

The public may attend the meeting in person or view it online at <https://www.facebook.com/CityofPrairieVillage>.

**COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE
Monday, October 17, 2022
6:00 PM**

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL**
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
- V. **INTRODUCTION OF STUDENTS AND SCOUTS**
- VI. **PRESENTATIONS**

National Arts and Humanities Month proclamation

Legislative presentations:

- Senator Ethan Corson
- Representative Stephanie Clayton
- Representative Jerry Stogsdill
- Representative Riu Xu

Recycle Right program - Brandon Hearn, Johnson County Department of Health and Environment

VII. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Participants may speak for up to three minutes. To submit written comment to the Council, please email cityclerk@pvkansas.com prior to 3 p.m. on October 17. Comments will be shared with Councilmembers prior to the meeting.

VIII. **CONSENT AGENDA**

All items listed below are considered to be routine by the Governing Body and will be enacted by one motion (roll call vote). There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Council member so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the regular agenda.

By Staff

1. Approval of regular City Council meeting minutes - October 3, 2022
2. Expenditure ordinance #3019
3. Consider appointments to the Arts Council
4. Consider traffic calming on Cherokee Drive from 71st Terrace to 71st Street

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Insurance Committee

- COU2022-71 Consideration of 2023 City health, dental and vision insurance providers, as recommended by City staff

Cindy Volanti

X. MAYOR'S REPORT

XI. STAFF REPORTS

Chief Chick, Consolidated Fire District #2

XII. OLD BUSINESS

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

COU2022-70 Finance Committee

- Presentation by Victoria McGrath
- Approval of the 2022 compensation/classification study and consider recommendations of implementation from the Finance Committee

Wes Jordan

XIV. COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (Council President presiding)

XV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE

Proclamation

National Arts and Humanities Month – October 2022

WHEREAS, the nation's 120,000 nonprofit arts organizations, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the nation's 4,500 local arts agencies in communities across the country, and the arts and humanities councils of the 50 states and the six U.S. jurisdictions and districts have regularly issued official proclamations on an annual basis designating October as National Arts and Humanities Month; and

WHEREAS, cities and states - through their local and state arts agencies, which represent thousands of cultural organizations - have celebrated the value and importance of culture in the lives of Americans and the health of thriving communities during National Arts and Humanities Month for nearly 30 years; and

WHEREAS, the humanities help diverse communities across the United States explore their history and culture with the support and partnership of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the 50 state and six jurisdiction and district humanities councils, and local educational and cultural institutions; and

WHEREAS, the arts and humanities embody so of much of the accumulated wisdom, intellect, and imagination of humankind; and

WHEREAS, the arts and humanities enhance and enrich the lives of everyone in America; and

WHEREAS, the arts and humanities play a unique role in the lives of our families, our communities, and our country; and

WHEREAS, despite significant losses due to the coronavirus pandemic, the creative industries remain among the most vital sectors of the American economy - providing new opportunities for developing cities, creating jobs and economic activity within their own industry and across sectors, and making communities attractive to business development; and

WHEREAS, the nation's arts and culture sector - nonprofit, commercial, education - is an \$877 billion industry that supports 4.6 million jobs representing 4.2% of the nation's economy, a larger share of GDP than powerhouse sectors such as agriculture, transportation, and utilities (2020); and boasts a \$33 billion international trade surplus (2019); and

WHEREAS, the nonprofit arts industry alone generates \$27.5 billion in government revenue and \$166.3 billion in economic activity (2015) annually by organizations and audiences - including spending by attendees to arts events of \$31.47 per person, per event, beyond the cost of admission on items such as meals, parking, and lodging, making the arts a vital income source for local businesses.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Eric Mikkelson, Mayor of the City of Prairie Village, do hereby proclaim October as National Arts and Humanities Month in the City of Prairie Village, Kansas, and call upon our community members to celebrate and promote the arts and culture in our nation, and to specifically encourage greater participation by said community members in taking action for the arts and humanities in their towns and cities.

Mayor Eric Mikkelson

Adam Geffert, City Clerk



**CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE
OCTOBER 3, 2022**

The City Council of Prairie Village, Kansas, met in regular session on Monday, October 3, at 6:00 p.m. Mayor Mikkelson presided.

ROLL CALL

Roll was called by the City Clerk with the following Councilmembers in attendance: Chad Herring, Cole Robinson, Inga Selders, Ron Nelson, Lauren Wolf, Bonnie Limbird, Dave Robinson, Piper Reimer, Greg Shelton, Courtney McFadden, Ian Graves and Terrence Gallagher. Staff present: Byron Roberson, Chief of Police; Keith Bredehoeft, Director of Public Works; Melissa Prenger, Public Works; City Attorney David Waters, attorney with Spencer Fane LLP; Wes Jordan, City Administrator; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Tim Schwartzkopf, Assistant City Administrator; Meghan Boom, Assistant City Administrator; Jason Hannaman, Finance Director; Adam Geffert, City Clerk.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Graves made a motion to amend the agenda for October 3, 2022, moving Old Business immediately after Presentations. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion, which passed 11-1, with Mr. Gallagher in opposition.

INTRODUCTION OF STUDENTS AND SCOUTS

There were no students or scouts present at the meeting.

PRESENTATIONS

- The Mayor read a proclamation recognizing October 10, 2022 as Gun Safety Awareness Day in the City of Prairie Village.
- Erin Brown and Kathleen Cussen from Dolce Bakery in the Village Shops shared information about the business and its recently opened event space.
- Andrew Meyer and Vlad Polishchuk of Stand with Ukraine KC gave an update on the country's war with Russia and ways to provide aid to Ukrainian citizens.
- Ms. Reimer introduced Teen Council members for the 2022-23 school year:



- David Allegri, Shawnee Mission East
- Ainsley Pyle, Shawnee Mission East
- Abigail Swanson, Shawnee Mission East (not present)
- Sneha Thomas, Shawnee Mission East
- Ava Van Alstyne, St. Teresa's Academy

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Graves said that based on resident feedback and additional research, an amendment removing multi-unit housing from the Ad Hoc Housing Committee's recommendations for neighborhoods zoned R-1 was appropriate. He recommended the following changes:

1. Amend the City's zoning regulations to allow quality, attainable housing, especially missing middle housing by-right in more zoning districts in the following ways:
 - Promote and remove impediments to accessory dwelling units in R-1A and R-1B districts
 - Consider ~~other~~ "neighborhood-scale" housing options in R-1A and R-1B ~~in the form of ,such as:~~
 - Small-lot detached, ~~single-family~~ houses
 - Council ~~directs~~ recommends the Planning Commission to exclude multi-family units traditionally associated with other residential zoning districts including but not limited to duplexes, 3- and 4-plexes, row houses, and apartments from consideration in R-1A and R-1B zones.
 - ~~Courtyard patterns~~
 - ~~Multi-unit houses~~

Mr. Graves moved to adopt the amended recommendations and to re-send them to the Planning Commission for consideration. Ms. Limbird seconded the motion.

Ms. Reimer stated that she agreed with the intent of the amendment but was concerned about the process of changing recommendations that came from a committee. Mr. Dave Robinson added that it was important to maintain due process rights for residents. Mrs. McFadden noted that it should be clarified that the amendment was being made by the Council rather than the Ad Hoc Housing Committee.

Mr. Graves revised his motion to the following: adopt the amended Council recommendations based on the Ad Hoc Housing Committee's recommendations and re-send them to the Planning Commission for consideration. Ms. Limbird seconded the motion.

After further discussion, a roll call vote was taken with the following votes cast: "aye": Herring, C. Robinson, Selders, Nelson, Wolf, Limbird, D. Robinson, Reimer, Shelton, McFadden, Graves, Gallagher. The motion passed unanimously.



PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The following residents voiced concerns regarding certain proposals recommended by the Ad Hoc Housing Committee.

- Frederick Lintecum, 9309 Linden Reserve Drive
- Jori Nelson, 4802 W. 69th Terrace
- Tricia Uhlmann, 8221 Nall Avenue
- Tom Clough, 8510 Delmar Street
- Gary Showater, 3518 W. 73rd Terrace
- Brenda Satterlee, 8600 Mission Road
- Brooke Morehead, 7921 Fontana Street
- Jan Bleakley, 8621 Delmar Street
- Barb Wheeler, 5204 W. 81st Street
- Anna Gepson, 5313 W. 70th Street
- Jim McGrath, 7178 Buena Vista Street
- Taylor Anthony, 4106 W. 68th Street
- Mary English, 4402 W. 71st Terrace
- Justin Green, 8717 Rosewood Drive
- Lindsey Stewart, 3400 W. 71st Street
- Mark Vianello, 5209 W. 83rd Terrace
- Karen Gibbons, 2904 W. 71st Street
- John Cantrell, 8236 Nall Avenue
- Lori Sharp, 3604 W. 71st Street
- Lucy Dailey, no address given
- John Anderson, 4402 W. 63rd Terrace

The following resident spoke in opposition to the proposed memorandum of understanding with the YMCA to collaborate in studying the market feasibility of building a community civic center:

- Sheila Myers, 4505 W. 82nd Street

The following resident provided questions and information for the Council to consider about the proposed memorandum of understanding with the YMCA:

- Dan Runion, 8417 Reinhardt Street

The following resident spoke in favor of the Ad Hoc Housing Committee's recommendations:

- Jameelah Lang, no address given



CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Mikkelson asked if there were any items to remove from the consent agenda for discussion:

- Approval of regular City Council meeting minutes - September 19, 2022

Mrs. McFadden made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Mr. Shelton said that the Tree Board's fall tree seminar would be held on October 5 at the Meadowbrook clubhouse.
- Ms. Limbird shared that the winning pieces from the Arts Council's State of the Arts event were now on display at Meadowbrook Park. She added that members of the Arts Council attended the Arts Council of Johnson County's symposium for Kansas arts councils and arts centers at the Johnson County Arts and Heritage Center.

MAYOR'S REPORT

- Mayor Mikkelson said that he had attended the following events since the previous Council meeting:
 - A Prairie Village Foundation meeting on September 20
 - The Shawnee Mission Education Foundation breakfast on September 22
 - A Northeast Johnson County Chamber of Commerce ribbon cutting at Body20 in Corinth Quarter on September 22
 - A MARC Board meeting
 - The Prairie Village Police Department's retiree lunch
 - A lunch recognizing the retirement of longtime Public Works employee Dennis Thompson
 - The Prairie Fields Homes Association's annual block party on September 24
- The Mayor reported that he would be attending the following event in the next week:
 - A Library Board meeting to discuss a planned new library in Prairie Village
- The Mayor shared dates for upcoming annual events:
 - The annual Christmas tree lighting ceremony would be held on December 1
 - The gingerbread house event would be held on December 4
- The Mayor said that he was a guest speaker at a UMKC honors class with other area mayors on September 21



- The Mayor noted the passing of Prairie Village resident John Trewolla

STAFF REPORTS

- Chief Roberson stated that a “Faith & Blue” event would be held at the Nall Avenue Church of the Nazarene on October 8.

NEW BUSINESS

COU2022-69

Ad Hoc Civic Center Committee

- 1. Consider updated market sustainability research proposal**
- 2. Consider memorandum of understanding with the YMCA to collaborate in studying the market feasibility of building a community civic center**

Mr. Graves said that the City had previously entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the YMCA of Greater Kansas City and the Johnson County Library to conduct a market feasibility study to measure community support of building a new YMCA/community center and library. The study was completed by Wiese Research Group and presented to Council in January 2020. As staff was preparing for the next steps of the project, the COVID pandemic occurred, and Council elected to place the project on hold.

Due to the extended timeframe of the completion of the previous study, Wiese Research Group recommended components of the survey specific to the civic center be completed again to affirm validation of previous community support. The questions specific to the library would no longer be included. To perform the survey, another MOU would be required with the YMCA.

Mark Hulet, Chief Operating Officer of the YMCA of Greater Kansas City, gave a presentation on the proposed MOU, noting that it was comprised of three different phases:

- Phase 1: Market sustainability study
- Phase 2: Community engagement evaluation
- Phase 3: Project design study

He shared information about programs offered by the YMCA, as well as images of recently constructed facilities in other communities to demonstrate how a new facility might look.

Mr. Jordan noted that the Wiese Research Group would again perform the study as it had in 2019. The total sample size for the phone phase of the 2019 study was 400 respondents across the entire market area. He said that Weise felt it could still provide accurate information with a smaller sample size of 300 respondents for this study. In addition, a supplemental sample of those living within the city limits of Prairie Village would be surveyed online, providing an expected total of approximately 600 respondents. The City would invite residents to participate by mailing each household a postcard containing a link to the web-based survey.



Mr. Graves made a motion to approve the proposed memorandum of understanding with the YMCA to collaborate in conducting a second market feasibility study at a cost not to exceed \$30,000. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

Mrs. McFadden asked what specifically would be validated by a second survey. Mayor Mikkelson said that he believed a new study was needed to confirm the results of the original study, in which 87% of Prairie Village residents indicated they would possibly use a community center assuming a reasonable cost, and 62% said they would be willing to pay a \$10 monthly tax to fund a center.

Mr. Shelton shared concern about the number of large projects currently underway, such as the potential remodel of City Hall and the Police Department, and whether adding another would be overwhelming for staff.

After further discussion, Mr. Dave Robinson made a motion to commit to send the revised survey and memorandum of understanding to the Ad Hoc Civic Center Committee for consideration. Mrs. McFadden seconded the motion.

Mr. Cole Robinson expressed concern about how the current YMCA facility had been allowed to fall into disrepair for a long period of time and noted that other nearby community centers were consistently losing money.

Ms. Selders made a motion to amend the motion to have a joint work session of the Ad Hoc Civic Center Committee and the City Council to review the revised survey and memorandum of understanding with the YMCA. Ms. Reimer seconded the motion, which failed 10-2, with Ms. Selders and Ms. Reimer in favor.

The motion to commit to send the revised survey and memorandum of understanding to the Ad Hoc Civic Center Committee for consideration passed 11-1, with Ms. Reimer in opposition.

COU2022-68 Consider updates to City Council Policy CP028 - remote participation for public meetings

Mr. Waters reported that the Kansas Attorney General had recently released new guidance regarding virtual public meetings. The guidance required cities to provide a physical place for the public to attend a meeting in-person, even if the meeting was held virtually.

As a result, Mr. Waters recommended revisions to the City’s remote meeting policy that specifically added the following language to provisions on predominantly remote meetings: “to the extent required by KOMA and any regulations, temporary or otherwise, issued in accordance with KOMA, the City shall provide an in-person alternative means to access and view the public meeting.”



Mr. Waters added that as the policy was currently drafted, the only time a fully remote meeting would be permitted was in a situation in which the Mayor had declared a state of local emergency, or if a committee chairperson in coordination with the City Administrator felt there was an applicable rule or regulation permitting a meeting to be held remotely.

