



**CITY OF MISSION, KANSAS**  
**FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2023 at 7:30 p.m.**  
**(or immediately following 6:30 p.m. Community Development Committee)**

**MISSION CITY HALL**  
**6090 Woodson Street**

**Meeting In Person and Virtually via Zoom**

*This meeting will be held in person at the time and date shown above. This meeting will also be available virtually via Zoom (<https://zoom.us/join>). 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 COMMENTS**

**PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS / INFORMATIONAL ONLY**

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS**

**ACTION ITEMS**

1. Acceptance of the October 4, 2023 Finance & Administration Committee Minutes - Robyn Fulks ([page 4](#))

Draft minutes of the October 4, 2023 Finance and Administration Committee meeting are included for review and acceptance.

2. Contract for 2024 Legislative Advocacy Services – Laura Smith ([page 17](#))

Since 2020, Mission has contracted with Little Government Relations (LGR), LLC for government affairs and advocacy services. The weekly updates, assistance with crafting testimony and the overall education and information provided about relevant legislative issues and the legislative climate have added value, helping to support and inform staff and Council on a timely basis, particularly during the legislative session. Staff recommends renewal of an agreement with LGR in an annual amount not to exceed \$12,500 for government affairs and advocacy services for 2024.

3. 2024 Employee Benefit Renewals – Emily Randel/Kathy Stratman ([page 22](#))

Staff has worked with Lockton, the City’s benefits broker, to present a benefits package for 2024. Each year, as part of recruiting and retaining good employees, staff seeks the most effective balance of robust benefits that still allows for a strong fiscal position. The recommendations for fiscal year 2024 are summarized in the attachments.

4. CMB Application Prairie Sailor, LLC – Robyn Fulks ([page 29](#))

State statutes and Mission’s Code require all businesses wanting to sell Cereal Malt Beverages or Enhanced Cereal Malt Beverages (CMB) to complete an application that includes information on the business and the business owner and/or manager. Additionally, a criminal history background check is completed on the business owner/manager by our Police Department. All original applications and renewals for the sale of CMB must be approved by the City Council. Prairie Sailor, LLC has submitted their application to sell CMB on premises, along with the required license fee. The required background check has been completed without issue and is now ready for City Council consideration.

5. Revisions to Council Policy 130 (Council Liaisons to Boards and Commissions) - Laura Smith ([page 30](#))

In April 2019, City Council Policy 130 was approved, creating Council liaison positions to the City’s various board and commissions and outlining roles and responsibilities. The liaison positions were to be updated in December of odd-numbered years. However, in order to align the policy more closely with elections and Council swearing ins, a few minor revisions to the policy are required.

6. Resolution Ratifying the Emergency Expenditure for a Police Vehicle – Dan Madden ([page 36](#))

A Mission Police Department patrol vehicle was struck by another vehicle causing damages which resulted in the vehicle being declared a total loss. A nationwide search for a replacement vehicle yielded just one available vehicle that matched the specifications for a Mission front-line patrol vehicle. That vehicle was set to be auctioned on October 26, 2023 which necessitated the emergency expenditure of funds. Staff is requesting the Council approve a Resolution which ratifies the emergency expenditure of funds in an amount not to exceed \$38,702.30.

7. Resolution Declaring Surplus Property – Emily Randel ([page 50](#))

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 items to be declared as surplus which include Tasers and related equipment from the Police Department, a two cage kennel and miscellaneous audio and computer equipment.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

## OTHER

### 8. Department Updates – Laura Smith

**Mary Ryherd, Chairperson**  
**Hillary Parker Thomas, Vice-Chairperson**  
*Mission City Hall, 6090 Woodson St*  
**913.676.8350**

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	1.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Robyn Fulks

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

**RE:** October 4, 2023 Finance & Administration Committee Minutes.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Review and accept the October 4, 2023 minutes of the Finance & Administration Committee.

**DETAILS:** Minutes of the October 4, 2023 Finance & Administration Committee meeting 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**

October 4, 2023

The Mission Finance & Administration Committee met at Mission City Hall and virtually via ZOOM on Wednesday, October 4, 2023. The following Committee members were present: Sollie Flora, Lea Loudon, Debbie Kring, Trent Boultinghouse, Mary Ryherd, Ken Davis, Hillary Thomas and Ben Chociej. Councilmember Inman attended the meeting virtually. Councilmember Ryherd called the meeting to order at 7:53 p.m.

The following staff were present: City Administrator Laura Smith, Deputy City Administrator Emily Randel, City Clerk Robyn Fulks, Parks and Recreation Director Penn Almoney, Chief Dan Madden, Budget and Finance Manager Christine Korth, and City Planner Karie Kneller.

### **Public Comments**

Councilmember Ryherd reminded the public they can participate via the chat feature on Zoom. All comments would be visible to the group.

There were no public comments tonight.

### **Public Presentations/Informational Items**

There were no public presentations or informational items.

### **Action Items**

#### **Acceptance of the September 6, 2023 Finance & Administration Committee Minutes**

Minutes of the September 6, 2023 Finance & Administration Committee were provided to the Committee for review.

Councilmember Davis recommended this item be forwarded to the City Council for approval. All on the committee agreed, and this item will be on the consent agenda.

## **58/Nall Tax Abatement Request**

City Administrator Laura Smith presented to the Committee the City team of Bruce Kimmel, Pete Heaven and Kevin Wempe who will contribute to the conversation this evening as well. Following the September 27 work session additional information has been collected, and staff is looking for further Council discussion and direction this evening. The proposed schedule contemplates a public hearing at the October 18 City Council meeting. However she noted that if, following that hearing, the Council is not prepared to take action the same evening, the hearing and action would be continued to a special City Council meeting on October 25.

She noted Mr. Kimmel has prepared a PowerPoint for the Committee, and the tax information has been obtained for both current tax receipts along with projected taxes once the development was built, including an assumption of a 70% tax abatement. The team will also revisit the abatement percentage amounts and timing. Ms. Smith then turned the presentation over to Mr. Kimmel of Ehlers, the City's financial advisor.

Mr. Kimmel thanked the Council for the opportunity share updated information on the project. For discussion purposes this evening, he put together calculations of taxes with and without the abatement to give a sense of how City taxes play into the picture and how the different levels of abatement may play out. Mr. Kimmel first introduced a calculation of the taxes the parcel will pay for fiscal year 2024. The appraised value from the County currently is \$1,530,000.00 and has the property classified as commercial industrial property with a 25% classification rate. The current assessed value, therefore, is \$382,500.00. When multiplied by Mission's mill rate (18.5 mills) the City could expect to receive taxes in the amount of approximately \$7,000 if no development occurred. The post-development estimates show a property value of approximately \$19,000,000. As a residential property, the classification rate would transition from 25% (commercial) to 11.5% (residential), putting the new estimated assessed value at about \$2.2 million. If no abatement were requested, the project would generate approximately \$40,000 annually in taxes for Mission. If the Council were to approve a 70% abatement, the City would retain 30% of that estimated assessed value or about \$12,000.00 per year. That amount assumes the mill rate does not change and also does not include any new sales taxes generated from residents, nor does it include the initial fee the City would collect from the issuance of the Industrial Revenue Bonds. Mr.

Kimmel pointed out that, even with abatement, the City would see a net gain of about \$5,000.00 per year.

Ms. Smith added that currently there is about \$5,600.00 per year in stormwater utility fees that are collected and those would still be paid in full to the City and would not be included as part of the abatement.

