, 2016;
2. Warrants or warrant check, whether original or duplicates, that have been paid dated prior to January 1, 2016;
3. Duplicates of receipts or stubs of receipts dated prior to January 1, 2018;
4. Duplicates or stubs of licenses issued for license fees or taxes dated prior to January 1, 2018;
5. Bonds of officers or employees dated prior to January 1, 2010, if the period to begin at the termination of the term of the bond is greater than 10 years;
6. Insurance policies dated prior to January 1, 2016, if the period beginning at the expiration of the policy is five years or greater, unless a claim is pending;
7. Cancelled checks dated prior to January 1, 2016;
8. Requisition and duplicate purchase orders dated prior to January 1, 2018;
9. Bonds and coupons, if any, stamped paid or cancelled and returned by the fiscal agent, five years, the period beginning at the date of maturity of the bond or coupon.

Section 2. Effective Date. This resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after its adoption by the Governing Body of the City.

PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL this 20th day of January 2021.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR this 20th day of January 2021.

Ronald E. Appletoft, Mayor

ATTEST:

Audrey M. McClanahan, City Clerk

City of Mission	Item Number:	3.
ACTION ITEM SUMMARY	Date:	January 6, 2021
Administration	From:	Brian Scott

Action items require a vote to recommend the item to full City Council for further action.

RE: Declaration of Surplus Equipment

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the resolution providing for the sale/disposal of surplus equipment from various Departments.

DETAILS: City Council Policy No. 111 defines the process and procedure for the sale and disposal of real and personal property by the City of Mission, which is also outlined in K.S.A. 12-101. Property and equipment identified for surplus has been included as Attachment A to the Resolution.

Each Department, in consultation with the Finance Director, will be responsible for determining the best method for disposal in accordance with Council Policy and State law.

Items to be declared as surplus include police patrol cars being rotated out of service, police patrol mobile data terminals, various desktop computers, and office furniture.

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	K.S.A. 12-101, City Council Policy 111
Line Item Code/Description:	NA
Available Budget:	NA

Attachment A

January 2021

Item	Description	Serial Number/Asset Tag	Department	Quantity	Potential Re-Sale Value
<u>Vehicles / Equipment</u>					
Ford	2017 Ford Explorer	1FM5K8AT4HGA89089	Police	1	\$ 5,000.00
Ford	2017 Ford Explorer	1FM5K8AT2HGA89088	Police	1	\$ 5,000.00
Ford	2017 Ford Explorer	1FM5K8AT0HGA89090	Police	1	\$ 5,000.00
Chevrolet	2012 Chevrolet Tahoe	1GNLC2E05CR175313	Police	1	\$ 5,000.00
Chevrolet	2012 Chevrolet Tahoe	1GNLC2E09CR174181	Police	1	\$ 5,000.00
Chevrolet	2015 Chevrolet Tahoe	1GNSK2EC2FR576363	Police	1	\$ 7,000.00
<u>Other Equipment</u>					
Fujifilm	digital camera	1RB00553	Police	1	\$ -
Fujifilm	digital camera	1CB1487	Police	1	\$ -
Pro Laser III	hand held laser	PL30987	Police	1	\$ -
<u>Pro laser III</u>	hand held laser	PL40368	Police	1	\$ -
Xplore	battery		Police	1	\$ -
Desk	wooden desk with top hutch	N/A	Police	6	donated
desk	wooden	NA	Police	1	donated
chairs	rolling cloth desk chairs	NA	Police		
Misc equipment	patrol vehicle lights, mounts, misc equipment	NA	Police	6	donated
Storage	four shelf metal storage cabinet	NA	Comm Center	1	\$ 50.00
Storage	four shelf white wood particle board cabinet	NA	Comm Center	2	\$ 20.00
Storage	four drawer metal storage organizer	NA	Comm Center	2	\$ 50.00
desk	small desk powered	NA	Police	1	donated
Wood Desk	wood desk with drawers	NA	Comm Center	1	\$ 75.00
Pro Laser III	handheld laser	PL19658	Police	1	\$ -
<u>Computer Equipment</u>					
Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	G9JHAG000220	Police	1	\$100.00

Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	G9JHAG000217	Police	1	\$100.00
Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	G9JHAG000216	Police	1	\$100.00
Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	G9JHAG000219	Police	1	\$100.00
Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	G9JHAG000215	Police	1	\$100.00
Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	GAJHAG000337	Police	1	\$100.00
Xplore tablet	R-12 mobile data terminal	G9JHAG000219	Police	1	\$100.00
Apple Ipad	Apple Ipad w/ case	DMRJG6LDFHW	Police	1	0
Panasonic	toughbook laptop	DFQX3A14XB	POLICE	1	0
Vostro	laptop	31TXX1	City Hall	1	0
Scanner	Canon DR-5010C	not readable	Police	1	0
printer	HP ink printer	no tag	Police	1	0
printer	HP deskjet D1660	unknown	Police	1	0
scanner	Brother FAX-2840	U63274L7J510889	Police	1	0
monitor	ASUS	unreadable	Police	1	0
monitor	DELL	unreadable	Police	1	0
monitor	PLANAR	unreadable	Police	1	0
tower	DELL desktop tower	MSNWCOM006	Police	1	0
monitor	Dell monitors	NA	City Hall	3	0
monitor	AOC	NA	City Hall	1	0
monitor	ASUS	NA	City Hall	1	0
Desktop computer	dell	MSNWCTH013	City Hall	1	0
Desktop computer	OTI PLEX 780	MSNWCTH005	City Hall	1	0
Desktop computer	Dell	MSNWCTH009	City Hall	1	0

CITY OF MISSION, KANSAS
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION DECLARING SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR SALE OR DISPOSAL

WHEREAS, City Council Policy No. 111 defines the process and procedure for the sale and disposal of real and personal property by the City of Mission, which is also outlined in K.S.A. 12-101; and

WHEREAS, the City, has identified those items listed on Attachment A as “Surplus Property;”

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Governing Body of the City of Mission:

Section 1. The items included on Attachment A are hereby declared as surplus.

Section 2. The Finance Director, in consultation with each Department, will be responsible for determining the best method for disposal or sale of the items declared as surplus.

Section 3. In accordance with Council Policy 111, all City Officials and employees, both elected and appointed, are prohibited from participating in the purchase of real and personal property from the City.

PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MISSION on this 20th day of January 2021.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR on this 20th day of January 2021

Ronald E. Appletoft, Mayor

ATTEST:

Audrey M. McClanahan, City Clerk

CITY OF MISSION
CITY COUNCIL POLICY MANUAL

POLICY NO. 111

SALE OF REAL PROPERTY & EQUIPMENT

- 1.01 This policy describes the process and procedure for the sale of real and personal property by the City which is also outlined in KSA 12-101.
- 1.02 All City Officials and employees both elected and appointed are prohibited from participating in the purchase of real and personal property from the City.
- 1.03 All real property of the City of Mission will be sold in accordance with applicable state law and requires the approval of the City Council.
- 1.04 The City will, on an as needed basis, establish a listing of unclaimed or obsolete personal property to be declared surplus. It will be the responsibility of the Department Head and Finance Director to determine the best means for disposing of or selling obsolete personal property, including the method of advertising.
- 1.05 The sale or disposal of real property will be determined on a case by case basis by the City Council.

APPROVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY ON DECEMBER 8, 2004

**REVISED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON APRIL 17,
2019**