The Council Committee of the Whole reviewed the proposed policy and provided suggestions at its September 19, 2022 meeting. Specifically, Councilmembers supported retaining the option to attend meetings remotely, when necessary, but allowing discretion regarding remote attendance at executive sessions. Mr. Waters incorporated those suggestions into the updated draft policy.

After discussion, Mrs. McFadden made a motion to approve the updates to Council Policy CP028 as presented. Mr. Cole Robinson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Wolf made a motion for the City Council to move to the Council Committee of the Whole portion of the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shelton and passed unanimously.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

COU2022-70

Finance Committee

- 1. Presentation by Victoria McGrath**
- 2. Discuss the 2022 compensation/classification study and consider recommendations of implementation from the Finance Committee**

Mr. Jordan gave a presentation on the compensation and benefit study performed by the McGrath Consulting Group. He noted that Council had previously decided to ask the consultant to develop a plan based on ranges that were above market average, at the 60th percentile. On September 14, 2022, McGrath gave a presentation on its recommendations to the Finance Committee and staff. After consideration and discussion at a second meeting on September 27, the Finance Committee approved the following recommendations to the City Council:

- Set new salary ranges based on 60% of the market average
- Add the following new classifications:
 - *Master Police Officer*
 - *City Engineer (new)*
 - *Assistant to the Public Works Director (new)*
 - *Accountant (new)*
 - *Deputy Court Clerk*
 - *Information Systems Administrator (new)*



PRAIRIE VILLAGE
KANSAS

- *Administrative Support Specialist II (new)*
- *Court Clerk II (new)*
- *Codes Support Specialist II (new)*
- *Deputy Police Chief*
- Move employees to the market rate (position point) within 3 to 5 years and continue that system of advancement through the respective ranges with an expectation of reaching “top out” by approximately year 12
- Continue to review and consider changes to improve work/life balance
- Consider alternatives to sick leave payout, such as making it tax-free
- Consult with McGrath on an annual basis to maintain the salary schedule
- Implement placement and adjustments beginning November 1, followed by a 1.5% salary range adjustment in January 2023:
 - Adjust current employees to meet the new range minimum - \$617,000
 - Increase lifeguard pay to \$14.50 per hour
- Make the following adjustments for salary compression - \$600,000
 - Classifications 50-100: \$492,000. Employees would be moved to the same placement percentage - if an employee was at 30% of the previous salary range, they would be moved to 30% of the new salary range
 - Classifications 105-150: \$108,000. Mid to upper-level management would be adjusted differently because a range percentage adjustment was unwarranted. Mid to upper-level management would be adjusted to year 1 in the new range with the exception of the Chief of Police, Public Works Director, and City Administrator who would be moved to year two based on tenure and/or level of responsibility.
- Associated costs - \$347,000
 - Increases to FICA, the police pension plan, KPERS, and Voya as well as incentives requiring adjustment based on new pay categories. The Police Department actuary projected the department’s portion would be approximately \$100,000 per year moving forward.
- 2023 salary range market adjustment - \$133,000 (based on a 1.5% increase)
- Total costs for implementation, adjustments and associated costs: \$1,697,000
- Budgeted funds to account for increases:
 - Total available funds - \$1,100,000
 - ARPA funds - \$500,000
 - 2023 budget - \$600,000
 - Use part of General Fund balance to fund the remaining \$597,000

At 10:38 p.m., Mr. Nelson made the following motion:

I move that the Governing Body recess into Executive Session for 30 minutes for the purpose of discussing salary and compensation matters of certain city employees, under the personnel matters of nonelected personnel justification pursuant to KSA 75-4319(b)(1). Present will be the members of



the Governing Body and the City Attorney. The regular meeting will resume at 11:08 p.m.

The Council Committee of the Whole session resumed at 11:08 p.m.

Ms. Wolf made the following motions:

1. To adopt the 2022 and 2023 salary ranges and employee classifications that reflects Council's goal of above average market ranges for recruitment and retention
2. To approve position title changes and/or change in responsibilities in conjunction with this study as presented
3. To adopt the recommended compensation system with the goal of moving employees to the market rate (position point) with 3 to 5 years and continue that system of advancement through the respective ranges with an expectation of reaching "top out" by approximately year 12
4. To continue and improve the "total rewards model" as presented
5. To approve the compensation implementation plan with projected annual costs of \$1,697,000 starting November 1, with a 1.5% salary range adjustment beginning January 2023
6. To approve staff's recommendations as specified to fund the compensation adjustments

Mr. Cole Robinson seconded each motion, all of which passed unanimously.

COU2022-71 Consider traffic calming on Cherokee Drive from 71st Terrace to 71st Street

Mr. Bredehoeft stated that residents along Cherokee Drive were seeking traffic calming measures and had met the requirements of the traffic calming program. The final petition exceeded the required 60% approval of residents to install measures, which would include two speed tables installed between 71st Terrace and 71st Street. Mr. Bredehoeft noted that speed tables had been successful installed in other parts of the City to slow vehicle traffic. He anticipated construction beginning in the fall of 2022, with \$10,000 in funding coming from the traffic calming CIP.

Mrs. McFadden made a motion to approve installation of traffic calming measures on Cherokee Drive between 71st Terrace and 71st Street as presented. Mr. Graves seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Discussion of Variety KC donation to Harmon Park inclusive playground

Ms. Prenger gave a presentation on a proposed donation from Variety KC for the planned new playground at Harmon Park. She noted that the project was in the current CIP with a



total budget of \$1,075,000, \$575,000 of which was estimated for the play equipment and play surface. Four vendors submitted playset plans for consideration.

Ms. Prenger said that a selection committee consisting of the Parks and Recreation Committee Chairs, Councilmembers Terrence Gallagher, Lauren Wolf and two staff members, was engaged to review the four submittals. Two playset designs were chosen and put on the City website for public survey. Over 400 participants responded to the survey, the majority of which preferred the playset submitted by All Inclusive Rec.

The City was then approached by Variety KC, a local charitable foundation, to incorporate a donation of \$250,000 - \$275,000 into the play area. The funding would be used in addition to the previously approved \$575,000 for the playset improvements, and would require the following:

1. Naming rights and signage at the playground
2. Installation of fencing around the perimeter of the play area

The design team, based on comments from the tour, proposed a fence of landscaping grasses in combination with seat walls and the three-rail fence style currently used along trails and at Wassmer Park. Unfortunately, this type of barrier would not meet the Variety KC standard of a hardscape fence in place to eliminate the concern of children wandering off. Neither of Variety KC's requirements met the normal standards of practice for the City.

Ms. Limbird asked how much donation money would remain after paying for the cost of the sign and the fence. Ms. Prenger estimated that at least half of the donation would need to be spent on fencing. Several councilmembers stated that they did not like the appearance of the sign. Mr. Gallagher added that the Parks and Recreation Committee was just beginning a park signage and branding project, and the proposed sign would conflict with that effort.

After further discussion, Ms. Limbird made a motion to authorize staff to move forward with the design of the playset without inclusion of the donated funds. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion, which passed 11-1, with Mrs. McFadden in opposition.

Ms. Limbird moved that the City Council end the Council Committee of the Whole portion of the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Graves and passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements were included in the Council meeting packet.

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Mikkelson declared the meeting adjourned at 11:40 p.m.



Adam Geffert
City Clerk

CITY TREASURER'S WARRANT REGISTER

DATE WARRANTS ISSUED:

Warrant Register Page No. 1

October 17, 2022

Copy of Ordinance
3019

Ordinance Page No. _____

An Ordinance Making Appropriate for the Payment of Certain Claims.

Be it ordained by the governing body of the City of Prairie Village, Kansas.

Section 1. That in order to pay the claims hereinafter stated which have been properly audited and approved, there is hereby appropriated out of funds in the City treasury the sum required for each claim.

NAME	DATE	AMOUNT	TOTAL
EXPENDITURES:			
Accounts Payable			
26938-27003	9/2/2022	322,347.94	
27004-27005	9/9/2022	1,981.86	
270066-27071	9/16/2022	548,296.83	
27072-27073	9/23/2022	1,679.35	
27074	9/27/2022	28,954.00	
27075-27151	9/30/2022	202,664.22	
Payroll Expenditures			
9/9/2022		416,032.34	
9/23/2022		387,986.76	
Electronic Payments			
Electronic Pmnts	9/1/2022	24,994.10	
	9/9/2022	7,645.21	
	9/13/2022	267.82	
	9/14/2022	5,263.10	
	9/30/2022	59,944.74	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:			2,008,058.27
Voided Checks	Check #	(Amount)	
Blaise Hinton	27094	(80.00)	
TOTAL VOIDED CHECKS:			(80.00)
GRAND TOTAL CLAIMS ORDINANCE			2,007,978.27

Section 2. That this ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Passed this 17th day of October 2022.


Signed or Approved this 17th day of October 2022.

ATTEST: _____

City Treasurer

ATTEST: _____


Finance Director



MAYOR

**Council Meeting Date: October 17, 2022
CONSENT AGENDA**

Consider Appointments to the Arts Council

RECOMMENDATION

Mayor Mikkelson requests Council ratification of the appointment of Justin Begnaud, Reese Naftel, McKay Stangler and Amy Bagnall to the Arts Council.

BACKGROUND

- Justin Begnaud - Justin recently moved back to the area after some years in Los Angeles as a film producer. He has a Master of Fine Arts degree and is heavily involved in non-profit charities, including art-related institutions.
- Reese Naftel - Reese retired from business as an armed services air traffic controller. He and his wife, Linda, moved to Prairie Village from Stanley about 4 years ago where they had previously lived for about 25 - 30 years. Reese has a Bachelor of Arts / Graphic Design degree from Auburn University.
- McKay Stangler - McKay is married to an artist, has an 8-year-old son and a baby on the way. He recently joined the Prairie Village Foundation Board of Directors but would like to be more involved. McKay is interested in broadening access and representation to include all residents of Prairie Village.
- Amy Bagnall - Amy has experience serving on non-profit boards that work with artists, and is currently on the board of Social Media Club - KC. She owns her own marketing firm and believes the strength of a community is buoyed by a strong vibrant arts culture.

ATTACHMENTS

Volunteer applications

PREPARED BY

Adam Geffert
City Clerk

Date: October 12, 2022

* Full Name
Justin Begnaud

* Full Address
4860 W 90th st
Prairie Village Ks 66207

* **Email**
justin.begnaud@gmail.com

* Phone
(816) 519-4913

* Select your City Ward
Ward 5

* **Please select your FIRST committee choice**
Arts Council

* **Please select your SECOND committee choice**
Environmental Committee

* **Please tell us about yourself, listing any special skills or experiences you have.**
I have a Master of Fine Arts and am heavily involved in non-profit charities, including arts related institutions.

This application is available November 1 through December 31 or when there are specific mid-year vacancies. Appointments are typically made by the end of February.

Thank you for your interest in serving our community.

* Full Name
Mr Reese Naftel

* Full Address
3901 W. 74th Street
Prairie Village ks 66208

* **Email**
naftelreese@gmail.com

* Phone
(816) 365-6124

* Select your City Ward
Ward 3

* **Please select your FIRST committee choice**
Arts Council

* **Please select your SECOND committee choice**
Parks & Recreation

* **Please select your THIRD committee choice**
Diversity Committee

* **Please tell us about yourself, listing any special skills or experiences you have.**

Retired Director of Marketing for a multi-national distribution company. Degree from Auburn University - Bachelor of Fine Arts /Graphic Design Former Air Force Air Traffic Controller -1969-1973 Married to Linda Adams for 45 years, two grown children.

This application is available November 1 through December 31 or when there are specific mid-year vacancies. Appointments are typically made by the end of February.

Thank you for your interest in serving our community.

* Full Name
McKay Stangler

* Full Address
7719 Mohawk Dr
Prairie Village KS 66208

* **Email**
pelicansandallies@gmail.com

* Phone
(913) 909-9302

* Select your City Ward
Ward 6

* **Please select your FIRST committee choice**
Arts Council

* **Please select your SECOND committee choice**
Environmental Committee

* **Please tell us about yourself, listing any special skills or experiences you have.**

Hello! I saw the item on Instagram about the Arts Council needing volunteers and I'd be delighted to help in any way I can. I am a PV resident (for the third time!) and a member of the board of directors of the Prairie Village Foundation. My wife is an artist who has exhibited at regional shows and businesses, and I care deeply about the role of the arts in our community -- particularly in broadening access and representation to encompass all residents of our city. I would love to help! Thanks!

This application is available November 1 through December 31 or when there are specific mid-year vacancies. Appointments are typically made by the end of February.

Thank you for your interest in serving our community.

* Full Name
Amy Bagnall

* Full Address
2408 W 76 St
Prairie Village KS 66208

* **Email**
amybagnall1@gmail.com

* Phone
(913) 226-7409

* Select your City Ward
Ward 6

* **Please select your FIRST committee choice**
Arts Council


* **Please select your SECOND committee choice**
Arts Council

* **Please tell us about yourself, listing any special skills or experiences you have.**

Board experience with GUILdIt, a non profit working with artists, currently on the board of the Social Media Club - KC. Own my own marketing firm and firmly believe the strength of a community is buoyed by a strong and vibrant arts culture.

This application is available November 1 through December 31 or when there are specific mid-year vacancies. Appointments are typically made by the end of February.

Thank you for your interest in serving our community.



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Council Committee Meeting: October 3, 2022

Council Meeting: October 17, 2022

COU2022-71

CONSIDER TRAFFIC CALMING ON CHEROKEE DRIVE FROM 71ST TERRACE TO 71ST STREET

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends City Council approve the installation of traffic calming measures on Cherokee Drive from 71st Terrace to 71st Street.

BACKGROUND

Residents along Cherokee Drive desire traffic calming measures and have met the requirements of the traffic calming program. The final petition exceeded 60% approval of the residents to install these measures. These measures will include two speed tables installed between 71st Terrace and 71st Street. Speed Tables have been successful in Prairie Village in the past and will help calm traffic on this section of Cherokee Drive. It is anticipated that these improvements will be built in the fall of 2022. The approximate cost of the two speed tables will be about \$10,000 with funds coming from the traffic calming CIP project.

Residents within the traffic calming project limits were notified that the project would be discussed at this council meeting.

FUNDING SOURCE

Funding is available under project TRAFRESV, Traffic Calming.