Mr. Kimmel next presented an estimate of City taxes that would be collected over the next twelve years. Mr. Kimmel added an additional 3% per year in years two through ten to account for likely increases in the valuation of the property or increases to the mill rate. He believes between those two factors, a three percent inflation is a reasonable amount to assume. If a 70% abatement is provided, the annual City collected taxes increase from about \$12,000 to about \$15,000. Once the abatement is completed after ten years, City taxes collected would be about \$50,000.00 per year. Finally, Mr. Kimmel provided different levels of abatement and showed taxes for the property as a whole and City taxes taken out independently.

Mr. Kimmel acknowledged that he had discussed different levels of abatement with the Council during the previous work session, and reminded them of Ehlers' recommendation of a 70% abatement. Mr. Kimmel showed total taxes for all jurisdictions at \$247,000, with a separate box for City taxes at \$40,000 with no abatement. At the 70% abatement level, total taxes paid by the Developer would be approximately \$74,000 with \$12,000 of that to the City. He also noted that the lesser the abatement amount the more taxes paid, and that decreasing the abatement percentage does not bring much more tax revenue in (only \$1000 to \$2000), comparatively speaking, because the City's mill rate is so low. He also believed it was helpful to show estimates with the different percentages to illustrate what numbers the Council would be looking at if the abatement is approved.

Councilmember Loudon thanked Mr. Kimmel for the very helpful information.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Kimmel to please discuss the issues related to the attainable housing considerations and the feasibility of increasing that from the 10% that has been part of the conversation so far. He began by reviewing the idea of requiring the attainable housing percentage to be 20% and stated that moving the percentage to that amount in this stage of the development process would require the Developer to do a large amount of work with their lender and is likely not feasible. At the ten percent requirement, eight units would be at the

attainable housing level, versus 16 if the Council were to require 20% attainable housing. Considering the project is only 77 units, that is a significant change. He also stated he would expect that, if this level of attainable housing is required, the Applicant would likely be asking for a higher level of abatement than the 70% currently being discussed. Even at a higher abatement level, that may not be enough to make up the difference between an attainable rent and a market rate rent. He did emphasize to the Committee that they are allowed to ask for whatever they would like during this open negotiation. He believes staying the course at 10% on this project would make sense as a strong push for a higher number of units for attainable housing would cause delays, especially if the Developer needed to re-work their financing. He also did state that this is his analysis for this project only, and that other projects asking for abatement should be considered individually for the amount of attainable or affordable housing as part of the abatement package.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Kimmel to speak more to the “but for piece,” or the need for incentives, to get the Developer to a market rate. Mr. Kimmel agreed, and stated that from other discussions there are different levels of rate or return calculations. He presented in his memo that many developers would be looking for a 10 – 12% cash on cash return for a project of this type and reminding the Committee that based on his review of the pro-forma, without any incentive the anticipated return for the developer was approximately \_\_\_\_.

Ms. Smith reviewed that direction sought this evening is if the Council is willing to grant the abatement, and if so, at what level. Once Staff has that direction the numbers can be finalized in a performance agreement and a Resolution of Intent and shared back prior to the October 18 meeting.

Councilmember Davis stated he is struggling with the questions to recommend abatement and the level and percentages of the recommendation and what the value is of abatement to the City. He is looking for what the level of the justification as far as the benefit to the City for approving abatement.

Ms. Smith stated she feels like the questions are intertwined and explained that by adopting the policy, creating a baseline and establishing a minimum criteria, confirmed that the Council was willing to entertain requirements for tax abatement. Mr. Kimmel’s analysis regarding determination of the “need” for the incentive based on market expectations, was the first step for staff to engage in any further conversation regarding how a project might score against the policy criteria. These conversations turn to what a Developer wants to invest to



meet the objectives such as attainable housing, sustainability, target area, or other community benefit. The Council also has the discretion to make any of those criteria required for a particular project.

Staff's analysis suggests that an abatement between 70-75% would create the incentive for the developer to proceed with the project. The recommendation presented this evening is for 70%. The Council can then look at additional information to say if there is enough return on their investment to incentivize the project, which is where playing with percentages in terms of numbers begins. She offered to help answer any other questions that may be causing conflict or confusion.

Mayor Flora stated that she believes the Staff recommendation to entertain the request provides some answers to Councilmember Davis's first question as that recommendation signifies that the proposal meets the but/for cause and has a positive ratio on the cost/benefit analysis. She clarified that question two then would be the ratios at which to offer incentives. Ms. Smith also added that the policy was written to clearly convey to the development community that the Council would not want to consider 100% abatement requests, that there would need to be something that was coming back more immediately to the City.

Councilmember Thomas asked if the City has any calculation on a per capita cost of providing City services in Mission. She is curious to know what revenues without abatement versus with abatement would be in comparison to how much it costs for City services for each resident, and inquired as to how many new residents the project would bring in. Ms. Smith answered that the cost/benefit analysis estimated 143 new residents in the 77-unit project. Ms. Smith also shared that although it wasn't something Staff had calculated, an estimate of the cost of County services per resident is included in the cost/benefit analysis. Mayor Flora echoed this information.

Councilmember Kring inquired what the rents would be for the units that are earmarked as attainable housing.

Chris Kline of Husch Blackwell approached the lectern representing the Developer and stated they had that information and would pull it up shortly. He also stressed that those rents would depend on the mix of sizes of units.

Councilmember Loudon asked for the rents in general. Ms. Smith explained the

Developer's team is working on pulling that information up for both the attainable housing and market-rate units. Councilmember Loudon then asked how those attainable housing units that are available are shared with the public. Ms. Smith answered that the City would share that information with the community, and she also imagines that the Developer's leasing staff will be well-versed in those units' availability and requirements. Mayor Flora mentioned that, anecdotally, a friend of hers works for the County in a community services role and they will also share the availability of attainable housing throughout the County with their clients.

Councilmember Thomas stated she's anxious for updated information from Staff and total property tax information in a final version to be prepared for October 18. She feels like she is missing some information on the environmental piece, specifically what does One Globe mean and what value does the development bring to the City. She stated that, overall, she's happy to see a general net positive for the City.

Councilmember Chociej stated that he feels like the basic question is how much money is the Council willing to forego to have the project move forward, and is the Developer willing to meet them? He feels like the differences between the levels of environmental certifications seem to get a bit fuzzy, he's most concerned with figuring out what those conditions they have in the policy such as what is a Globe or LEED, and as Ms. Smith stated, the questions are does the Council want to do abatement, and then at what level. His understanding of the abatement is the taxing entities will be putting in less than 1% of the appraised value of the property, and he feels that is worthwhile considering what the Council's vision for Johnson Dive and area going forward. He questioned whether this project is one the Council wants to see replicated in the future based on the comp plan and land use plan, and he finds it to be a very good development. The question for him is how the policy is dialed in and to use this request to shake out the details. He believes the target area deserves more incentive than the 5% initially shown. He would like to see the attainable housing be at the full 10%. He also shared some information he learned from reading about the environmental component, and from his research about a report commissioned by a Province in Canada comparing LEED to Globes. The study stated that two Globes is equal to the base level of LEED, therefore he thinks he would like to see two Globes for the environmental portion.

Chris Kline, representing the Developer, next spoke to provide rental amounts

proposed for the various units. A studio rent would be \$1,077 per month, 1 bed \$1100, and for a 2 bed \$1300 for the attainable rent units. He also stressed that while a potential 2% reduction in the abatement percentage doesn't sound like a lot, with interest rates and costs rising adding additional attainable housing units would put the project at risk. They would strongly request that the Council consider the abatement at the full 70%.

Ms. Smith noted that every project of every size is important, however it's important to recognize that this is the first to move forward using the new abatement policy, and she believes that it is beneficial to be able to have the conversation, refine the application of criteria and make decisions in connection with a smaller scale project.