ATTACHMENTS

1. TranSystems Study

PREPARED BY

Keith Bredehoeft, Director of Public Works

September 28, 2022

**Cherokee Drive Traffic Calming Eligibility Study
71st Street to 71st Terrace**

**Prepared for
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE**

By



October 2021

Introduction

In accordance with your request, TranSystems Corporation has prepared the following traffic calming eligibility study for the roughly one-fourth of a mile segment of Cherokee Drive between 71st Street and 71st Terrace in Prairie Village, Kansas. The criteria used to determine eligibility for traffic calming measures are defined in the Prairie Village Traffic Calming Program. This section of Cherokee Drive is classified as a Local Street Traffic Calming Project with respect to the application of eligibility criteria. The street was evaluated using average daily traffic volumes, the 85th percentile speed of vehicles, and the percentage of cut-through traffic. A local street segment must receive a minimum score of 40 points in order to be eligible for a Local Street Traffic Calming Project.

Data Collection

Road Segment Inventory

As part of the data collection, we reviewed the study segments and documented various existing features which may affect vehicle speed. These included characteristics such as road width, horizontal and vertical alignment, parking practices, and roadside development. A summary of our findings is listed below:

- ▶ Cherokee Drive is a two-lane local residential street with curbs and gutters along both sides of the street. The street is generally 28 feet wide, measured between the backs of curb for the entire length. A sidewalk runs along the south side of the street for the entirety of the segment. The sidewalk is generally located 8 feet behind the curb.
- ▶ The posted speed limit on Cherokee Drive is 25 m.p.h.
- ▶ The segment of Cherokee Drive between 71st Street and 71st Terrace has horizontal curves. There is a reverse curve adjacent to 71st Street and another horizontal curve adjacent to 71st Terrace. The segment adjacent to Windsor Street is generally straight.
- ▶ The vertical alignment of the roadway is generally at a slight downhill grade as drivers travel southbound from 71st Street to 71st Terrace.
- ▶ The study segment of Cherokee Drive is located in a predominately residential area. Single-family homes are generally set back 40 to 60 feet from the street along the study segment. All of these homes have at least one driveway onto Cherokee Drive. Several commercial developments and a shopping center are located west of Cherokee Drive.
- ▶ There are no schools directly on Cherokee Drive. There is a park with tennis courts located south of Cherokee Drive along Windsor Street.
- ▶ On-street parallel parking is allowed on both sides of the street.
- ▶ Cherokee Drive is free-flowing between 71st Street and 71st Terrace with no control signage posted for through traffic. There are skewed three-leg intersections at 71st Street and 71st Terrace, with both of those streets being stop-sign controlled.
- ▶ There is one other local street intersection within the study segment. The tee-intersection at Windsor Street operates under stop-sign control for the side street.

Average Daily Traffic Volumes

TranSystems placed machine traffic volume counters at two locations along the study segment. The counters were in place from Tuesday, October 19, 2021 through Thursday, October 21, 2021. See the Appendix (Figure A-1) for the average daily traffic volume at each location. The average daily traffic volume was based on the three weekdays included in the count period. Detailed tabulations of the counts are included in the Appendix (Pages A-2 to A-3). The average daily traffic volume falls in the “Over 1,001 vehicle per day” range, per the Traffic Calming Program, corresponding to a score of 30 points.

Table 1 Vehicle Volume Data	
Location	Total Daily Traffic Volume (vehicles)
Cherokee Drive, west of Windsor Street	2,104
Cherokee Drive, east of Windsor Street	2,052

Vehicle Speeds

Spot speed studies were conducted using the vehicle speed-measuring feature of the traffic counters. The results of the studies are shown below in Table 2. Relative frequency distributions for the data have also been prepared and are included in the Appendix (Pages A-4 to A-5).

Table 2 Vehicle Speed Data		
Location	85th Percentile Speed (m.p.h.)	Average Speed (m.p.h.)
Cherokee Drive, west of Windsor Street	28.0	24.3
Cherokee Drive, east of Windsor Street	28.9	25.4

Table 2 shows that the measured 85th percentile speeds for the study segment average to approximately 28.5 mph. These 85th percentile speeds fall in the “0-5 m.p.h. over the posted speed limit” range, per the Traffic Calming Program, corresponding to a score of 0 points.

Cut-Through Traffic

Origin and destination surveys were conducted on Monday, October 18, 2021 between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. The percentage of cut-through traffic was determined from combining the recorded license plates at both the 71st Street and 71st Terrace intersections. It was found that the average amount of cut-through vehicles at both locations was 54 percent. This percentage corresponds to a score of 15 points, per the Traffic Calming Program.

Total Eligibility


The study segment of Cherokee Drive between 71st Street and 71st Terrace does meet the eligibility requirements as outlined in the Traffic Calming Program. According to the criteria, a street must receive a minimum score of 40 points in order to be eligible for traffic calming measures. Table 3 indicates that the study segment is assessed with **45 points**.

Table 3 Total Eligibility Cherokee Drive from 71st Street to 71st Terrace		
Eligibility Criteria	Measurement	Point Assessment
Average Daily Traffic Volumes	2,078 vehicles	30
85th Percentile Speeds	4 mph above limit	0
Cut-through Traffic	54 percent	15
Total Points:		45

We trust that the enclosed information proves beneficial to the City of Prairie Village. We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you and will be available to review this study at your convenience.

Sincerely,
TranSystems

By: 
Jeffrey J. Wilke, PE, PTOE


By: 
Emma H Martin, EIT

Appendix

Daily Traffic Volume and Travel Speed Summary Figure A-1

Daily Traffic Volume Counts A-2 to A-3

Spot Speed Studies A-4 to A-5




Daily Traffic Count

Prairie Village Traffic Calming Study

Prairie Village

Location: **Cherokee Drive east of Windsor Street**

Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL	Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL	Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL	Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL
12:00a	0	1	1	6:00a	4	4	9	12:00p	12	18	31	6:00p	21	18	40
12:15a	0	0	1	6:15a	3	7	10	12:15p	18	16	33	6:15p	17	21	39
12:30a	1	0	1	6:30a	3	5	8	12:30p	6	12	18	6:30p	18	20	37
12:45a	0	0	0	6:45a	7	11	18	12:45p	15	12	27	6:45p	15	16	31
1:00a	1	0	1	7:00a	10	13	23	1:00p	12	15	27	7:00p	17	16	33
1:15a	0	0	1	7:15a	11	21	32	1:15p	12	12	25	7:15p	15	9	24
1:30a	0	0	0	7:30a	14	31	45	1:30p	14	11	25	7:30p	13	6	20
1:45a	1	1	2	7:45a	42	42	84	1:45p	14	13	27	7:45p	12	7	19
2:00a	2	0	2	8:00a	27	43	70	2:00p	15	14	29	8:00p	14	5	19
2:15a	0	0	0	8:15a	17	30	47	2:15p	17	13	31	8:15p	8	4	13
2:30a	0	1	1	8:30a	16	25	41	2:30p	13	11	23	8:30p	8	5	13
2:45a	0	1	1	8:45a	12	19	31	2:45p	27	18	45	8:45p	6	4	10
3:00a	0	0	0	9:00a	14	15	29	3:00p	36	25	61	9:00p	8	5	13
3:15a	0	0	0	9:15a	14	11	25	3:15p	19	50	69	9:15p	5	1	6
3:30a	0	0	0	9:30a	10	10	19	3:30p	20	24	44	9:30p	6	3	9
3:45a	0	0	0	9:45a	10	13	23	3:45p	21	20	41	9:45p	6	2	8
4:00a	0	0	0	10:00a	10	13	23	4:00p	21	23	44	10:00p	3	4	7
4:15a	0	0	0	10:15a	13	11	25	4:15p	18	23	41	10:15p	3	2	6
4:30a	0	1	1	10:30a	9	14	23	4:30p	21	18	38	10:30p	2	0	3
4:45a	0	2	2	10:45a	9	13	21	4:45p	24	27	51	10:45p	2	2	4
5:00a	0	5	5	11:00a	13	15	27	5:00p	28	24	53	11:00p	0	1	1
5:15a	0	2	3	11:15a	12	14	26	5:15p	25	27	52	11:15p	1	0	2
5:30a	1	5	6	11:30a	16	17	32	5:30p	25	23	48	11:30p	1	1	2
5:45a	0	4	4	11:45a	13	18	31	5:45p	28	27	55	11:45p	1	0	1



HOURLY TOTALS

Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL
12:00a	1	1	3
1:00a	2	1	4
2:00a	2	2	4
3:00a	0	0	0
4:00a	0	3	3
5:00a	1	16	18
6:00a	17	27	45
7:00a	77	107	184
8:00a	72	117	189
9:00a	48	49	96
10:00a	41	51	92
11:00a	54	64	116
12:00p	51	58	109
1:00p	52	51	104
2:00p	72	56	128
3:00p	96	119	215
4:00p	84	91	174
5:00p	106	101	208
6:00p	71	75	147
7:00p	57	38	96
8:00p	36	18	55
9:00p	25	11	36
10:00p	10	8	20
11:00p	3	2	6

Approach	3-Day Average	AM Peak 7:30a - 8:30a	Noon Peak 11:00a - 12:00p	PM Peak 2:45p - 3:45p	Totals
Southbound		100	59	102	978
Northbound		146	69	117	1,066
TOTAL		246	127	219	2,052



TranSystems Corporation

2400 Pershing Road, Suite 400, Kansas City, Missouri 64108 (816) 329-8600


Daily Traffic Count

Prairie Village Traffic Calming Study

Prairie Village

Location: **Cherokee Drive west of Windsor Street**

Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL	Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL	Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL	Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL
12:00a	0	1	1	6:00a	1	5	6	12:00p	15	20	35	6:00p	18	19	37
12:15a	1	0	1	6:15a	1	7	8	12:15p	18	18	36	6:15p	19	20	39
12:30a	1	0	1	6:30a	4	6	10	12:30p	9	12	21	6:30p	19	22	41
12:45a	0	0	0	6:45a	7	11	18	12:45p	16	12	28	6:45p	18	19	36
1:00a	1	0	1	7:00a	5	15	20	1:00p	16	15	31	7:00p	17	16	33
1:15a	0	1	1	7:15a	12	17	29	1:15p	16	14	29	7:15p	14	9	22
1:30a	0	0	0	7:30a	30	25	55	1:30p	11	10	21	7:30p	14	7	21
1:45a	1	1	2	7:45a	35	31	66	1:45p	14	14	29	7:45p	13	6	19
2:00a	1	0	1	8:00a	23	34	57	2:00p	14	13	26	8:00p	11	4	16
2:15a	0	0	0	8:15a	19	34	53	2:15p	19	14	33	8:15p	10	6	16
2:30a	0	1	1	8:30a	20	28	48	2:30p	17	12	29	8:30p	11	4	15
2:45a	0	0	0	8:45a	16	23	40	2:45p	23	21	44	8:45p	6	5	11
3:00a	0	0	0	9:00a	14	16	30	3:00p	29	25	54	9:00p	7	6	13
3:15a	0	0	0	9:15a	13	12	26	3:15p	21	40	61	9:15p	4	3	7
3:30a	0	0	0	9:30a	10	9	19	3:30p	21	27	48	9:30p	6	3	9
3:45a	0	0	0	9:45a	10	15	24	3:45p	28	21	49	9:45p	4	1	5
4:00a	0	1	1	10:00a	15	12	27	4:00p	19	22	41	10:00p	5	5	10
4:15a	0	1	1	10:15a	15	11	26	4:15p	24	21	45	10:15p	2	1	4
4:30a	0	0	0	10:30a	11	17	28	4:30p	22	21	42	10:30p	2	1	3
4:45a	0	2	3	10:45a	11	14	25	4:45p	32	23	55	10:45p	2	2	4
5:00a	0	1	1	11:00a	14	13	28	5:00p	27	22	49	11:00p	0	2	2
5:15a	0	3	3	11:15a	15	14	29	5:15p	28	29	57	11:15p	1	1	2
5:30a	1	4	5	11:30a	22	17	39	5:30p	25	25	50	11:30p	1	1	2
5:45a	1	3	3	11:45a	19	18	37	5:45p	26	24	49	11:45p	1	1	1



HOURLY TOTALS

Period Start	SB	NB	TOTAL
12:00a	2	1	3
1:00a	2	2	4
2:00a	1	1	2
3:00a	0	0	0
4:00a	0	4	5
5:00a	2	11	12
6:00a	13	29	42
7:00a	82	88	170
8:00a	78	119	198
9:00a	47	52	99
10:00a	52	54	106
11:00a	70	62	133
12:00p	58	62	120
1:00p	57	53	110
2:00p	73	60	132
3:00p	99	113	212
4:00p	97	87	183
5:00p	106	100	205
6:00p	74	80	153
7:00p	58	38	95
8:00p	38	19	58
9:00p	21	13	34
10:00p	11	9	21
11:00p	3	5	7

Approach	3-Day Average	AM Peak 7:30a - 8:30a	Noon Peak 12:15p - 1:15p	PM Peak 3:00p - 4:00p	Totals
Southbound		107	74	99	1,044
Northbound		124	73	113	1,062
TOTAL		231	147	212	2,104



TranSystems Corporation


2400 Pershing Road, Suite 400, Kansas City, Missouri 64108 (816) 329-8600

SPOT SPEED STUDY RESULTS RELATIVE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

CITY: Prairie Village
OBSERVER: EHM
DATE: 10/20/2021

COUNTY: Johnson
SPEED LIMIT: 25
DIRECTION: SB+NB

LOCATION: Cherokee Drive East of Windsor Street
TIME START: 9:00 AM
TIME END: 3:00 PM



AVERAGE SPEED = 25.4
50th PERCENTILE = 25.2
85th PERCENTILE = 28.9
90th PERCENTILE = 29.9
95th PERCENTILE = 32.

PACE = 21 - 30
VEHICLES IN PACE = 539
% IN PACE = 78.8
% BELOW PACE = 11.8
% ABOVE PACE = 9.4


SAMPLE VARIANCE = 17.599077
STANDARD DEVIATION = 4.1951254
RANGE 1*S = 73.97661
RANGE 2*S = 94.44444
RANGE 3*S = 100.

SPOT SPEED STUDY RESULTS RELATIVE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

CITY: Prairie Village
OBSERVER: EHM
DATE: 10/20/2021

COUNTY: Johnson
SPEED LIMIT: 25
DIRECTION: SB+NB


LOCATION: Cherokee Drive West of Windsor Street
TIME START: 9:00 AM
TIME END: 3:00 PM



AVERAGE SPEED = 24.3
50th PERCENTILE = 23.9
85th PERCENTILE = 28.
90th PERCENTILE = 28.8
95th PERCENTILE = 30.2

PACE = 20 - 29
VEHICLES IN PACE = 594
% IN PACE = 79.2
% BELOW PACE = 11.7
% ABOVE PACE = 9.1

SAMPLE VARIANCE = 16.099619
STANDARD DEVIATION = 4.0124331
RANGE 1*S = 73.46667
RANGE 2*S = 95.86667
RANGE 3*S = 100.



HUMAN RESOURCES

City Council Meeting Date: October 17, 2022

COU2022-71

Consideration of 2023 City health, dental, and vision insurance providers, as recommended by City staff

SUGGESTED MOTION

Make a motion to approve the City's employee insurance benefit package for 2023 as presented.