Councilmember Thomas asked if Staff or Mr. Kimmel has had any conversations about using LEED instead of Globes, and possibly increasing the environmental component as she understands the reasoning for potentially not being able to increase the attainable housing component to the 20% the Council would like. She was hoping that increasing the environmental factors would be more financially possible.

Ms. Smith stated she has not had the specific conversation about one Globe to two, but stated she cannot speak to the Developer. She did say they (developer) have indicated a concern over the cost of LEED certification overall.

Developer John Moffit addressed the Committee and explained that there are four LEED levels, certification and then silver, gold and platinum. He offered the comparison of one Globe to LEED certification and four Globes to LEED platinum. Ms. Smith explained that was what Mr. Chociej was explaining from his report, that two Globes are the LEED certification, not one. Councilmember Chociej agreed, but also acknowledged that that opinion could probably be found repudiated in other publications. Councilmember Chociej also voiced his support again for the project.

Mr. Moffit also spoke about the human factor of the project, bringing in 77 new homes in the area and new community residents who will use City businesses. He referenced a previous meeting with the Council in 2022 and spoke about the rising interest rates and the impact on his firm. He explained that from his perspective there is a large financial impact and the likelihood it would proceed by making small tweaks like more attainable housing or additional environmental components.

Councilmember Chociejs responded that he agrees that time is of the essence, as he understands the economic and interest rate components. He also believes this development will provide those positive community impacts Mr. Moffit is referencing.

Councilmember Ryherd echoed Councilmember Chociejs's comments, she would not like to see these parcels sit vacant while collecting a minimal amount of tax revenue when more could be collected. She is in favor of moving forward while fine-tuning numbers.

Councilmember Loudon expressed her like of the project and a desire to see it move forward. She does believe the attainable housing piece needs to be looked at harder, as she doesn't believe the rents provided earlier are not really affordable. She believes that the attainable housing conversation maybe needs to be moved to a different route and not through abatement. She knows these reduced amounts will help some families, but it isn't really solving any long-term problem.

Ms. Smith stated she would never want a Council to feel pressured to move forward if they are not comfortable. She acknowledged that in the development community, time is money, but the decision to grant an incentive is always entirely at the Council's discretion. She also stated that this Council has demonstrated consistently in their responses that their concern is the best interest of the City and its residents. She also believes, following Councilmember Loudon's comments, perhaps the larger policy discussion surrounding attainable or affordable housing and sustainability should not be limited to the incentive conversations. She believes if the goal is to affect the environment for years to come the conversation could be better had in other places.

Councilmember Boultinghouse agreed with Ms. Smith and asked for an update on conversations that have been had about bringing those issues forward for Council discussion. Ms. Smith agreed, while also stating that Mr. Moffit has been waiting for some time for this to move forward as the City did not know of the need for incentives when the project first came about. She feels like lost revenue opportunities and how long the City as a whole wants to wait for development is still an unknown. Surrounding some projects, such as the Gateway project, the Council is willing to wait. But for other things, how long should we wait. She referenced ScriptPro moving so much of their workforce

to home based, which minimizes the amount of people brought into the City. She believes projects like this can help fill that gap.

Mayor Flora stated that, talking more about the target area and the conversations tonight, she feels like she would be comfortable with the full 10% to avoid the blight aspect of the project not being built at all, to Councilmember Ryherd's point. She acknowledged that no single action taken is going to solve every problem in the City or on a more global level, however she thinks seeing all of the pieces as moving toward improvement does advance Council goals and is beneficial. She believes conversations around the comprehensive plan and talking about how the Council wants Johnson Drive to be shaped will lead to conversations about sustainability and providing that missing middle housing.

Councilmember Chociej liked Mayor Flora's point. He knows that this policy will never give all of the answers and will only be a guideline for developers to understand the Council's goals. He doesn't believe that continuing to try and dial in specifics for a 2 – 2.5% change in the abatement percentage is a good use of the Council's time. He believes the Council should advance the tax abatement request forward at the 70% level proposed by staff. He finds that the benefit has been clearly demonstrated, and that Mission will take the hardest hit on taxing entities with the school district taking the least of the abatement which he agrees with.

Councilmember Thomas agreed with Councilmember Chociej, but did say she would like to see the percentages assigned to the criteria reviewed, especially as it relates to sustainability. While she recognizes that each project is considered on its own merits, she does believe future developers would look to previous incentives that have been granted, and she would like to reinforce the importance of the sustainability expectations.

Councilmember Chociej recommended this item be forwarded to the City Council at the 70% abatement for approval. All on the committee agreed, and this item will be on the regular agenda.

Ms. Smith reviewed processes, stating that the numbers agreed upon tonight will be plugged in to a Performance Agreement and that will be shared ahead of the Council meeting on October 18. She stated that the documents will be very similar to what they have seen, along with a Resolution of Intent which would expire if construction doesn't commence within a certain timeframe.

There will also be scheduled milestones in the Performance Agreement. Staff suggests a presentation and public hearing on October 18, and if the Council is comfortable voting, then that would please Mr. Moffit and his team, however if the Council is not comfortable on the 18th a special meeting can be called the following week.

### **Automated License Plate Reader Policy**

Chief Dan Madden introduced a Department policy that governs the use of the automatic license plate readers the Police Department is in the process of receiving. He stated that the policy is one of the final pieces of putting the ALPR system in place. This policy was developed through the Department's policy management system, Lexipol, which had a model policy that Staff was able to update and add clarification. Those updates include data retention, a stipulation of entry of vehicles with misdemeanor traffic warrants, and a requirement that if an officer self enters a plate into the system the officer would be required to enter a reason, and the data would need to be removed once the situation for which it was entered is resolved. The policy also manages who the data can be released to. Chief Madden explained that they will use WebALPR, a regional system that allows other area agencies using this system to share data to assist in the resolution and prevention of crime. He also pointed out that, in the past few legislative sessions, the State has removed license plate data from open records requests so that data does not have to be shared in connection with open records requests.

Councilmember Davis asked for clarification on a part of the policy that states that the officer who enters the information into the system is responsible for removing it if and when the reason for entry has been resolved. He worries that the person who entered it may not be on staff at the time of resolution. Chief Madden explained that there are a few reasons to do that. The most likely is inputting data from another jurisdiction. If staff finds out the situation is resolved it can then be removed. Chief Madden stated situations are typically removed fairly quickly.

Ms. Smith clarified Councilmember Davis' question, confirming that he was concerned about data remaining in the system due to staff turnover, Chief Madden noted there are operating procedures that will address that situation. He is unable to give much detailed accurate information until the system becomes live and operational. In the future, any substantive changes to the policy will be brought back for Council discussion. Lexipol updates policies

frequently, so Staff will use best judgment as to when changes need to be shared.

Councilmember Chociey expressed his agreement with the policy and will be interested to hear the use and issues six to twelve months from now. He likes the accountability of the “reason why requirement.”

Councilmember Loudon asked for clarification on who will have access to the information at a higher level than local agencies, such as the FBI. Chief Madden explained that only agencies that are on the system can use it and that the system is a locally developed system, not on a national level. As far as direct access, only agencies paying for the subscription in the region can use it. He stated that State or Federal agencies would not have direct access.

Councilmember Boultinghouse stated he was in favor of the policy as well. He asked Chief Madden if he could share success stories that come out of using the technology and software down the road. Chief Madden agreed and stated they will document successes to pass along.

Councilmember Chociey agreed that he would like aggregate data in six to twelve months as to how the system is being used.

Councilmember Davis recommended this item be forwarded to the City Council for approval. All on the committee agreed, and this item will be on the consent agenda.

### **MOU with the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office for ALPR Data Storage**

The final action item was also from Chief Madden for consideration of an MOU with the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office for ALPR data storage. Chief Madden explained that the data needs to be maintained and the Sheriff’s office has agreed to host all of the small agency’s data. This agreement outlines the City’s and County’s responsibilities in hosting that data. The MOU provides many of the same aspects as far as proper access, notification about incidents surrounding the data, and having open communication. The MOU includes a 24-month maximum data retention, which will be reviewed to find a “sweet spot” of data and storage space. The City’s policy gives the City control of the data to modify as Staff sees fit. There is no cost associated with the MOU at this time; however the Sheriff’s office will do an annual assessment to look at cost if our storage needs are higher than other agencies. He also noted that the City’s legal counsel has reviewed the MOU.

Councilmember Chociey stated he believes its vital to be able to delete information from the database, and wanted to know if the MOU is terminated can that data still be deleted. Ms. Smith answered that timing of termination of an MOU and deletion of data could be appropriately coordinated. Chief Madden agreed.

Councilmember Davis recommended this item be forwarded to the City Council for approval. All on the committee agreed, and this item will be on the consent agenda.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

There were no discussion items tonight.

### **Department Updates**

### **OTHER**

### **Meeting Close**

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting of the Community Development Committee adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Robyn L. Fulks, City Clerk



<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	2.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>	From:	Laura Smith

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

**RE:** LGR Legislative and Advocacy Services 2024

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the 2024 agreement for legislative advocacy services with Little Government Relations, LLC., in an amount not to exceed \$12,500.00.

**DETAILS:** In 2020, Mission, along with other cities in northeast Johnson County contracted with Stuart Little of Little Government Relations, LLC (LGR) to provide legislative information and advocacy services. Several other cities in northeast Johnson County also contract with LGR, and Mission has worked both independently and collaboratively with LGR in 2020 – 2023 for legislative affairs and advocacy services.

LGR provides weekly updates during the session and monthly outside of the session. They craft or assist staff in crafting testimony, and the overall education and information provided about relevant legislative issues and the legislative climate helps to support and inform staff and Council on a timely basis. Additionally, LGR has been available to participate in ongoing conferences, education and information sessions related to various pass-through funding via the CARES Act and the American Rescue Plan (ARPA) Act, and other State and federal grant programs to keep the City apprised of important updates and changes

Staff recommends renewing the agreement for 2024 to help support and inform both the staff and Council of important or relevant legislation on a timely basis. Annual fees have not increased since the original contract approval in 2020, and LGR has requested a modest increase for 2024 going from \$10,000 to \$12,500 annually. Staff and the Mayor reviewed and discussed the request with LGR earlier this year and are recommending approval of the contract. The contract is paid in four quarterly installments.

We anticipate having a work session on the City’s proposed 2024 Legislative Priorities in late November, with Council review and approval at the December 2023 Committee and Council meetings.

**CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS:** Timely and effective monitoring and review of legislative action helps the City stay abreast and educated about various issues impacting our community. We strongly advocate each year for the maintenance of our

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	N/A
Line Item Code/Description:	01-09-206-05
Available Budget:	\$12,500

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	2.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>	From:	Laura Smith

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

home rule authority in order to allow the greatest degree of flexibility in meeting the needs of residents and visitors of all ages and abilities in our community.

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	N/A
Line Item Code/Description:	01-09-206-05
Available Budget:	\$12,500

# Memorandum of Agreement

## 1. Parties to Agreement

This agreement for government relations and lobbying services is entered into between “LGR Government Relations, LLC” hereinafter referred to as “LGR” and the “City of Mission” hereinafter referred to as “Mission.”

## 2. Services to be Provided

A. LGR shall provide pro-active lobbying, monitoring, and reporting services for Mission before Kansas legislative and administrative branches of government on matters related to city government. Little shall analyze and report on legislative bills and policy issues of interest and communicate such analysis to Mission on a regular and timely basis.

B. Little shall communicate and meet with the Governing Body, administration, and staff to discuss policy, budget, legislative activity, and administrative issues related to State public policy and budget activities, and LGR shall provide weekly reports during the legislative session, at least monthly during the interim period, and be available for meetings as requested.

D. LGR shall testify before legislative committees as directed by Mission and shall provide assistance to Mission in the production and presentation of legislative testimony.

E. LGR will be available to represent Mission before relevant policy organizations; League of Kansas Municipalities’ meetings and activities; collective Northeast Johnson County cities events, local and regional chambers, and city activities related to shared public policy issues.

F. LGR will facilitate meetings with the legislators and key stakeholders upon request.

G. LGR may perform other government affairs services for Mission as requested. Extraordinary expansion of duties may be subject to additional or other terms as agreed by the parties.

H. LGR shall provide advice and consultation with appropriate Mission elected officials and staff as requested.

3. Coalition.

Mission and other cities in Northeast Johnson County may join together in a voluntary coalition to accomplish shared public policy goals and objectives. The coalition may collectively and collaboratively receive the services articulated in Sec. 1. The coalition will be governed by the following terms and conditions.

- A. Each coalition city will designate one representative to represent and articulate city position, serve as primary point of contact, and serve as the voting member on any non-consensus decisions in the event of required vote.
- B. Coalition will communicate at least on a weekly basis during the legislative session and more often as necessary, including but not exclusively in written reports and conference calls or in person.
- C. LGR will be available to represent the coalition before relevant policy organizations; League of Kansas Municipalities' meetings and activities; collective Northeast Johnson County cities events, local and regional chambers, and city activities related to shared public policy issues.
- D. LGR will be available for city governing board meetings and city staff upon request.
- E. During non-session period, LGR will provide monthly written reports, represent the members at relevant meetings, and be available for governing body meetings upon request.
- F. Participation in the coalition of Northeast Johnson County cities does not supersede or preclude the right of a coalition member to express or advocate individually and independently for a position different from the coalition position. Coalition city members are not obligated to support a majority coalition position and may oppose, without prejudice.

3. Independent Contractor

It is understood by both parties that LGR is an independent contractor and its services are not exclusive to Mission. LGR is specifically allowed to represent other cities by mutual consent in a coalition of Northeast Johnson County cities and additional clients in non-competing areas.

4. Compliance with Applicable Statutes and Rules and Regulations

It is understood by both parties that LGR will register with the office of the Kansas Secretary of State as a lobbyist for Mission. Furthermore, LGR will comply with both the spirit and the intent of all reporting requirements as well as all statutes and rules and regulations pertaining to lobbying. Copies of any reports filed by or on behalf of LGR with various reporting agencies will be available for review by Mission upon request.

5. Terms of Agreement

This contract shall be in effect for the period beginning January 1, 2024 and ending December 31, 2024.

6. Compensation

LGR shall receive the sum of twelve thousand five hundred dollars (\$12,500.00) for services provided under this agreement, payable in four quarterly payments in the amount of three thousand one hundred and twenty-five dollars (\$3,125.00), due after January 1, April 1, July 1 and October 1 upon receipt of an invoice from LGR. LGR may be reimbursed for documented expenses approved by the administrator or chief elected member in advance.

7. Liability Insurance

LGR shall possess professional liability and workers compensation insurance and shall make documentation of coverage available upon request.

8. Termination.

Either party may terminate this agreement upon thirty (30) days written notice.

This contract encompasses all written and oral agreements of the parties and is entered into this 15 day of November 2023.

---

Stuart J. Little, Ph.D.