A CBIZ representative will be in attendance at Monday night's meeting.

MEDICAL RENEWAL

CBIZ provided our renewal summary for 2023. The City is within its first year with the Cigna health plan, therefore only able to utilize the rating period of 1/1/2022-06/30/2022.

During the initial contract negotiations, the City was able to obtain a 12% rate cap to apply to the 2023 renewal year. In addition to the rate cap, the City's Wellness program provided up to 4% renewal rate savings for the 2023 premium costs. The City successfully completed all four wellness categories to receive the savings. Therefore, the renewal rate increase for 2023 is averaged at 8% of our two plan options.

The Cigna plan will continue to include; a wellness program employees can participate in for Wellness reimbursement, MotivateMe Incentive awards, Healthy Rate renewal program, and Identity Theft Protection.

The insurance package was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Insurance Committee.

Rate breakout between City and Employee - Monthly Rates

QHDHP/HSA	2022 Current			2023 Renewal		
	Total \$	City \$	Employee \$	Total \$	City \$	Employee \$
Employee Only	\$608.71	\$695.45	(\$86.74)	\$651.12	\$751.92	(\$100.80)
Employee + 1	\$1,217.42	\$1,154.45	\$62.97	\$1,305.21	\$1,250.64	\$54.57
Family	\$1,947.87	\$1,780.34	\$167.53	\$2,090.10	\$1,930.13	\$159.97
BASE						
Employee Only	\$695.45	\$695.45	\$0.00	\$751.92	\$751.92	\$0.00
Employee + 1	\$1,390.90	\$1,154.45	\$236.45	\$1,506.79	\$1,250.64	\$256.15
Family	\$2,225.43	\$1,780.34	\$445.09	\$2,412.66	\$1,930.13	\$482.53

*As a reminder, the Governing Body is eligible for plan coverage but are responsible for paying the total premium cost.

RENEWAL HISTORY

- 01/01/2022: Cigna health plan was selected as new provider for 2022. Premium was negotiated at 9.05% increase (vs. a 12% and premium holiday from former United Health Care plan). A 12% rate cap was implemented for 2023. Additional discounts up to 4% based on “stacked” savings from achieving wellness incentives. Full Insured Plus contract provides potential refund based on claims experience with no penalty for deficit. The Contract also allows for refund of 50% of surplus at year end. Renewal calculation is based on 42% credibility and 58% manual rating. Renewal increase of 12%, with wellness reductions provided an overall 8% increase. 2023 wellness credits can be earned up to 6% for 2024 rate reduction.
- 01/01/2021: The initial renewal calculated at an 11.84% increase. UHC delivered it at 9.9%. CBIZ negotiated the final renewal offer to 7.9% with no plan changes for an approximate savings of \$23,987. UHC provided a premium credit of approximately \$10,000 in July, 2020 (based on premium numbers in May of 2020). UHC also suppressed all claim reporting for the last 3 months due to COVID-19. The paid loss ratio for the rating period (5/1/19 -4/30/20) was 71.4%, vs. 74.8% for the prior 12 months (this includes an adjustment of \$102,000 premium credit in December of 2018). The paid loss ratio does not include costs for administration, pooling or trend. Also, due to artificially lower claims in February and March of 2020 due to the pandemic, UHC added a renewal adjustment of +3% in the renewal ratings of their total book of business.
- 1/1/2020 Medical renewal rate as presented by United Healthcare (UHC) had a 0.0% increase with no plan changes. Renewals are on the claims incurred by plan participants over the twelve-month period of July 2018 - June 2019 and by forecasting potential claims. The loss ratio during this time was 61.5%, (*this does not include a premium credit of \$102,000 for December, 2018*), as compared to 63.4% for the same period last year. Taxes and/or fees that are required due to the Affordable Care Act (ACA) returned for 2020. This tax is included in the renewal increase for 2020.
- 1/1/19: Due to ongoing large claims, UHC initially proposed an increase of 10.4% which CBIZ negotiated to 8.4% with no plan changes; CBIZ also negotiated a one month premium holiday for December 2018 that saved the City approximately \$102,197; renewal included a \$10,000 wellness fund; the ACA Health Excise Tax was suspended in 2019; UHC began sharing manufacturer drug rebates with fully insured members at point of sale.

DENTAL COVERAGE

Delta Dental of Kansas, the City’s dental insurance provider is renewing at 0% with a 1 year rate guarantee.

VISION COVERAGE

The City’s vision insurance provider, Superior Vision, is renewing at 0% with a 4 year rate guarantee. The plan is renewing as Superior by Metlife.

LIFE INSURANCE/ACCIDENTAL DEATH AND DISABILITY

The Standard provides base life insurance and AD&D for the City. The Standard plan is within a 2 year rate guarantee.

DISABILITY COVERAGE

The City uses The Standard as the City’s long-term disability insurance provider. The Standard is renewing at 0% with a 2 year rate guarantee.

Employee Assistance Program (EAP)

The City uses LifeWorks as the City’s employee assistance provider. LifeWorks is within a 2 year rate guarantee.

ACA Taxes/Fees

Excise Tax is suspended indefinitely
PCOR Fee is still in place
Cadillac tax is permanently repealed.

FUNDING SOURCE


Employee insurance premiums are a General Fund expenditure. The 2023 budget anticipated an increase in City premium contributions of 12.5%. The renewal rates for the health, dental, and vision plans fit within the budgeted funds for 2023. Since the budget renewals came in lower than expected, the City is projected a budget savings of approximately \$76,000.

2023 Renewal Costs	
Health Insurance	\$1,510,807
Dental Insurance	\$ 34,153
Vision Insurance	\$ 7,271
Life Insurance	\$ 1,118
Police Dept Life Insurance	\$ 21,790
Long Term Disability	\$ 23,261
Total:	\$1,598,400

2023 Budget: \$ 1,674,779

PREPARED BY

Cindy Volanti
HR Manager
Date: October 11, 2022



October 17th, 2022

2023

**RENEWAL
PLANNING**

City of Prairie Village



CBIZ



Table of Contents




Agenda Item	Page #
Section 1: Summary of Current Programs	3
Section 2: Ancillary Line Renewals	7
Section 3: Medical Performance	9
Section 4: Medical Renewal	12



SECTION

1

**SUMMARY OF
CURRENT
PROGRAMS**





Summary of Current Programs and Renewal Dates

COVERAGE	CARRIER	RENEWAL DATE	NOTES
Medical	Cigna	1/1/2023	Renewing this year
Dental	Delta Dental of Kansas	1/1/2023	Renewing this year
Vision	Superior	1/1/2023	Renewing this year
Life/Voluntary Life	Standard	1/1/2025	In rate guarantee
Short Term Disability	Standard	1/1/2025	In rate guarantee
Long Term Disability	Standard	1/1/2025	In rate guarantee
Employee Assistance Program	LifeWorks	1/1/2023	In rate guarantee

2022 Renewal History



MEDICAL

- United Healthcare provided renewal at 16% with no plan changes. After negotiations, they offered an increase of 12% with a ¼ premium holiday (equivalent to \$27,070) with no plan changes.
- Sent Request for Proposal to Aetna, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas City, Cigna, Humana, and Midwest Public Risk (MPR), in addition to United Healthcare.
- Received competitive proposals from Aetna, Cigna, and Humana; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas City was not competitive and Midwest Public Risk declined.
- The City moved to Cigna effective 1/1/2022 with a 9.05% increase overall

DENTAL

- Delta Dental rates guaranteed until 1/1/2023

VISION

- Superior rates guaranteed until 1/1/2023

LIFE AND VOLUNTARY LIFE INSURANCE

- Standard renewed at 0% with a 2 year rate guarantee

2022 Renewal History



VOLUNTARY SHORT TERM DISABILITY

- Standard renewed at 0% with a 2 year rate guarantee

LONG TERM DISABILITY

- Standard renewed at 0% with a 2 year rate guarantee

EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM


- Conducted RFP. Moved from New Directions to LifeWorks



SECTION

2

**2023 ANCILLARY
LINE RENEWALS**



2023 Ancillary Lines Renewals


-  **DENTAL**
Delta Dental renewing at 0% for one year
-  **VISION**
Superior renewing at 0% with a 4 year rate guarantee
Renewing as Superior by Metlife
-  **LIFE & VOLUNTARY LIFE**
Standard in a 2 year rate guarantee
-  **SHORT TERM DISABILITY**
Standard in a 2 year rate guarantee
-  **LONG TERM DISABILITY**
Standard in a 2 year rate guarantee
-  **EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**
LifeWorks in 2 year rate guarantee



SECTION

3

**MEDICAL
PERFORMANCE**



Medical Premium and Claims



Cigna

Medical Premium and Claims Report for CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE



ADVICE Reporting System

Page 1 of 1
Date: 8/3/2022

This report contains proprietary and/or confidential information. Disclosure is strictly prohibited except to the extent required by law.

CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE

MONTHLY CLAIM REPORT

January 2022 thru June 2022

YTD/MONTH	In Network	Out of Network	Pharmacy	Total Paid Claims	Total Premium	Subscribers	Members
Jan-22	\$15,990	\$181	\$28,033	\$44,215	\$98,288*	104	193
Feb-22	\$28,100	\$0	\$15,993	\$44,691	\$111,954	105	194
Mar-22	\$40,019	\$598	\$45,028	\$86,337	\$110,619	104	192
Apr-22	\$45,928	\$149	\$31,025	\$77,815	\$108,749	103	187
May-22	\$44,493	\$149	\$41,671	\$87,055	\$108,829	104	187
Jun-22	\$19,905	\$0	\$15,994	\$36,699	\$109,412	105	188
Grand Total				\$376,812	\$647,851	104 (average)	189 (average)

Paid Loss Ratio: 58%

This calculation does not include the cost for establishing reserves for incurred but not recorded claims, administration, pooling, or trend.

* First month's premium was credited by \$13,000 for Implementation Credit. \$2,000 charge due to premium payment by check.

Large Claims



CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE
DE-IDENTIFIED CLAIMS EXCEEDING REPORT
January 2022 thru June 2022

Rating Type : POOLED STOP LOSS, RETROSPECTIVE EXPERIENCE RATED

Claims Exceeding : \$25,000.00

Note: Diagnosis is based on the largest medical claim amount

FUNDING TY	RATING TY	MEMBER ID	REL CD	CD CODE	DRUG CLAIMS	PAID CLAIMS	CLAIMANT TOTAL
1	R	1	SP	O034	\$0	\$25,921	\$25,921
1	R	2	SB	C44712	\$79,625	\$1,314	\$80,939
1	R	3	SP	R002	\$38,659	\$6,480	\$45,139
1	R	4	SB	K5720	\$74	\$27,780	\$27,854
Grand Total					\$118,359	\$61,495	\$179,853





SECTION

4

MEDICAL RENEWAL

Medical Plan Renewal Summary 2023

- On 1/1/22, implemented Cigna plan with following negotiated provisions:
 - Premium at 9.05% increase(vs. 12% and premium holiday from current UHC plan)
 - 12% rate cap for 1/1/23
 - Additional discounts of up to 4% based on “stacked” savings from achieved wellness savings
 - Participating contract (Fully Insured Plus) which provides potential refund based on claims experience with no penalty for deficit
- Participating contract would allow refund of 50% of surplus at year end
 - As of 7/31/2022, status of surplus is (\$84,283) after claims, pooling cost, administrative cost and establishing reserves
- Renewal calculation is based on 42% credibility(City’s Experience) and 58% manual rating
- Calculation calls for renewal increase of 12%(negotiated rate cap); with negotiated wellness reductions, final increase is overall 8%
- 2023 wellness credits can be up to 6% if targets are increased

Healthy Rate Decrement for 2023

YEAR 1 RENEWAL RATE SAVINGS

YEAR 2 RENEWAL RATE SAVINGS

**STACK
YOUR
SAVINGS**

1%
savings when
35% of eligible
employees
get an annual
physical

Preventive care

Annual physicals can catch issues while they're still small.

1%
savings when
40% of eligible
employees
get an annual
physical



Extra **0.5%** savings when 45% of eligible employees get an annual physical

1%
savings when
40% of eligible
employees
complete
a health
assessment

Health assessment

It only takes a few minutes to complete at myCigna.com.

1%
savings when
45% of eligible
employees
complete
a health
assessment



Extra **0.5%** savings when 50% of eligible employees complete a health assessment

1%
savings when
10% of eligible
employees
participate in
My Health
Assistant

My Health Assistant

Online coaching on myCigna.com that helps employees track their progress and reach their goal.

1%
savings when
15% of eligible
employees
participate in
My Health
Assistant



Extra **0.5%** savings when 20% of eligible employees participate in My Health Assistant

1%
savings when
employees
complete one
challenge

Cigna employer challenge

A fun way to bond and inspire more active lifestyles over a six-week period.