Little Government Relations, LLC  
800 SW Jackson, Suite 1000  
Topeka, Kansas 66612-2205

---

Laura Smith

City of Mission  
6090 Woodson St.  
Mission, Kansas 66202

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	3.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Emily Randel

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

**RE:** Recommendation for 2024 Employee Benefits Program

**RECOMMENDATION:** Authorize the Mayor, or her designee, to execute any and all documents necessary to approve contracts for the City of Mission’s 2024 employee health/welfare benefits program.

**DETAILS:** Staff and the City’s benefit broker, Lockton Benefit Company, is recommending an employee benefits program for 2024 that is both supportive of the employees and fiscally sound for the City. Key items of note for 2024 include:

- **Medical Benefit** The City received a premium package from Blue Cross Blue Shield for 2024 with no increase from current rates. This requires shifting Mission from the large group segment to the small group segment one year sooner than it would be required in 2025 and the implementation of the BKC Premium Formulary. If the Premium Formulary is not implemented in 2024, the premium package would be offered with a 2.96% increase. There is wide variability in the rate renewals from year to year, with no increases in 2020, 2021 or 2023, but a 19.1% increase in 2022. Staff works to insulate against large swings annually by building excess funds into each year’s budget, since the final numbers are not available when the budget is finalized.

Each year, Staff discusses potential plan design changes with Lockton, including offering a high deductible plan and making various changes to the plan designs. Staff and Lockton staff again agreed that any major changes to the City’s offerings should be reserved for a year when plan premiums increase significantly, and employees are more likely to be interested in making changes to their coverage. Evaluation of these options will continue in the spring of 2024 as part of Staff’s strategic planning with Lockton.

- **Dental Benefit** Delta Dental provided a renewal with a 1.5% increase for 2024 after a 2% rate increase for 2023. This translates to a \$0.48 annual increase for individual coverage and a \$1.39 annual increase for family coverage.

The full recommendations for 2024 include:

- Renew with Blue Cross / Blue Shield of Kansas City with current plan options, with no increase to premiums. Continue with the current health insurance premium structure, 80% of the premium being paid by the City and 20% being

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	NA
Line Item Code/Description:	Various personnel line items that make up the 2024 Budget
Available Budget:	\$2,448,563

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	3.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Emily Randel

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

paid by the employee.

- Renew the dental insurance benefit plan with Delta Dental of Kansas with a 1.5% increase in premium rates and no change in plan structure. Maintain the current dental insurance premium structure of 80% paid by the City and 20% paid by the employees.
- Maintain the vision insurance benefit plan with EyeMed with no plan changes and 100% of the premium paid by the City. The plan is on a rate hold through January 1, 2025.
- Maintain basic Group-Term Life/AD&D benefits through These benefits are paid 100% by the City. The plan is on a rate hold through January 1, 2026.
- Maintain access to voluntary life insurance benefits through The Standard with all premiums paid 100% by participating employees.
- Continue to provide a Section 125 Flexible Spending Account through BASIC.
- Maintain access to voluntary supplemental insurance benefits through AFLAC with all premiums paid 100% by participating employees.
- Fund the KPERS and KP&F retirement plans in accordance with state mandated rates.
- Maintain the quarterly contribution of 2% of total earnings in the Principal Plan for non-KP&F employees, with no optional matching benefit.
- Maintain Employee Assistance Program services with LifeWorks. The plan is on a rate hold until December 31, 2024.
- Fund a wellness program for City employees in the amount of \$10,000.

A memorandum with additional detail on each of the program elements is included in the meeting packet.

**CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS:** The health benefits offered in the City’s benefit package represent services that can facilitate active participation throughout each phase of life. Access to community and health services is one of the six areas of focus for the Communities for All Ages checklist and providing some of that access in the workplace contributes to overall wellness in a fundamental way.

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	NA
Line Item Code/Description:	Various personnel line items that make up the 2024 Budget
Available Budget:	\$2,448,563

**Date:** November 1, 2023  
**To:** Mayor and City Council  
**From:** Emily Randel, Deputy City Administrator  
**RE:** 2024 Employee Benefits Program

---

Each year, staff seeks the most effective balance of robust benefits for our employees that still allows the City to maintain a fiscally responsible position. The City's benefit broker, Lockton Benefit Company, assists to evaluate, negotiate and recommend an employee benefits package. The recommendations for fiscal year 2024 are summarized below.

### **Medical Benefit**

The City received an annual proposed premium package from Blue Cross Blue Shield for 2024 with no change to current rates or plan design. The City offers three plans, Blue Select Plus, Preferred Care Blue and Spira Care. Employee plan costs in 2024 will range from \$139.78 to \$509.08 per month based on the plan type.

***Recommendation: Continue health insurance coverage with Blue Cross / Blue Shield of Kansas City with no premium increase for 2024 and with a continued cost share of 80% / 20% between the City and employees. Estimated budget is projected at \$771,002.***

### **Dental Benefit**

The City offers its employees dental coverage through Delta Dental of Kansas. The City's dental insurance plan provides an annual deductible of \$50 for an individual and \$150 for a family with an annual maximum of \$1,500, regardless of whether care is in or out of network. The plan also provides for 100% of preventive services and 80% of basic services within network. The program includes unlimited cleanings and the Right Start4Kids program which covers all services except orthodontics at 100% for dependents under the age of 13.

As with the medical benefit, the City currently pays 80% of the premium rates and the employee pays 20%. Delta Dental is proposing a 1.5% increase in premiums for 2024. The employee's portion of the monthly premiums range from \$6.46 for an individual to \$18.89 for family coverage.

***Recommendation: Renew the dental insurance benefit plan with Delta Dental of Kansas effective January 1, 2024 with a 1.5% increase in premium rates and maintain the current premium structure of 80% City and 20% employees.***



***Estimated impact to the City's 2024 budget for the recommended dental benefits is \$42,836.***

### **Vision Benefit**

The City provides vision insurance to its employees through EyeMed. Vision benefit premiums are paid 100% by the City. EyeMed issued a 4-year rate hold through January 1, 2025.

***Recommendation: Continue vision benefits with EyeMed, effective January 1, 2024 with no increase in premiums. Maintain 100% of the premium paid by the City with an estimated impact to the City's 2024 budget of \$8,470.***

### **Wellness Benefit**

The employee wellness program encourages employees to earn points throughout the year by engaging in wellness activities such as doctor and dental visits, vaccinations, group workouts or attending wellness seminars at work. A secondary benefit to the program is the employee engagement and the chance to build relationships between employees across departments. Employees who earn the minimum number of points earn \$400 at the end of the year. Thirty-five employees have participated in at least one of the tracked activities to date in 2023. This is a significant increase over the historic performance of this program due to more varied programming and strengthened support from supervisors.

***Recommendation: Maintain the wellness benefit in 2024 at \$400 for each participant that completes the annual wellness program, and fund biometric screenings and miscellaneous expenses for a budgeted wellness and employee engagement program in the amount of \$10,000.***

### **125 Flexible Spending Account Benefit**

The City offers a Flexible Spending Account (FSA) program (unreimbursed medical and dependent care expenses) through BASIC. The plan allows employees to set aside pre-tax dollars for qualified expenses eligible for reimbursement throughout the plan year.

There are currently 31 employees participating in the FSA with annual contributions totaling approximately \$55,126.58. Annual plan administration fees are approximately \$2,202. Participation in the plan saves both the employees and the City approximately \$4,168 in FICA taxes.

***Recommendation: Continue to provide a Section 125 Flexible Spending Account through Basic with an estimated budget impact of \$2,202***

### **Basic Life / AD&D Insurance Benefit**

The City provides a basic group-term life/AD&D policy through The Standard for all benefit eligible employees, paid 100% by the City. The City provides \$50,000 coverage for department directors, and \$40,000 for all other employees (unless reduced as a result of age). The plan is on rate hold through January 1, 2026. The coverage, paid 100% by the City, is estimated to be \$4,895.