1%
savings when
employees
complete one
challenge



Extra **0.5%** savings when employees complete two challenges

Medical Comparison



MEDICAL			
Carrier Website			
Plan Type			
Annual Deductible (calendar year) ⁽¹⁾			
Individual			
Family			
Coinsurance			
Member Pays			
Maximum Out-of-Pocket (calendar year) ⁽²⁾			
Individual			
Family			
Physician Services			
Preventive Care			
Office Visits			
Diagnostic (Non-routine) X-Ray			
Diagnostic (Non-routine) Labs			
Routine Eye Exam (every year)			
Chiropractic Services (40 visits)			
Urgent Care Center			
Hospital Services			
Inpatient Care			
Outpatient Surgery and Services			
High Tech Diagnostics			
Ambulance			
Emergency Room			
Prescription Drugs			
Level 1			
Level 2			
Level 3			
Mail Order (90 Day Supply)			
Rates			
MONTHLY RATES	QHDHP	Base	Total
Employee Only	27	42	69
Employee + One	3	10	13
Employee + Family	17	6	23
TOTAL MEMBERSHIP	47	58	105

Cigna	
www.cigna.com	
QHDHP ChoiceCare	
In Network	Out of Network
Annual Deductible (calendar year) ⁽¹⁾	
Individual	\$3,000
Family	\$6,000
Coinsurance	
Member Pays	10%
Maximum Out-of-Pocket (calendar year) ⁽²⁾	
Individual	\$3,000
Family	\$6,000
Physician Services	
Preventive Care	\$0
Office Visits	Deductible then 10%
Diagnostic (Non-routine) X-Ray	Deductible then 10%
Diagnostic (Non-routine) Labs	Deductible then 10%
Routine Eye Exam (every year)	Not covered
Chiropractic Services (40 visits)	Deductible then 10%
Urgent Care Center	Deductible then 10%
Hospital Services	
Inpatient Care	Deductible then 10%
Outpatient Surgery and Services	Deductible then 10%
High Tech Diagnostics	Deductible then 10%
Ambulance	Deductible then 10%
Emergency Room	Deductible then 10%
Prescription Drugs	
Level 1	Deductible then \$10
Level 2	Deductible then \$35
Level 3	Deductible then \$60
Mail Order (90 Day Supply)	Deductible then 2.5x Copays
45% of Membership	
Current	Renewal
Employee Only	\$605.96
Employee + One	\$1,214.67
Employee + Family	\$1,945.12
	\$651.12
	\$1,305.21
	\$2,090.10

Cigna	
www.cigna.com	
Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	
In Network Only	Out of Network
Annual Deductible (calendar year) ⁽¹⁾	
Individual	N/A
Family	N/A
Coinsurance	
Member Pays	30%
Maximum Out-of-Pocket (calendar year) ⁽²⁾	
Individual	\$5,500
Family	\$10,000
Physician Services	
Preventive Care	\$0
Office Visits	\$35 / \$70*
Diagnostic (Non-routine) X-Ray	\$0
Diagnostic (Non-routine) Labs	\$0
Routine Eye Exam (every year)	Not covered
Chiropractic Services (40 visits)	\$70
Urgent Care Center	\$70
Hospital Services	
Inpatient Care	30%
Outpatient Surgery and Services	30%
High Tech Diagnostics	30%
Ambulance	30%
Emergency Room	\$250 then 30%
Prescription Drugs	
Level 1	\$10
Level 2	\$35
Level 3	\$60
Mail Order (90 Day Supply)	2.5x Copays
55% of Membership	
Current	Renewal
Employee Only	\$692.70
Employee + One	\$1,388.15
Employee + Family	\$2,222.68
	\$751.92
	\$1,506.79
	\$2,412.66

Employee Contributions			
MONTHLY RATES	QHDHP	Base	Total
Employee Only	27	42	69
Employee + One	3	10	13
Employee + Family	17	6	23

Current	Renewal
\$62.51	\$54.57
\$166.98	\$159.97

Current	Renewal
\$235.99	\$256.15
\$444.54	\$482.53

Employer Contributions			
MONTHLY RATES	QHDHP	Base	Total
Employee Only	27	42	69
Employee + One	3	10	13
Family	17	6	23


Current	Renewal
\$1,152.16	\$1,250.64
\$1,778.14	\$1,930.13

Current	Renewal
\$1,152.16	\$1,250.64
\$1,778.14	\$1,930.13

Annual City Cost
Annual Increase to City Cost

Current \$1,244,061
Renewal \$1,350,404
\$106,343

	2022 ER %	2023 ER %
Employee Only	100.00%	100.00%
Employee + One	83.00%	83.00%
Employee + Family	80.00%	80.00%



FINANCE COMMITTEE

Council Committee Meeting Date: October 3, 2022

City Council Meeting Date: October 17, 2022

COU2022-70: Discuss the 2022 Compensation/Classification Study and consider recommendations of implementation from the Finance Committee.

SUGGESTED MOTIONS

1. Move to approve Position Title Changes and/or change in responsibilities in conjunction with this study as presented.
2. Move to adopt the 2022 and 2023 Salary Ranges & Employee Classifications that reflects Council's goal of above average market ranges for recruitment and retention.
3. Move to adopt the recommended Compensation System with the goal of moving employees to the market rate (position point) within 3 to 5 years and continue that system of advancement through the respective ranges with an expectation of reaching "top out" by approximately year 12.
4. Move to continue and improve the Total Rewards Model as presented.
5. Move to approve the compensation implementation costs of \$1,697,000 starting November 2022 with a 1.5% salary range adjustment beginning in January 2023.
6. Move to approve staff's recommendations as specified to fund the new compensation adjustments.

BACKGROUND

City Council commissioned McGrath Human Resources Group to complete a compensation and benefits study after receiving input from the Governing Body learning their philosophy where in the market the City should strive to pay and provide benefits to employees. Victoria McGrath has completed the study (attached) and shared her findings and recommendations with the Finance Committee on September 14, 2022. She will also be present to address the City Council and answer questions.

At its October 3, 2022 meeting, the Council Committee of the Whole voted unanimously to recommend approval of all six motions to the City Council.

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Staff reviewed implementation strategies of the study with the Finance Committee and subsequently provided staff recommendations for consideration (see attached Finance Committee Agenda dated September 14, 2022, for complete narrative). Staff also met with the Finance Committee on September 27 to review proposed implementation strategies and final budgetary costs:

COMPENSATION PHILOSOPHY - As an overarching goal of the study, McGrath was provided direction by the City Council to provide data points where Prairie Village would be above the market average when establishing pay ranges and benefit analysis. McGrath determined that the 60% percentile met the Council and Staff goal of achieving above market averages.

Staff Recommendation - Staff concurs that the 60% percentile analysis has met the goals as directed.

POSITION PLACEMENT - McGrath completed a salary schedule (attached) based upon a position questionnaire, market analysis, compression analysis, and internal equity through executive team input & education.

Staff Recommendation - Staff concurs with the job classifications as positioned within the new salary ranges.

Position Title Recommendations

Staff Recommendation - Staff proposed the following title changes and/or change in responsibilities in conjunction with this study

- *Master Police Officer*
- *City Engineer (new)*
- *Assistant to the Public Works Director (new)*
- *Accountant (new)*
- *Deputy Court Clerk*
- *Information Systems Administrator (new)*
- *Administrative Support Specialist II (new)*
- *Court Clerk II (new)*
- *Codes Support Specialist II (new)*
- *Deputy Police Chief*

COMPENSATION SYSTEM - The current compensation system places an employee at the salary range mid-point by the completion of their 7th year of service. The recommendation from McGrath is to move employees to the market rate (Position Point) within 3 to 5 years and continue that system of advancement through the respective ranges with an expectation of reaching “top out” by approximately year 12.

Staff Recommendation - Staff supports this overall concept and is consistent with the current compensation philosophy. Staff did try to project future costs of this system and projected if the salary ranges moved 1.5% annually, the merit increase would be approximately 4%.

TOTAL REWARDS MODEL - The following areas were reviewed to determine how the current system and strategies are positioned in the market:

- Wages
- Benefits
- Well-being (including work/life balance strategies)
- Employee Development
- Recognition

Staff Recommendation - Continue current program and initiatives. We will continue to review and consider changes where possible to improve work/life balance.

INSURANCE PREMIUMS - Current City expense and/or shared costs of insurance premiums:

- Employee Only - 100%
- Employee Plus One - 83%
- Family - 80%

McGrath recommended that the City should discuss family premium amount to position the City higher in the market.

Staff Recommendation - Staff believes this recommendation should be further discussed and evaluated by staff in the future; however, the current focus is based on compensation due to costs.

VACATION/SICK LEAVE

Staff Recommendation - No changes

SICK LEAVE PAYOUT PROVISIONS - The recommendation is to consider alternatives where this payout (upon retirement or resignation) would be tax free or deferred to assist employees with future health care or retirement needs.

Staff Recommendation - This would be at no cost to the City, Human Resources could review this suggestion at a later date.

MAINTENANCE OF SALARY SCHEDULE - McGrath has recommended the City consider a procedure to adjust the salary schedule on an annual basis.

Staff Recommendation - This is the current process, and staff would consult with McGrath on an annual basis for appropriate adjustments.

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS - McGrath has recommended that the City consider a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment at the first of each year then followed by a merit adjustment in July.

Staff Recommendation - Staff would like to retain the current system of merit and can factor in other market factors if warranted.

EMPLOYEE PLACEMENT AND ADJUSTMENT - Staff reviewed several implementation strategies if the proposed the salary ranges are adopted as presented and sought input and guidance from the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee made the following recommendations based on the implementation started November 1st, with a 1.5% salary range adjustment beginning in January 2023.

1. Adjust current employees to meet the new range minimum - \$617,000.
Lifeguards would increase to \$14.50 per hour.
2. Adjustments for salary compression - \$600,000 .
 - Classifications 50-100: \$492,000. Employee would be moved to the same placement percentage - if an employee was at the 30% of the previous salary range they were moved to the 30% of the new salary range.
 - Classifications 105-150: \$108,000. Mid to upper level management would be adjusted differently because a range percentage adjustment is unwarranted. Mid to upper level management would be adjusted to year 1 in the new range with the exception of the Chief of Police, Public Works Director, and City Administrator who would be moved to year 2 based on tenure and/or level of responsibility.
3. Associated Costs - \$347,000. There will be other associated increases to the FICA, PD Pension Plan, KPERS, and VOYA as well as incentives that will need to be adjusted based on new pay categories. The PD actuary projected the PD portion would be approximately \$100,000 per year moving forward.
4. 2023 Salary Range Market Adjustment - \$133,000. Staff has forecasted the 2023 salary ranges should increase by 1.5%.

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

- New Range Minimums - \$617,000 (including lifeguards)
- Compression Adjustment - \$600,000
- Associated Costs - \$347,000
 - FICA - \$97,000
 - KPERS - \$76,000
 - VOYA - \$74,000
 - PD Pension - \$100,000
- 2023 1.5% Salary Range Adjustment - \$133,000
- **TOTAL - \$1,697,000**

BUDGETED FUNDS TO ACCOUNT FOR INCREASES

- Total available funds - \$1,100,000
 - ARPA - \$500,000
 - 2023 Budget - \$600,000
- Implementation Costs - \$1,697,000
- How to Fund the \$597,000 Difference?
 - Staff recommends using the General Fund balance since we are now projecting 1.8 million over what was forecasted for the 2023 budget due to strength in sales and use tax

ATTACHMENTS

- Compensation and Classification Study Executive Report by McGrath Human Resources Group
- Proposed 2022-2023 Salary Ranges

PREPARED BY

Wes Jordan
City Administrator
Date: September 28, 2022



Compensation and Classification Study Executive Report

for

City of Prairie Village, KS



August 2022



McGrath Consulting Group, Inc.
P.O. Box 865
Jamestown, TN 38556
Office (815) 728-9111
Fax (815) 331-0215
www.mcgrathconsulting.com

©Copyright 2022 McGrath Human Resources Group. All rights reserved.
No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording or otherwise without the expressed written permission of McGrath Consulting Group, Inc.

Table of Contents

Introduction5

Methodology6

 Data Collection..... 6

 Labor Market 6

 Market Data Solicited 7

Market Analysis7

 Minimum Salary Comparison 8

 Midpoint Salary Comparison 9

 Average Market Salary Analysis..... 10

 Maximum Salary Comparison..... 11

 Above Market Analysis 12

Current Compensation System 13

Other Factors..... 14

 Public Sector Turnover/Recruitment Challenges 14

 The Great Resignation and Private Sector Influence 15

 Employee Demographics 15

Top Motivators for Employee Retention..... 17

Compensation Philosophy..... 18

Recommended Salary Schedule..... 18

 Position Placement 19

 Position Title Recommendations 19

Employee Placement 19

General Operational Guidelines 20

 Maintenance of Salary Schedule 20

 Salary Schedule Adjustments 20

 Annual Performance Adjustments 20

 Employee Market Adjustments 20

 Market Updates 21

Total Rewards Model..... 22

Benefits..... 25

 Health Insurance 25

 Plan Design Overview 25

 Premiums..... 25

 Expected Employee Cost 27

 Maximum Employee Cost..... 29

 Other Benefits..... 31

 Payout Provisions..... 32

Appendix A: Recommended Salary Schedule 33

Appendix B: Definitions..... 36

Figure 1: Minimum Analysis Summary8

Figure 2: Midpoint Analysis Summary..... 10

Figure 3: Incumbent Analysis Summary 11

Figure 4: Maximum Analysis Summary 12

Figure 5: Schedule Minimum to Market Minimum at the 50th, 60th and 65th Percentiles..... 12

Figure 6: Public Sector Recruitment Trends..... 14

Figure 7: Employee Demographics by Age Group15

Figure 8: Employee Demographics by Years of Service16

Table 1: Comparable Organizations6

Table 2: Benchmark Position Minimums below Average Market Minimum9

Table 3: Benchmark Positions Midpoint Below Average Market Rate10

Table 4: Benchmark Incumbents Below Average Market Rate11

Table 5: Health Plan Summary.....25

Table 6: Single Plan Premium Comparison25

Table 7: Family Plan Premium Comparison26

Table 8: Single Plan Comparable Review.....27

Table 9: Family Plan Comparable Review28

Table 10: Single Plan Maximum Risk Comparative Review29

Table 11: Family Plan Maximum Risk Comparative Review30

Introduction

McGrath Human Resources Group, Inc. (Consultants), an organization that specializes in public sector consulting, was commissioned by City of Prairie Village, Kansas (City), to conduct a comprehensive Compensation and Classification Study (Study) for all positions. The purpose of this Study was to:

- ❖ Guide the City in confirming their pay philosophy including their desired position in the market;
- ❖ Review the City's existing compensation plan and classifications;
- ❖ Obtain and establish benchmark compensation data from the external market through a survey of mutually-identified, comparable entities;
- ❖ Obtain information on each job title/position for a job evaluation through department meetings, job descriptions, and position description questionnaires;
- ❖ Define and update the City's classification system, as needed;
- ❖ Establish internal equity among positions within the City through a job evaluation point factor process;
- ❖ Integrate the data from the external market, internal market, and job evaluations to develop a comprehensive compensation system by updating current schedules or designing a new salary schedule to align with their compensation philosophy;
- ❖ Prepare a cost analysis for implementation of recommended changes;
- ❖ Review and recommend compensation policy and procedure changes that will assure consistent implementation and application of compensation;
- ❖ Provide a plan for the City to provide on-going maintenance of the system independently; and
- ❖ Provide an analysis of City benefits for market competitiveness.

The Consultants would like to extend their appreciation to the City Administrator, Deputy City Administrator, Human Resources Manager, Department Directors, and employees for their time and cooperation, as well as sharing their information and perceptions.

Methodology

Data Collection

This project involved the following three (3) steps: (1) collection of data, (2) interviews, and (3) data analysis. The first step involved the gathering of data that pertains to current compensation practices within the City. The Consultants received information relating to current salaries, specific policies, collected market data, and current job descriptions.

Interviews were conducted with the City Administrator, Deputy City Administrator, Human Resources Manager, Department Directors, and other management personnel within each department. The purpose of these meetings was to first, gain an understanding of the City’s current compensation practices and philosophy; secondly, to solicit ideas and input from these stakeholders for future compensation methodologies and practices; and finally, to determine whether it’s difficult to recruit or retain employees for any positions within the City and whether any of the positions have unique responsibilities. Employees were then asked to complete a Position Questionnaire (PQ) which provided extensive information about their positions. The Consultants analyzed the PQs completed by the employees, previously reviewed by supervisory employees, to gain a better understanding of the job responsibilities, skills, and various competencies of each position.