***Recommendation: Provide basic Group-Term Life/AD&D benefits through The Standard for 2024 with an estimated budget impact of \$4,895.***

### **Voluntary Life Insurance Benefit**

The City offers employees the option to purchase additional life insurance through The Standard. The plan allows employees to purchase insurance in increments of \$10,000 up to a max of five times their annual salary. The pricing is age rated and employees may purchase coverage for a spouse and dependents as well. The premiums are paid 100% by the employee. The voluntary life insurance benefit will renew at no rate increase. Premium may increase only if an employee crosses an age-band or they make specific application for an increase in coverage amounts.

***Recommendation: Maintain access to voluntary life insurance benefits through The Standard with all premiums paid 100% by participating employees with no impact to the 2024 budget.***

### **Voluntary Supplemental Insurance Benefit**

Employees are provided the option to participate in a supplemental insurance benefit through AFLAC. Though AFLAC provides primarily short-term disability insurance, they also offer several other insurance options that employees can select to participate in given their needs. This benefit is paid 100% by the employees that choose to participate.

***Recommendation: Maintain access to voluntary supplemental insurance benefits through AFLAC with all premiums paid 100% by participating employees with no impact to the 2024 budget.***

### **Retirement Plan Benefit**

The City participates in the Kansas Public Employee Retirement System and the Kansas Police and Firefighters retirement system (KPERs/KP&F) for all eligible employees. Contributions to these two systems are mandatory for both the City, as the employer, and the employees. Contribution rates are dictated annually by the plan and

are as follows for 2024:

KPERS:	Employer	10.26% of Covered Payroll
	Employee	6.00% of earnings
KP&F:	Employer	23.1% of Covered Payroll
	Employee	7.15% of earnings

The estimated employer (the City's) contribution to KPERS/KP&F is approximately \$854,266 for 2024.

***Recommendation: Fund the KPERS and KP&F retirement plans in accordance with state mandated rates for an estimated cost of \$854,266 for 2024.***

### **Supplemental Retirement Benefit**

Since 1980, the City has provided a supplemental retirement program for all non-public safety employees working more than 1,000 hours per year. This plan, through Principal, was put in place based on a desire by the City to help equalize the gap in the employer funded contributions between KPERS and KP&F. It has no impact on the KPERS benefits available to employees upon their retirement.

***Recommendation: Maintain the contribution of 2% of total earnings in the Principal plan for non-KP&F employees, with no optional matching benefit. The estimated cost for 2024 is \$61,365.***

### **Employee Assistance Program**

In 2022, the City began contracting with Lifeworks for Employee Assistance Program services a switch from New Directions Behavioral Health. The program offers mental health services, and online toolkit and additional behavioral health resources. The current contract ends December 2024 at a flat annual rate of \$2,002.

***Recommendation: Continue contracting EAP services with LifeWorks through the termination of the contract in July 2024 at a cost of \$2,002.***

### **Summary and Recommendation for Health & Welfare Benefits**

The following is the recommended 2024 Employee Benefit Package.

- Renew with Blue Cross / Blue Shield of Kansas City with current plan options, with no increase to premiums by switching the Premium Formulary. Continue

with the current health insurance premium structure, 80% of the premium being paid by the City and 20% being paid by the employee.

- Renew the dental insurance benefit plan with Delta Dental of Kansas with a 1.5% increase in premium rates and no change in plan structure. Maintain the current dental insurance premium structure of 80% paid by the City and 20% paid by the employees.
- Maintain the vision insurance benefit plan with EyeMed with 100% of the premium paid by the City. The plan is on a rate hold through January 1, 2025.
- Maintain basic Group-Term Life/AD&D benefits through The Standard paid 100% by the City. The plan is on a rate hold through January 1, 2024.
- Maintain access to voluntary life insurance benefits through The Standard with all premiums paid 100% by participating employees.
- Continue to provide a Section 125 Flexible Spending Account through BASIC.
- Maintain access to voluntary supplemental insurance benefits through AFLAC with all premiums paid 100% by participating employees.
- Fund the KPERS and KP&F retirement plans in accordance with state mandated rates.
- Maintain the quarterly contribution of 2% of total earnings in the Principal Plan for non-KP&F employees, with no optional matching benefit.
- Maintain Employee Assistance Program services with LifeWorks. The current contract is on a rate hold until January 1, 2025.
- Fund a wellness program for City employees in the amount of \$10,000.

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	4.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Robyn Fulks

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

**RE:** CMB Application – Prairie Sailor, LLC – 5811 Johnson Drive

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the application for Prairie Sailor, LLC, 5811 Johnson Drive, to sell Cereal Malt Beverage on premises.

**DETAILS:** State statutes and Mission’s Code require all businesses wanting to sell Cereal Malt Beverages / Enhanced Cereal Malt Beverages (CMB) to complete an application that includes information on the business and the business owner and/or manager. Additionally, a criminal history background check is completed on the business owner/manager by our Police Department. All original applications and renewals for the sale of CMB must be approved by the City Council. Renewal CMB licenses are presented annually to Council for approval at the December City Council meeting.

Prairie Sailor, LLC has submitted their application to sell CMB on premises, along with the required license fee. The required background check has been completed without issue. This approval is good through December 31, 2023 at which time it will be renewed with all other CMB licenses.

**CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS:** NA

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	K.S. A. 4-2702, Mission City Code Chapter 600
Line Item Code/Description:	N/A
Available Budget:	N/A

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	5.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	December 8, 2021
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Laura Smith

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

**RE:** Revisions to City Council Policy 130 – Council Liaison Positions

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the revised City Council Policy 130 detailing roles and responsibilities related to City Council communication and interaction with certain appointed Commissions and Committees and establishing City Council liaisons to same.

**DETAILS:** In 2019, interest was expressed in establishing formal Council liaison positions to the City’s various advisory boards and commissions. In April 2019, City Council Policy 130 was approved, creating the liaison positions and outlining roles and responsibilities. Liaison positions were to be updated or renewed in December of odd-numbered years.

The Policy was revised in 2021 to remove the reference to the CIP Committee which had been disbanded. In addition to removing the reference to the CIP Committee, staff also recommended appointments to the Mission Magazine editorial board and the Family Adoption Committee be added to the policy.

Staff believes the Council liaison positions have been successful and continue to improve the opportunities for information sharing among our volunteers boards and the Governing Body.

In reviewing the policy earlier this year, the appointment of the liaison positions by the December meeting in odd numbered years doesn’t coincide well with timing of municipal elections and any transition on the Governing Body which may results. Staff recommends moving the appointments to January of even-numbered years to allow any new Council members the opportunity to be on-boarded and have an idea of which Commission they might be interested in serving.

In addition to this change,

A red-lined version of CP 130 has been included in the packet detailing recommending modifications. A clean version of the proposed policy is also included.

**CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS:** The City’s various commissions and committees provide opportunities for a wide variety of community residents to become engaged with

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	Council Policy 130
Line Item Code/Description:	NA
Available Budget:	NA

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	5.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	December 8, 2021
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Laura Smith

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

local government. Keeping the lines of communication open between the Council and these appointed commissions or committees helps to strengthen the ability of both to meet the needs of diverse groups and interests.