Upon completion of the draft compensation schedule, the Consultants met with City Administration and with the Executive Team to review the recommended salary schedule and ascertain the City’s perspective prior to finalization. All recommendations and feedback provided were reviewed by the Consultants and taken into consideration in both its relation to the position analysis and the external market data, as well as its impact to internal equity within the entire compensation system.

Labor Market

In order to gain information from the external market, a list of comparable organizations was established. Each of the comparable organizations was contacted requesting current salary schedules and incumbent data. The following comparable organizations were contacted:

Table 1: Comparable Organizations

Community/Municipality	
City of Blue Springs, MO	
City of Gladstone, MO	
City of Leawood, KS	
City of Lee's Summit, MO	
City of Lenexa, KS	
City of Liberty, MO	
City of Olathe, KS	
City of Overland Park, KS	
City of Shawnee, KS	

Community/Municipality	
Gardner, KS	
Johnson County, KS	
Kansas City, MO	DNP
Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas	

DNP = Did not participate

Data from these organizations were collected through completion of a survey developed by the Consultants and receipt of compensation data from the benchmark positions.

The data collected was utilized to analyze the average market minimum, midpoint and maximum rates per defined benchmark positions. A comparison of the average salary of the positions to the average salary of incumbents within the City was also performed. When necessary, evaluation of a comparable organization’s job description, when available online, was utilized to resolve conflicts.

In addition to current positions within the City, the Consultants sought comparable data on future positions/career ladders, and positions with job responsibilities that are combined in the City but might be separate positions in other organizations. In some cases, titles were altered to better align with the industry. Not all positions are reflected in the following data analysis. In some situations, data were either not available in the external market, were insufficient, or there were no internal matches at the time of the Study.

Market Data Solicited

The market survey gathered the following 2022 information: minimum, midpoint, and maximum salary for the positions as well as the average salary of the incumbents. Upon examination, salaries were eliminated if statistically too high or too low so as to not skew the average (typically within one to two standard deviations). Then, a new percentile amount was calculated with the remaining salaries. There was a great deal of time spent in the data analysis to ensure that each position was examined based on the data available and how the responsibilities of each position align within the City.

Market Analysis

It is standard compensation practice to establish a range around the minimum or market rate to determine if employee compensation is in line with the comparable market. Employees can mistakenly assume that if the average market rate is \$25,000, then their salary should align to the market rate, not realizing there many factors attributable to being above or below a market rate. Compensation practices look at a range around the average market rate where an employee should be by the time the employee is fully functioning within his/her position. Traditionally, organizations establish a 5%-10% range around the market rate. Thus, if an employee is making between 40%-60% of the market rate, the employee is considered fairly compensated. In order to analyze the salaries, a comp ratio is used. This is a ratio of the City's salary in relation to the external market data. A 50% comp ratio would mean that it is in line with the external market. Again, the 10% range is utilized. Thus, if a ratio is within 40%-60% of the salary, it is within an acceptable range. Note: With the current economic climate and shortage of labor, the lower portion of the range may be considered below market.

Minimum Salary Comparison

The analysis of the minimum salary range gives the initial indication if starting salaries are within an acceptable market range. When building a salary schedule, consideration of this information will ensure the City's minimums are within an acceptable range to the average market minimum; however, this analysis is only the beginning in the development of a compensation schedule.

Approximately 31% of the benchmarked job titles are below the average market minimums. There are an additional 6% of the positions that are in the lower 40% comp ratio that are still within the acceptable range; however, the positions are at risk of falling below the market in the near future. Overall, 69% of the positions are within the acceptable average market minimum. It would appear the majority of the City's minimum hiring salaries are adequate against the average market, although some adjustment will be required. The Figure below provides a summary of findings.

Figure 1: Minimum Analysis Summary




Table 2: Benchmark Position Minimums below Average Market Minimum

Arborist
Assistant City Administrator
Building Official
City Administrator
City Engineer (Sr Project Engineer)
Communications Specialist /PIO
Court Administrator
Deputy City Administrator
Finance Director
Human Resources Manager
IT Manager
Master Police Officer
Public Workers - Maintenance Worker I
Public Works Director
Receptionist
Stormwater Engineer

Midpoint Salary Comparison

The Consultants wanted to know if the midpoint was aligned with the average market. Therefore, a midpoint analysis between the City’s midpoint and the market average was conducted. Again, a comp ratio less than 40% would indicate the salary ranges may not be in line. Approximately 24% of the benchmark positions – looking at the midpoint – are lower than the average market rate. There are an additional 8% of the positions that are in the lower 40% comp ratio that are within the acceptable range; however, the positions are at risk of falling below the market in the near future. Overall, 76%

of the positions are within the acceptable average market at the midpoint. The following is a summary of findings.

Figure 2: Midpoint Analysis Summary




Table 3: Benchmark Positions Midpoint Below Average Market Rate

Arborist
Assistant City Administrator
Building Official
City Administrator
City Engineer (Sr Project Engineer)
Communications Specialist /PIO
Court Administrator
Deputy City Administrator
Human Resources Manager
IT Manager
Public Workers - Maintenance Worker I
Public Works Director

Average Market Salary Analysis

The next step is to compare the City’s current incumbent salaries to the average market rate to assess how competitive incumbent wages are within the market. For this purpose, an *average* of the current employees’ salaries is utilized for positions with more than one (1) incumbent. Overall, 26% of the positions are below the average market rate. There are another 13% of positions in the lower 40% comp ratio that are at risk of falling below the market in the near future. In total, 74% of the positions within the City are at or above the average market rate. In summary, the City fares well when employee salaries are compared to the average market rate of incumbent salaries. One does need to consider the tenure of employees during this analysis. The Figure below provides a summary of findings.

Figure 3: Incumbent Analysis Summary




Table 4: Benchmark Incumbents Below Average Market Rate

Assistant City Administrator
IT Manager
Human Resources Manager
Communications Specialist /PIO
Deputy City Administrator
Master Police Officer
Arborist
City Administrator
Court Administrator
Facility Maintenance Technician
Finance Director
Building Official

Keep in mind, tenure in the position may affect a lower-than-average comp ratio.


Maximum Salary Comparison

The Consultants then compared the City’s salary range maximum to the average market maximum. However, due to various types of salary range construction, one must always consider this may not be an exact comparison.

The City’s salary range maximum is at or above the market maximum for 73% of positions, while an additional 4% of positions are still within an acceptable distance from the average although on the lower end. This leaves 22% of positions with maximum rates that are under the market average.

The Figure below provides a summary of findings.

Figure 4: Maximum Analysis Summary




Rounding may not result in 100%

Above Market Analysis

The City is a progressive organization. Thus, consideration may be given to a compensation philosophy that is above the average. To make this decision, the Consultant evaluated the minimum of the current salary schedule to the 60th and 65th percentile market minimum, as well as current incumbent salary at the same levels of the market. When comparing the City’s current minimums to these levels, the City still fares well. However, more resources may be needed to place employees in the 65th percentile range and to minimize in-range compression of these placements.

The Figure below provides a summary of findings.

Figure 5: Schedule Minimum to Market Minimum at the 50th, 60th and 65th Percentiles



Current Compensation System

The current compensation system is a salary range. There is a 50% range from minimum to maximum. The midpoint does represent the middle of the pay scale. The schedule is adjusted annually which has maintained the salary schedule to the market.

Employees receive an evaluation that provides a weighted score which equates to a performance-based increase. The merit pool in the last year was 3.5%, and based upon the score, an employee could receive up to a 3.75% merit increase.

In addition, the City keeps an eye on where employees are placed within the salary schedule. Employees with less than seven (7) years of service receive a market/merit adjustment. This method ensures that employees reach the midpoint of the salary range. In compensation theory, an employee should reach the market rate within three (3) to five (5) years which means the employee is fully capable and competent to perform the job duties. In the case of the City, an employee reaches the midpoint within seven (7) years.


The salary schedule has 17 pay grades that are 10% apart. The Police Department has a salary schedule that is embedded in this schedule, although not all of the pay grades are utilized.

Other Factors

Public Sector Turnover/Recruitment Challenges

According to human resources professionals across the United States, it is becoming progressively harder to hire qualified personnel. Looking at a tight labor market, recruitment and retention of qualified personnel with the necessary skills for public service topped the list of workforce challenges (State and Local Government Workforce: 2017 Trends). Between 2013 and 2018, postings for government jobs have increased by 29% while applicant volume fell by 8%, resulting in a 37% gap (Neogov Job Seeker Report 2019). The figure below illustrates this change.

Figure 6: Public Sector Recruitment Trends



More recently, the Center for State and Local Government Excellence released its State and Local Government Workforces 2021 report. Based on a survey conducted with 300 state and local government participants across the United States in the first quarter of 2021, nearly 64% of respondents identified police positions as one of their most challenging positions to fill, and 57% identified skilled trades.

This is not a new issue. Public employers have been experiencing ongoing challenges of this nature for almost a decade. Governments historically have had a compelling proposition to offer workers with secure lifetime employment and generous health benefits followed by a robust pension for retirement, which is no longer the case. Public employers are now battling for their talent because:

- Long term employment has less appeal to the younger workforce;
- There is a real or perceived decline in public support for government workers;
- Public employers feel they can no longer compete with the private sector with regard to salaries and benefits;
- There is a growing skills gap. Many government jobs now require specialized education or training - fewer positions are “learn on the job”;
- Public employers are not able to offer the same level of flexible work arrangements to all employees;
- Limitations in technologies prevent needed efficiencies and automation; and

- There are limited financial resources.

The Great Resignation and Private Sector Influence

Compounding the public sector recruitment challenges, as the nation re-opened following COVID shutdowns in 2021, the country has experienced continued private industry prosperity, record inflation, record retirements, and record turnover from an otherwise qualified workforce, causing all industries, both public and private, to be competing for already limited human resources. In addition, State Minimum Wage Laws are pushing non-skilled wages higher. This has led employers to escalate wages for all positions to help recruit and retain its talent. The effect has been substantial, and nearly every employer is experiencing recruitment and retention challenges.

As a result, all employers, including the City, will need to ensure its wages and benefit package is as competitive as financially possible in order to help mitigate turnover and facilitate recruitment success.

Employee Demographics

In reviewing the City's employee demographics for positions covered in the Study, the tenure of the organization ranges from new hire to 33 years. The overall tenure average of the employees is 10.39 years. The national average in the public sector is currently six and one-half (6.5) years (*Local Government-Bureau of Labor Statistics, September 2020*), showing the City is higher than the average in overall tenure. In order to have a full picture of the City, one needs to explore these demographics further. These findings are found in the following Figures.

Figure 7: Employee Demographics by Age Group





Figure 8: Employee Demographics by Years of Service



The above Figures show those in age groups 50 and over have the longest tenure of the organization and represent nearly 38% of all employees. This group has the ability to retire, and when they do, the average tenure of the organization is likely going to decrease, as the tenure of this group is boosting the current average tenure.

Another finding is that the City's demographics illustrate 46% of the workforce is under the age of 40, and this is likely the cross-section of employees who are seen as more mobile in today's workforce, focus heavily on work/life balance, consider non-compensatory benefits for the purposes of retention, and change jobs quickly because it results in earning higher wages as opposed to remaining with one organization for a longer period of time.

The City is recommended to monitor its demographics periodically to properly respond to shifts within the organization as needed. Although the Consultants acknowledge compensation is not the

only reason for unwanted turnover, it is a consideration of the overall picture. In order to ensure competitive recruitment/retention, the City is recommended to follow the compensation philosophy at the 60th percentile, or 10% above market to ensure the City can stay competitive to support retaining its personnel as long as possible.

Top Motivators for Employee Retention

With an increasing unemployment rate and the effects of the pandemic, strategies for recruitment and retention have changed. The usual methods of attracting job seekers and/or retaining employees are no longer applicable in today's market. In addition, job seekers are more likely to leave for better opportunities than in the past.

According to the NEOGOV 2021 Job Seekers Report, job motivators for the age group 18-34 are job security, meaningful work, advancement opportunities and work/life balance. Forty-eight percent of respondents mentioned higher salary (as the top reason for pursuing a new job while twenty-eight percent of respondents mentioned the difference in public versus private sector salaries and benefits. In addition, respondents pointed out that the private sector, especially during the past year, responded quicker to the changing needs of the new workforce. Other areas that are critical for recruitment and retention are:

- Job skill improvement
- An organization that shares “my” values
- Job that allows working remotely
- Flexible work hours

The pandemic illustrated that there are a variety of ways to conduct business, and while not all jobs have the ability to work from home, many do. These options need to be pursued to meet the needs of the new workforce. In addition to work at home, the City has the opportunity to provide flexible work schedules for those positions that cannot work from home; e.g., working a four-day, 10-hour schedule.

Since work-life balance is one of the reasons to apply for positions, the City should evaluate its time-off policies, and if needed, update these policies to provide more flexibility to the worker. In a recent survey conducted by the City, work-life balance ranked 4th as a reason to apply for a position, after pay, insurance and retirement benefits.

The City needs to continue trying non-traditional forms of compensation such as greater tuition reimbursement, assistance in paying off student loans, and developing personalized benefits. “While public sector jobs may always lack the ability to compete on salary, government agencies can outdo the private sector by spotlighting their most desirable factors: providing job security, the ability to do meaningful work, and offering attractive benefit packages” (NEOGOVS 2021). Unlike most public organizations, the City of Prairie Village should be commended on the number of ways it already rewards employees, which increases retention.

These have included a sign-on bonus, an inflation bonus, adding sworn personnel to the deferred compensation program, and time in service awards. Unfortunately in this labor market, there is no one-size-fits-all approach and customization of options to meet all age groups will be needed.

Compensation Philosophy

A compensation philosophy is an organization's financial commitment to how it values its employees. The goal of this philosophy is to attract, retain, and motivate qualified people. A consistent philosophy provides a strong foundation in determining the type of total compensation package to offer employees.

There are foundational aspects of compensation to assist with the development of a compensation philosophy to ensure the goals of compensation align with the goals of the organization. First, there are basic questions to consider:

1. What is considered a fair wage?
2. Are wages too high for the financial health of the organization?
3. Does the compensation system reflect the value of positions within the organization?
4. Is the compensation strong enough to retain employees?
5. Is there currently a defined compensation philosophy?
6. If so, is the compensation philosophy keeping in line with labor market change, industry change, and organizational change?

After conversations with elected officials, the City has decided to have a compensation philosophy that pays 10% above the market, or at the 60th percentile. This philosophy sets the tone of the City's commitment to hire and retain the best qualified individuals to provide services to the Prairie Village community.

Recommended Salary Schedule

The recommended 2022 compensation system continues to be a range system, provided in Appendix B. There are 21 pay grades with a 10% range between the minimum and market point called the position point. The total spread from minimum to maximum is 36% and there is 5% to 10% between pay grades. The schedule has been developed around the market rate (position point) of the schedule, which is set at average market. The schedule does have some overlap in ranks in some occupations, which is common. The recommended salary schedule, however, will help minimize compression and allow for growth of positions in the future.

The goal is to have employees with acceptable performance around the position point within five (5) years of service.

At this time, there are also two (2) additional pay ranges for part-time, seasonal personnel. The ranges are based on current economic trends in salaries in the private sector. There is a flat dollar amount between the minimum, position point, and maximum. Returning employees should receive a flat dollar amount.

Position Placement

Placement in the respective salary schedule is based upon several criteria:

- Position Questionnaire
- Market analysis
- Compression analysis
- Internal equity

After considering these criteria, placement of some positions on the salary schedule have changed, with some positions now being placed in lower or higher pay grades than on the previous schedule. However, this is not an indication that any given position is more or less important. Similarly, this is not a “reclassification” process, where a position is being evaluated on changes in responsibility, authority, or decision-making that may place the position in a higher or lower pay grade, etc. This process is a complete reset of the compensation system. This is sometimes difficult for employees because they look only at where their position is placed on the schedule and compare themselves to positions that have been placed higher. When this occurs, employees begin to compare their perception of the value of positions within the organization, and do not know, or disregard, all the factors the Consultants considered when placing all the positions in the schedule.

Position Title Recommendations

In the proposal, the City requested a compensation and classification study. This involves not only integrating the external market into position placement but also aligning job titles for either internal equity or to reference a more common job title. These recommended titles, for the most part, are reflected in the updated salary schedule.

Employee Placement

In the implementation year, employees below the minimum of the designated salary range will be placed at the minimum. This placement does not take into account years of service within the position.

In the second year, and if needed, in the third year as well, the City can work on in-range compression. This occurs when longer tenured employees are lower in the range and close to less tenured or new employees. Moving employees within the range and closer in alignment with their years of service

in the position (assuming acceptable performance) frees up the hiring range of the salary schedule and allows the City to hire experienced personnel.

General Operational Guidelines

Maintenance of Salary Schedule

It is important for the City to have a standardized procedure to adjust the salary schedule for consistency and for budgetary forecasting. It is the Consultants' recommendation that on a set date each year (January 1 is recommended), the salary schedule be increased by the national Consumer Price Index – Urban (CPI -U) percentage or by a local economic indicator. For example, since budgeting is done at approximately the same time each year, the City should establish a specific month in which to capture the average of the previous 12 months of the selected economic indicator for a recommended adjustment. The City will still maintain control if conditions and finances fluctuate in a specific year. It is recommended the adjustment to the salary schedule be done on a different date than the date of the salary increases, so employees understand there are two (2) separate adjustments per year.

Salary Schedule Adjustments

The salary schedule should be adjusted annually for economic reasons. Without maintaining the salary schedule, it will fall below the market and the City will end up having to pay to get it updated. Annual salary schedule adjustments will keep a competitive, fair, and fiscally sound salary schedule. It is important the City also budget dollars for increases to the overall schedule each year. There may be years when the economy cannot support such increases; however, that should be the exception, not the norm. It is recommended that salary range adjustments occur in January. Employees should receive this cost-of-living increase.

Annual Performance Adjustments

The salary schedule is based on a premise of annual salary adjustments. Each year employees can receive the salary increase set by City Administration through the performance evaluation process. The Consultants recommend the performance increases occur in the first pay period of July.

As the City works on its performance-based pay program, the January increase can be based upon the metrics designed within this program.

Employee Market Adjustments

The salary schedule has been designed to move employees through the salary range. Benchmarks have been established for Human Resources to evaluate the City's ability to move employees through the system. The City may need to provide a market adjustment annually to employees who are falling short of these compensation targets. This may or may not occur each year, but analysis of movement


through the range will work to ensure that employees remain at a competitive salary level. The current goal has been to provide market adjustments to reach the mid-point by the seventh (7th) year. It is recommended that this adjustment occur so that employees reach the position point by the fifth (5th) year of employment within the position.

Market Updates

One of the main concerns in any salary schedule is the ability to keep it current. Organizations often spend time and resources to review and reevaluate their salary schedule, resulting in providing employees or pay grades significant increases because either the positions or the schedule is not in line with the external market. A salary schedule has a typical life span of three (3) to five (5) years, at which time market conditions typically necessitate a review. The City can strive to prolong the life of their schedule if it continues to commit to maintaining its competitiveness with the external market by ensuring market updates occur. Given the current competitive market, the City is recommended to initially conduct a market update in three (3) years. In addition, maintaining metrics should help to indicate if an external market update is required even sooner.

Total Rewards Model

Attraction, motivation, engagement and retention are critical issues facing all employers. Successfully addressing these issues begins with, at a minimum, having a strategy that aligns certain elements of the employment experience with the goals and objectives of the employer. A total rewards model encompasses specific employment elements to drive performance. A total rewards model considers all of the following areas (Source: WorldatWork):



The following is an inventory of the City's current compensation, benefits, and related opportunities it provides to employees, based on the total rewards model:

- **Wages (Base Pay and Variable Pay).** Pay provided by an employer for services rendered that includes both fixed pay and variable pay tied to performance:
 - - Base Wages, annual cost-of -living adjustment
 - Performance Increase and/or lump payments
 - Accelerated salary increases to midpoint
 - Recruitment bonus

- **Benefits.** Programs an employer uses to supplement the cash compensation that employees receive. These include health, income protection, retirement programs that provide security for employees and their families, etc.:
 - Social Security - mandatory
 - Medicare - mandatory
 - Workers Compensation - mandatory
 - Unemployment compensation -mandatory
 - Health insurance
 - Dental insurance
 - Vision insurance
 - Life insurance
 - Long-term disability
 - KPERS retirement system
 - Police pension plan
 - Deferred compensation with employer match
 - Flexible benefits plan
 - Vacation
 - Sick leave
 - Bereavement, jury, and paid military leave
 - Paid observed holidays
 - Paid maternity/paternity leave
 - Paid breaks

- **Well-being.** Organizational practices, policies and programs that help employees achieve success both at work and outside of work:
 - Employee Assistance Program
 - Pool membership
 - Onsite fitness center
 - Annual health screening
 - Food truck Fridays
 - Stock the breakroom events
 - Employee luncheons
 - Fitness discount/reimbursement
 - Weight Watchers reimbursement
 - Eye exam
 - Weight loss program
 - Flu and COVID vaccination
 - Telecommuting options
 - Nursing mother-friendly environment

- **Talent Development.** Provides the opportunity and tools for employees to advance their skills and competencies in both short- and long-term careers:
 - Tuition reimbursement program
 - Training and development courses
 - On the job training
 - Annual Inservice training
 - Performance management feedback

- **Recognition.** Acknowledgement of employee behaviors/outcomes that support the organization's success. Recognition programs can be formal or informal, do not need to have a financial component:
 - Longevity payments

The City has been building a robust model that can positively influence the culture of the organization and the work culture of the employees. This model should help the City develop new Total Reward opportunities to provide a balanced and engaging employment experience to its employees when it is not able to provide the highest wages in the region. Compensation is not the only driving factor for recruitment and retention, although it is currently the highest rated factor for both recruitment and retention feedback (Neogov Job Seeker Report 2021). The second highest rated item for retention is a positive work environment/culture, followed by challenging work and the ability to utilize their skills and talents. For a smaller organization with limited resources, the City is poised well to become an employer of choice, not because of its wages, but because of the other opportunities afforded to employees as well as the adjusted wage schedule. These are areas the Human Resources Department will want to utilize when developing recruitment strategies.

Benefits

In addition to compensation, the City asked that a comparison of major benefits be completed. The following is a summary of how the City is fairing in the market and future opportunities.

Health Insurance

Plan Design Overview

The City offers two (2) health plan designs. The health plan is summarized as follows:

Table 5: Health Plan Summary

Plan Description	Deductible Amounts	Out of Pocket Maximums	Employee Contribution (S/F)
HDHP	\$2,800/\$5,600	\$3,000/\$6,000	\$0/\$167.53
Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$0/\$0	\$5,500/\$10,000	\$0/\$445.09

Many of the comparables offer multiple plan design options with differing deductible/out-of-pocket maximums to allow employees the opportunity to select from the coverage that best matches their personal situation. The City also two (2) plans similar to the comparables.

Premiums

It is extremely difficult to compare health insurance, as the number of plans and the plan designs are significantly different among organizations. What can be compared is the amount the employee contributes toward the cost of that insurance. As the City is aware, the cost of health insurance is a large budget item for any organization. Health insurance is also often the single largest benefit looked at by potential new hires, so a review of employee contributions to this benefit is imperative for offering a comprehensive benefit package.

The Consultants compared Prairie Villages 2022 health plan with the comparable organizations' health plans for a more accurate reflection of insurance in this geographical region. The following are the results from comparable entities that provided benefit data, broken down into single and family coverage. Wellness incentives and HSA/HRA deposits are excluded.

Table 6: Single Plan Premium Comparison

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Single Monthly Premium	Single Annual Premium
Prairie Village	Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$0.00	\$0.00
Prairie Village	HDHP	\$0.00	\$0.00
Gardner	HDHP	\$0.00	\$0.00
Leawood	HDHP A	\$0.00	\$0.00
Leawood	HDHP B	\$0.00	\$0.00

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Single Monthly Premium	Single Annual Premium
Liberty	Choice Fund 2500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$0.00
Liberty	Choice Fund 1500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$0.00
Leawood	PPO C	\$15.20	\$182.40
Overland Park*	HRA Base Blue Select Plus	\$18.00	\$216.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Blue Select Plus	\$20.00	\$240.00
Lee's Summit	HDHP	\$21.25	\$255.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Preferred Blue Care	\$23.00	\$276.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Preferred Care Blue	\$30.00	\$360.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2500 Open Access	\$35.00	\$420.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Blue Select Plus	\$37.00	\$444.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2000-Open Access	\$39.00	\$468.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Preferred Care Blue	\$50.00	\$600.00
Olathe*	CDHP	\$59.00	\$708.00
Johnson*	PPO Blue Select Plus	\$66.00	\$792.00
Johnson*	PPO Preferred Blue Care	\$78.00	\$936.00
Lenexa*	QDHP	\$82.00	\$984.00
Lee's Summit	PPO (Base)	\$84.45	\$1,013.40
Gladstone	INO- 500 Sure Fit	\$85.00	\$1,020.00
Overland Park*	Blue Select Plus	\$86.00	\$1,032.00
Overland Park*	Preferred Care Blue	\$103.00	\$1,236.00
Leawood	PPO D	\$105.88	\$1,270.56
Olathe*	PPO	\$117.00	\$1,404.00
Gladstone	Cigna Open Access-2000	\$127.00	\$1,524.00
Lenexa*	PPO	\$131.00	\$1,572.00
Gardner	PPO 1	\$136.11	\$1,633.32
Gardner	PPO 2	\$145.12	\$1,741.48
Gardner	PPO 3	\$147.38	\$1,768.52
Gladstone	INO-2 Buy Up	\$215.00	\$2,580.00
Leawood	Buy-Up PPO	\$249.30	\$2,991.60
Liberty	In Network Only-INO1	\$264.00	\$3,168.00
Liberty	Open Access Plus	\$264.00	\$3,168.00

*2021 Data

Table 7: Family Plan Premium Comparison

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Family Monthly Premium	Family Annual Premium
Liberty	Choice Fund 2500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$0.00
Liberty	Choice Fund 1500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$0.00
Leawood	HDHP A	\$77.32	\$927.84
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2500 Open Access	\$79.00	\$948.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Blue Select Plus	\$92.00	\$1,104.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Preferred Blue Care	\$108.00	\$1,296.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2000-Open Access	\$112.00	\$1,344.00
Prairie Village	HDHP	\$167.53	\$2,010.36
Johnson*	PPO Blue Select Plus	\$187.00	\$2,244.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Blue Select Plus	\$195.00	\$2,340.00

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Family Monthly Premium	Family Annual Premium
Johnson*	PPO Preferred Blue Care	\$219.00	\$2,628.00
Lenexa*	QDHP	\$237.00	\$2,844.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Preferred Care Blue	\$238.00	\$2,856.00
Lee's Summit	PPO (Base)	\$249.00	\$2,988.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Blue Select Plus	\$266.00	\$3,192.00
Gardner	HDHP	\$287.54	\$3,450.46
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Preferred Care Blue	\$314.00	\$3,768.00
Overland Park*	Preferred Care Blue	\$369.00	\$4,428.00
Leawood	HDHP B	\$373.10	\$4,477.20
Gardner	PPO 1	\$374.31	\$4,491.76
Lee's Summit	HDHP	\$377.18	\$4,526.16
Lenexa*	PPO	\$390.00	\$4,680.00
Gardner	PPO 2	\$399.08	\$4,788.94
Olathe*	CDHP	\$400.00	\$4,800.00
Gardner	PPO 3	\$405.30	\$4,863.56
Overland Park*	Blue Select Plus	\$423.00	\$5,076.00
Leawood	PPO C	\$439.06	\$5,268.72
Prairie Village	Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$445.09	\$5,341.08
Gladstone	INO- 500 Sure Fit	\$540.00	\$6,480.00
Olathe*	PPO	\$546.00	\$6,552.00
Gladstone	Cigna Open Access-2000	\$654.00	\$7,848.00
Liberty	In Network Only-INO1	\$695.00	\$8,340.00
Leawood	PPO D	\$701.02	\$8,412.24
Liberty	Open Access Plus	\$759.00	\$9,108.00
Gladstone	INO-2 Buy Up	\$904.00	\$10,848.00
Leawood	Buy-Up PPO	\$1,115.32	\$13,383.84

*2021 Data

The above information indicates that Prairie Village is at the top of the comparables for the employees cost for single coverage; however, Prairie Village is varied with the family plan based with upper third and lower third placement.

Expected Employee Cost

Because premiums and deductibles are varied in the region, when considering the cost of the monthly premium plus the deductible, this is a truer look at the expected employee cost. This calculation shows the City’s true position in the market, based on expected annual risk to an employee, which is calculated as premium plus in-network deductible amounts. The results are shown in the Tables below. Organizations that did not provide deductible amounts are excluded.