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	Council Policy 130
Line Item Code/Description:	NA
Available Budget:	NA

# CITY OF MISSION

## CITY COUNCIL POLICY MANUAL

---

### POLICY NO. 130

## CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION WITH APPOINTED ~~CERTAIN~~ COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

---

### 1.01 Purpose and Objectives

In order to assist it in setting direction for the city, the City Council considers the advice of its various commissions, committees, task forces, and ad hoc advisory groups. The City Council has historically engaged a wide variety of citizens on the commissions and committees in order to expand the knowledge and experience base of the elected decision makers. This policy is intended to create a more formalized method for keeping the Council and ~~these~~ the City's citizen volunteers connected and informed and to outline roles, responsibilities and expectations.

### 1.02 Exceptions and Exclusions

The Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals have distinct roles and responsibilities outlined by state statute. As a result of their quasi-judicial nature, the expectations and requirements established through this policy will not apply to either of these bodies.

### 1.03 Communication and Work Plans

Each commission, committee, task force, and ad hoc advisory group is responsible to investigate and make thoughtful recommendations to the City Council and/or city staff on issues coming before it. Such recommendations are often most useful if they include any alternatives that were considered and an analysis of the pros and cons of those alternatives.

Matters upon which a board makes recommendations can come from the City Council, from city staff, the citizens of Mission, and from the board members themselves. The City Council does not wish to impose a rigid structure upon the thoughts and ideas of any board or commission, but instead believes that creative and innovative ideas can come from many different sources.

Ideas or projects will often originate with the consideration and adoption of goals by the City Council. Each commission, committee, task force, and ad hoc advisory group will be asked to consider such goals and to coordinate with the designated staff liaison in the development of a work plan each year.



The normal channels for communication between the City Council and the commission or committee are through the City Council liaison and the staff liaison. Such persons will periodically report to the Council the deliberations and recommendations of the group. The chair of each commission or committee will make a formal report to the entire Governing Body at least ~~two~~ one times each year.

In considering recommendations from ~~boards and~~ commissions, committees or other advisory task force groups, the City Council will attempt to balance the many diverse interests in our community.

#### **1.04 Council Liaison - Roles and Responsibilities**

In order to enhance communication, City Council liaison positions to the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission, ~~the~~ Sustainability Commission, the Mission Magazine ~~e~~Editorial ~~b~~Board, and the Family Adoption Committee are formally established. The role of the Council liaison is not to direct the board in its activities or work. The liaison will serve as a point of contact and connection for the commission or committee, rather than an advocate for or ex-officio member.

The City Council liaison shall have the following roles and responsibilities:

1. Attend meetings of the commission or committee.
2. Communicate with the commission or committee when City Council communication is needed and to serve as a two-way communications channel between the City Council and the commission or committee.
3. Work with the staff liaison to establish or align priorities or resolve questions about the appropriate roles of the City Council, municipal government, and the commission or committee.
- ~~4. Participate in reviewing applications, and interviewing candidates for the commission or committee.~~

#### **1.05 City Council Liaisons - Appointment and Selection**

Two Council liaison positions will be created for each of the following: Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission and the Sustainability Commission. At least one Council liaison position will be established for the Mission Magazine Editorial Board and the Family Adoption Committee. Appointments shall be made for a period of two (2) years in order to allow the Council liaison an opportunity to become familiar with the members and their established work plan, goals and objectives. Council liaison appointments will be made in January ~~December~~ of ~~oddeven-~~ numbered years, or as a vacancy occurs.

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

**REVISED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 15, 2021**

**REVISED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 15, 2023.**

# CITY OF MISSION

## CITY COUNCIL POLICY MANUAL

---

### **POLICY NO. 130**

## **CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION WITH APPOINTED COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES**

---

### **1.01 Purpose and Objectives**

In order to assist it in setting direction for the city, the City Council considers the advice of its various commissions, committees, task forces, and ad hoc advisory groups. The City Council has historically engaged a wide variety of citizens on the commissions and committees in order to expand the knowledge and experience base of the elected decision makers. This policy is intended to create a more formalized method for keeping the Council and these citizen volunteers connected and informed and to outline roles, responsibilities and expectations.

### **1.02 Exceptions and Exclusions**

The Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals have distinct roles and responsibilities outlined by state statute. As a result of their quasi-judicial nature, the expectations and requirements established through this policy will not apply to either of these bodies.

### **1.03 Communication and Work Plans**

Each commission, committee, task force, and ad hoc advisory group is responsible to investigate and make thoughtful recommendations to the City Council and/or city staff on issues coming before it. Such recommendations are often most useful if they include any alternatives that were considered and an analysis of the pros and cons of those alternatives.

Matters upon which a board makes recommendations can come from the City Council, from city staff, the citizens of Mission, and from the board members themselves. The City Council does not wish to impose a rigid structure upon the thoughts and ideas of any board or commission, but instead believes that creative and innovative ideas can come from many different sources.

Ideas or projects will often originate with the consideration and adoption of goals by the City Council. Each commission, committee, task force, and ad hoc advisory group will be asked to consider such goals and to coordinate with the designated staff liaison in the development of a work plan each year.

The normal channels for communication between the City Council and the commission or committee are through the City Council liaison and the staff liaison. Such persons will periodically report to the Council the deliberations and recommendations of the group. The chair of each commission or committee will make a formal report to the entire Governing Body at least one time each year.

In considering recommendations from commissions, committees or other advisory task force groups, the City Council will attempt to balance the many diverse interests in our community.

#### **1.04 Council Liaison - Roles and Responsibilities**

In order to enhance communication, City Council liaison positions to the Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission, Sustainability Commission, the Mission Magazine Editorial Board, and the Family Adoption Committee are formally established. The role of the Council liaison is not to direct the board in its activities or work. The liaison will serve as a point of contact and connection for the commission or committee, rather than an advocate for or ex-officio member.

The City Council liaison shall have the following roles and responsibilities:

1. Attend meetings of the commission or committee.
2. Communicate with the commission or committee when City Council communication is needed and to serve as a two-way communications channel between the City Council and the commission or committee.
3. Work with the staff liaison to establish or align priorities or resolve questions about the appropriate roles of the City Council, municipal government, and the commission or committee.

#### **1.05 City Council Liaisons - Appointment and Selection**

Two Council liaison positions will be created for each of the following: Parks, Recreation and Tree Commission and the Sustainability Commission. At least one Council liaison position will be established for the Mission Magazine Editorial Board and the Family Adoption Committee. Appointments shall be made for a period of two (2) years in order to allow the Council liaison an opportunity to become familiar with the members and their established work plan, goals and objectives. Council liaison appointments will be made in January of even-numbered years, or as a vacancy occurs.

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

**REVISED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 15, 2021**

**REVISED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 15, 2023.**

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	6.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>Police</b>	From:	Dan Madden

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

**RE:** Resolution Ratifying the emergency expenditure of funds to purchase a 2021 Ford Interceptor Police Vehicle.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve the Resolution ratifying the emergency expenditure of funds to purchase a 2021 Ford Interceptor in an amount not to exceed \$38,702.30.

**DETAILS:** On September 11, 2023 one of the front-line patrol vehicles was struck by a motorist on I-35 causing significant damage to the vehicle. Initially, repairs to the vehicle were approved through the insurance claim process. As the vendor began taking apart the wrecked vehicle, additional damages were discovered. At that time, the insurance company declared the damages to be a total loss. The city will be receiving a check from the insurance company those damages in the amount of approximately \$33,654.45.

Police Department staff asked Bob Allen Ford to search for a replacement vehicle. A nationwide search resulted in one vehicle available, a 2021 Ford Interceptor with approximately 13,000 miles. The vehicle was going to auction on October 26 which resulted in the emergency expenditure being approved by the City Administrator

Bob Allen Ford provided a purchase price for the vehicle at \$38,702.30, which will ultimately leave the City with a net expenditure of approximately \$5,047.85 for the cost of the replacement vehicle. Additional costs will also be incurred for the removal of the equipment from the wrecked vehicle, along with the costs of installing the new equipment on the new vehicle. Those costs are undetermined at this time due to the possibility that some of the equipment that would be transferred could be damaged as well.

**CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS:** Maintenance of a public safety fleet ensures the members of the Mission Police Department are equipped with the appropriate resources to ensure they are providing high quality services and response to residents and visitors of all ages and abilities.

Related Statute/City Ordinance:	120.150 (5)
Line Item Code/Description:	Equipment Reserve and Replacement Fund
Available Budget:	\$7,500

**CITY OF MISSION  
RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF MISSION, KANSAS RATIFYING THE EMERGENCY EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE A 2021 FORD INTERCEPTOR TO REPLACE A 2020 FORD INTERCEPTOR WHICH WAS DAMAGED IN A TRAFFIC COLLISION.**

WHEREAS, On September 11, 2023, a Mission Police Department patrol vehicle was struck by another vehicle causing significant damage to the 2020 Ford Interceptor; and

WHEREAS, Staff worked through the insurance claim process which ultimately resulted in the insurance officials declaring the wrecked 2020 Ford Interceptor a total loss; and

WHEREAS, Staff requested Bob Allen Ford to conduct a search for a replacement vehicle; and

WHEREAS, a nationwide search revealed only one vehicle meeting the same specifications was located for sale, a 2021 Ford Interceptor; and

WHEREAS, the only vehicle available for sale was to be sold at auction on October 26, 2023 necessitating the emergency expenditure of funds; and

WHEREAS, Nationwide supply chain challenges, along with an on-going auto worker strike has significantly impacted the availability of police vehicles; and

WHEREAS, the proceeds from the insurance carrier will result in a net expenditure for the vehicle of approximately \$5,047.

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 120.140 (5) of the Mission Municipal Code the City Administrator authorized the emergency expenditure of funds on October 25, 2023, and is now seeking ratification of that emergency expenditure by the City Council.

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

**Section 1.** That the emergency expenditure with Bob Allen Ford for the purchase of a 2021 Ford Interceptor in an amount not to exceed \$38,702.30 is hereby ratified.

**PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL** this 15th day of November 2023.

**APPROVED BY THE MAYOR** this 15th day of November 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Solana Flora, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Robyn Fulks, City Clerk

924



# MARKET VALUATION REPORT

Prepared for TRAVELERS

## REPORT SUMMARY

### CLAIM INFORMATION

Owner	City Of Mission Mission, KS 66202
Loss Unit	Police 2020 Ford EXPLORER POLICE AWD 6cyl. 3.0l Sport Utility Vehicle
Loss Unit Type	SPECIALTY VEHICLES
Loss Incident Date	09/11/2023
Claim Reported	10/20/2023

The CCC ONE® Market Valuation Report reflects CCC Intelligent Solutions Inc.'s opinion as to the value of the loss unit, based on information provided to CCC by TRAVELERS.

### INSURANCE INFORMATION

Report Reference Number	115690007
Claim Reference	F0F2687001
Adjuster	Wilson, Lacey
Appraiser	Hundley, Micah
Odometer	46,507
Last Updated	10/24/2023 11:03 AM

### VALUATION SUMMARY

<b>Base Value</b>	<b>\$ 31,583.00</b>
<b>Adjusted Value</b>	<b>\$ 31,583.00</b>
Tax ( 9.725% )	+ \$ 3,071.45
Tax reflects applicable state, county and municipal taxes.	
Deductible	- \$ 1,000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,654.45</b>

The total may not represent the total of the settlement as other factors (e.g. license and fees) may need to be taken into account.

#### BASE VALUE

This is derived from comparable unit(s) available or recently available in the marketplace at the time of valuation, per our valuation methodology described on the next page.

#### Inside the Report

Valuation Methodology.....	2
Loss Unit Information.....	3
Comparable Units.....	6
Valuation Notes.....	8
Supplemental Information.....	9



## Purchase Proposal

Buyer	Co-Buyer	Vehicle
CITY OF MISSION CITY OF MISSION 6090 WOODSON RD MISSION KS 66202 E: (913) 676-8300 D: C: E-Mail: rmeyers@missionks.org	E: D: C: E-Mail:	2021 Ford Police Interceptor VIN: 1FM5K8AB8MGB96907 Stock#: Mileage: 13422 Color:

Customer Trade							
	Year	Make	Model	VIN	Engine	Mileage	Payoff
1							
2							

Cash Down	
Term	Payments

Purchase Details	
Retail Price:	
Savings:	(\$38,200.00)
Sales Price:	\$38,200.00
Rebates:	
<b>Total Sales Price:</b>	\$38,200.00
Accessories:	\$0.00
Service Contract:	\$0.00
GAP:	\$0.00
Government Fees:	\$3.50
Proc/Doc Fees:	\$499.00
Total Taxes:	\$0.00
Trade Allowance:	
Trade Payoff:	
Trade Equity:	
Cash Down:	
<b>Amount Financed:</b>	\$38,702.50

X  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Customer Signature

Disclaimer:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

Payments are based on average interest rates with approved credit. Payments are valid for 24 hours.

<b>City of Mission</b>	Item Number:	7.
<b>ACTION ITEM SUMMARY</b>	Date:	November 1, 2023
<b>Administration</b>	From:	Emily Randel

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 Deputy City Administrator, 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 a printer and typewriter from the Administration Department.

**CFAA CONSIDERATIONS/IMPACTS:** NA

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

**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**

**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 Deputy City Administrator, 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 15th day of November 2023.

**APPROVED BY THE MAYOR** on this 15th day of November 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Solana Flora, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robyn L. Fulks, City Clerk

## Attachment A

11/1/2023

Item	Description	Serial Number/Asset Tag	Department	Quantity	Potential Resale Value
<b><u>Vehicles / Equipment</u></b>					
<b><u>Other Equipment</u></b>					
Metal Kennel	2 cage kennel		Police	1	\$500.00
Tasers	X26P tser		Police	15	
Taser Batteries	new batteries		Police	24	
Taser Batteries	used taser batteries		Police	15	
Taser Cartridges	new cartridges		Police	23	
Taser Cartridges	expired cartridges		Police	47	
Taser Data Cable	data cable		Police	1	
Target	taser target		Police	1	
<b><u>Computer Equipment</u></b>					
Network Printer			Administration	1	\$100.00
Electronic Typewriter	Brother Correctronic GX-6750		Administration	1	\$100.00
Laptop Computer	Dell Latitude 5590	3WDHNV2	Police	1	\$100.00
Surface Pro	Laptop		Police	1	\$50.00
Laptop Computer	panasonic cf 33	CF-33LE-02VM	Police	1	\$10
Printer	HP	CN55EFX1SB	Police	1	\$10.00
Laptop Computer	Dell	DSD03W2	City Hall	1	\$10
Printer	HO printer laser jet pro	M452DN	City Hall	1	\$10
ex connect	ex connect		Police	1	\$0
Audio	Audio solo	N005924	City Hall	1	\$20.00
Laptop Computer	Dell Precision 5520		City Hall	1	\$10
Laptop Computer	Dell Precision 5520		City Hall	1	\$10
Monitor	Dell monitor		Police	1	\$5
Desktop Computer	Dell desktop tower	GZHVVHH2	Court	1	\$20
Desktop Computer	Dell desktop computer	GZJ3JH2	Court	1	\$20.00
6 battery charger	Endura battery charger		Police	1	\$25.00