Table 8: Single Plan Comparable Review

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Single Annual Premium	In Network Deductible	Expected Annual Risk to Employee
Prairie Village	Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Leawood	PPO C	\$182.40	\$500.00	\$682.40
Gardner	HDHP	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
Liberty	Choice Fund 1500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
Lee's Summit	PPO (Base)	\$1,013.40	\$500.00	\$1,513.40
Gladstone	INO- 500 Sure Fit	\$1,020.00	\$500.00	\$1,520.00
Johnson*	PPO Blue Select Plus	\$792.00	\$750.00	\$1,542.00
Overland Park*	Blue Select Plus	\$1,032.00	\$600.00	\$1,632.00
Johnson*	PPO Preferred Blue Care	\$936.00	\$750.00	\$1,686.00
Leawood	PPO D	\$1,270.56	\$500.00	\$1,770.56
Overland Park*	Preferred Care Blue	\$1,236.00	\$600.00	\$1,836.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Blue Select Plus	\$240.00	\$1,750.00	\$1,990.00
Gardner	PPO 2	\$1,741.48	\$250.00	\$1,991.48
Gardner	PPO 3	\$1,768.52	\$250.00	\$2,018.52
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Preferred Blue Care	\$276.00	\$1,750.00	\$2,026.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Blue Select Plus	\$444.00	\$1,700.00	\$2,144.00
Olathe*	PPO	\$1,404.00	\$800.00	\$2,204.00
Olathe*	CDHP	\$708.00	\$1,500.00	\$2,208.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Preferred Care Blue	\$600.00	\$1,700.00	\$2,300.00
Lenexa*	PPO	\$1,572.00	\$750.00	\$2,322.00
Gardner	PPO 1	\$1,633.32	\$750.00	\$2,383.32
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2000-Open Access	\$468.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,468.00
Lenexa*	QDHP	\$984.00	\$1,500.00	\$2,484.00
Liberty	Choice Fund 2500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Gladstone	INO-2 Buy Up	\$2,580.00	\$0.00	\$2,580.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Blue Select Plus	\$216.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,716.00
Leawood	HDHP A	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00
Leawood	HDHP B	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00
Prairie Village	HDHP	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Preferred Care Blue	\$360.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,860.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2500 Open Access	\$420.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,920.00
Leawood	Buy-Up PPO	\$2,991.60	\$0.00	\$2,991.60
Lee's Summit	HDHP	\$255.00	\$2,800.00	\$3,055.00
Gladstone	Cigna Open Access-2000	\$1,524.00	\$2,000.00	\$3,524.00
Liberty	Open Access Plus	\$3,168.00	\$750.00	\$3,918.00

*2021 Data

Table 9: Family Plan Comparable Review

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Family Annual Premium	In Network Deductible	Expected Annual Risk to Employee
Liberty	Choice Fund 1500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Johnson*	PPO Blue Select Plus	\$2,244.00	\$1,500.00	\$3,744.00
Lee's Summit	PPO (Base)	\$2,988.00	\$1,000.00	\$3,988.00
Johnson*	PPO Preferred Blue Care	\$2,628.00	\$1,500.00	\$4,128.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Blue Select Plus	\$1,104.00	\$3,500.00	\$4,604.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Preferred Blue Care	\$1,296.00	\$3,500.00	\$4,796.00

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Family Annual Premium	In Network Deductible	Expected Annual Risk to Employee
Liberty	Choice Fund 2500 HDHP	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Gardner	PPO 2	\$4,788.94	\$500.00	\$5,288.94
Prairie Village	Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$5,341.08	\$0.00	\$5,341.08
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2000-Open Access	\$1,344.00	\$4,000.00	\$5,344.00
Gardner	PPO 3	\$4,863.56	\$500.00	\$5,363.56
Lenexa*	QDHP	\$2,844.00	\$3,000.00	\$5,844.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2500 Open Access	\$948.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,948.00
Gardner	PPO 1	\$4,491.76	\$1,500.00	\$5,991.76
Lenexa*	PPO	\$4,680.00	\$1,500.00	\$6,180.00
Overland Park*	Preferred Care Blue	\$4,428.00	\$1,800.00	\$6,228.00
Leawood	PPO C	\$5,268.72	\$1,000.00	\$6,268.72
Gardner	HDHP	\$3,450.46	\$3,000.00	\$6,450.46
Leawood	HDHP A	\$927.84	\$5,600.00	\$6,527.84
Overland Park*	Blue Select Plus	\$5,076.00	\$1,800.00	\$6,876.00
Prairie Village	HDHP	\$2,010.36	\$5,600.00	\$7,610.36
Olathe*	CDHP	\$4,800.00	\$3,000.00	\$7,800.00
Gladstone	INO- 500 Sure Fit	\$6,480.00	\$1,500.00	\$7,980.00
Olathe*	PPO	\$6,552.00	\$1,600.00	\$8,152.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Blue Select Plus	\$3,192.00	\$5,100.00	\$8,292.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Preferred Care Blue	\$3,768.00	\$5,100.00	\$8,868.00
Leawood	PPO D	\$8,412.24	\$1,000.00	\$9,412.24
Overland Park*	HRA Base Blue Select Plus	\$2,340.00	\$7,500.00	\$9,840.00
Leawood	HDHP B	\$4,477.20	\$5,600.00	\$10,077.20
Lee's Summit	HDHP	\$4,526.16	\$5,600.00	\$10,126.16
Overland Park*	HRA Base Preferred Care Blue	\$2,856.00	\$7,500.00	\$10,356.00
Liberty	Open Access Plus	\$9,108.00	\$1,500.00	\$10,608.00
Gladstone	INO-2 Buy Up	\$10,848.00	\$0.00	\$10,848.00
Gladstone	Cigna Open Access-2000	\$7,848.00	\$4,000.00	\$11,848.00
Leawood	Buy-Up PPO	\$13,383.84	\$0.00	\$13,383.84

*2021 Data

Looking at the deductible amount with premium costs, Prairie Village remains at the top of the market for single coverage. Family coverage is not as competitive, but a plan option is in the upper third of the market. A final look at the City in relation to out-of-pocket maximums, follows.

Maximum Employee Cost

The following tables shows employees that experience a major medical event that exceeds the deductible costs will have a lower financial risk on Prairie Village's plan than many other comparables, if on the High Deductible Health Plan, when considering the maximum out of pocket expenses. With that said, there are a few slightly more competitive plans in the comparable market. The results are shown in the Tables below. Organizations that did not provide out of pocket maximum amounts are excluded.

Table 10: Single Plan Maximum Risk Comparative Review

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Single Annual Premium	In Network Out of Pocket Maximum	Maximum Annual Risk to Employee
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2000-Open Access	\$468.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,468.00
Leawood	HDHP A	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00
Leawood	HDHP B	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2500 Open Access	\$420.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,920.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Blue Select Plus	\$444.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,944.00
Prairie Village	HDHP	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Gardner	HDHP	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Lenexa*	PPO	\$1,572.00	\$1,500.00	\$3,072.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Preferred Care Blue	\$600.00	\$2,500.00	\$3,100.00
Overland Park*	Blue Select Plus	\$1,032.00	\$2,100.00	\$3,132.00
Johnson*	PPO Blue Select Plus	\$792.00	\$2,500.00	\$3,292.00
Overland Park*	Preferred Care Blue	\$1,236.00	\$2,100.00	\$3,336.00
Johnson*	PPO Preferred Blue Care	\$936.00	\$2,500.00	\$3,436.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Blue Select Plus	\$240.00	\$3,250.00	\$3,490.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Preferred Blue Care	\$276.00	\$3,250.00	\$3,526.00
Leawood	PPO C	\$182.40	\$3,500.00	\$3,682.40
Olathe*	PPO	\$1,404.00	\$2,300.00	\$3,704.00
Olathe*	CDHP	\$708.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,708.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Blue Select Plus	\$216.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,716.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Preferred Care Blue	\$360.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,860.00
Lenexa*	QDHP	\$984.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,984.00
Leawood	Buy-Up PPO	\$2,991.60	\$1,500.00	\$4,491.60
Gardner	PPO 1	\$1,633.32	\$3,000.00	\$4,633.32
Leawood	PPO D	\$1,270.56	\$3,500.00	\$4,770.56
Prairie Village	Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$0.00	\$5,500.00	\$5,500.00
Gardner	PPO 2	\$1,741.48	\$6,500.00	\$8,241.48
Gardner	PPO 3	\$1,768.52	\$6,500.00	\$8,268.52

*2021 Data

Table 11: Family Plan Maximum Risk Comparative Review

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Family Annual Premium	In Network Out of Pocket Maximum	Maximum Annual Risk to Employee
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2000-Open Access	\$1,344.00	\$4,000.00	\$5,344.00
Gladstone	Cigna Choice Fund 2500 Open Access	\$948.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,948.00
Leawood	HDHP A	\$927.84	\$5,600.00	\$6,527.84
Johnson*	PPO Blue Select Plus	\$2,244.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,244.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Blue Select Plus	\$1,104.00	\$6,500.00	\$7,604.00
Johnson*	PPO Preferred Blue Care	\$2,628.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,628.00
Lenexa*	PPO	\$4,680.00	\$3,000.00	\$7,680.00
Johnson*	HDHP BlueSaver Preferred Blue Care	\$1,296.00	\$6,500.00	\$7,796.00
Prairie Village	HDHP	\$2,010.36	\$6,000.00	\$8,010.36
Lenexa*	QDHP	\$2,844.00	\$6,000.00	\$8,844.00
Gardner	HDHP	\$3,450.46	\$6,000.00	\$9,450.46
Leawood	HDHP B	\$4,477.20	\$5,600.00	\$10,077.20
Olathe*	CDHP	\$4,800.00	\$5,600.00	\$10,400.00
Gardner	PPO 1	\$4,491.76	\$6,000.00	\$10,491.76
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Blue Select Plus	\$3,192.00	\$7,500.00	\$10,692.00

Comparable	Health Plan Description	Family Annual Premium	In Network Out of Pocket Maximum	Maximum Annual Risk to Employee
Overland Park*	Preferred Care Blue	\$4,428.00	\$6,300.00	\$10,728.00
Olathe*	PPO	\$6,552.00	\$4,200.00	\$10,752.00
Overland Park*	HRA Plus Preferred Care Blue	\$3,768.00	\$7,500.00	\$11,268.00
Overland Park*	Blue Select Plus	\$5,076.00	\$6,300.00	\$11,376.00
Leawood	PPO C	\$5,268.72	\$7,000.00	\$12,268.72
Overland Park*	HRA Base Blue Select Plus	\$2,340.00	\$10,500.00	\$12,840.00
Overland Park*	HRA Base Preferred Care Blue	\$2,856.00	\$10,500.00	\$13,356.00
Prairie Village	Base Plan PPO ChoiceCare	\$5,341.08	\$10,000.00	\$15,341.08
Leawood	PPO D	\$8,412.24	\$7,000.00	\$15,412.24
Leawood	Buy-Up PPO	\$13,383.84	\$3,000.00	\$16,383.84
Gardner	PPO 2	\$4,788.94	\$13,000.00	\$17,788.94
Gardner	PPO 3	\$4,863.56	\$13,000.00	\$17,863.56

*2021 Data

Overall, although premiums are initially looked at for comparative purposes, that dollar amount is not the full picture, as the above tables show. With that said, the Consultants would like to point out that the High Deductible Health Plan may be better for employees with a major medical event, but the City has worked diligently to keep the PPO plan affordable with low premiums, so employee may be more inclined to keep that plan.

The City’s health insurance strategy is not clear, as the lower deductibles with lower premiums on the PPO plan may be incentivizing to employees, but this is also the plan that is more costly to the City. It is understood the City provides a Health Savings Account incentive with the High Deductible Health Plan to close the gap, but there is still a difference in deductible levels, especially on a family plan.

The City should discuss family premium amounts, to position the City higher in the market for family plans.

Other Benefits

Holidays: The City offers 11.5 holidays per year, with one (1) personal/floating holiday. The comparables offer between 6 – 11 holidays, and 0 – 2 floating holidays. Thus, the current holiday schedule is competitive with the external market.

Vacation: The City offers vacation to employees with five (5) levels of accruals, starting with 11 days per year, and reaching the maximum accrual of 25 days at 21 years of service. There are a few of the comparables that have a 27 – 30-day maximum accrual. Although there are organizations that have fewer accrual levels, which results in reaching maximum accruals faster than the City, only two (2) organizations reported attaining 25 days of vacation prior to the 21st year. As a result, the vacation benefit is competitive to surrounding municipalities, and no changes are recommended.

Sick Leave: City employees earn 88 hours of sick leave per year as compared to the comparables which earn 96 – 144 hours per year. The maximum accrual provided by some comparables was 720 hours, with one (1) having no maximum accrual. The City of Olathe provides retirees a payout of 25% up to 960 hours. No other comparables provided any sick leave payout information. Thus, the City's 20% payout at retirement; or payout after five (5) years of service puts the City above the market.

Payout Provisions

Currently, the City's payout provisions allow for 10-20% payout of accrued, unused sick leave which is included in the employee's final check. This payment is then considered taxable to the employee, and the City pays related employment taxes on these amounts. The City could consider enhancing the payout process in a way that will assist employees with their future health care needs since the main reason employees choose not to retire is because they financially are not able to continue health care coverage. A medical trust could be developed for these payouts, in which deposits are tax free for both the employee and employer, are not considered income to the employee, and are to be used for medical expenses by the employee/qualified beneficiaries upon separation from employment. The City also has an alternative, a deferred compensation 457(b) program, in which the payouts could be placed into a qualified tax deferred retirement plan for the employee. The Consultants caution this last option may be restrictive since the IRS provides for annual contribution limits on individual deferred compensation accounts, and large payouts may exceed annual IRS limits.

Appendix A: Recommended Salary Schedule

New PG	Proposed Title	Department	2022 Min	60th Percentile 2022 PP	2022 Mid	2022 Max
			\$14.50	\$15.95		\$19.58
A	Lifeguard	Swimming Pool				
A	Assistant Swim/Dive	Swimming Pool				
A	Bailiff	Prosecutor				
			\$15.66	\$17.23		\$21.14
B	Assistant Managers					
B	Head Swim	Swimming Pool				
B	Head Dive	Swimming Pool				
			\$17.23	\$18.95		\$23.26
			\$18.00	\$19.80	\$21.15	\$24.30
			\$37,440	\$41,184	\$43,992	\$50,544
50	Customer Service Representative	City Clerk				
			\$19.44	\$21.38	\$22.84	\$26.24
			\$40,435	\$44,479	\$47,511	\$54,588
55	Maintenance Worker I	PW				
			\$21.00	\$23.09	\$24.67	\$28.34
			\$43,670	\$48,037	\$51,312	\$58,955
60	Accounting Specialist	Finance				
60	Administrative Support Specialist I	Various Depts				
60	Code Support Specialist I	Codes Admin				
60	Community Support Officer	Police - Comm Services				
60	Court Clerk I	Municipal Court				
60	Police Records Specialist	Police-Staff Services				
			\$22.67	\$24.94	\$26.64	\$30.61
			\$47,164	\$51,880	\$55,417	\$63,671
65	Administrative Support Specialist II	Various Depts				
65	Aquatics Supervisor	Parks & Recreation				
65	Code Enforcement Officer	Codes Admin				
65	Code Support Specialist II	Codes Admin				
65	Court Clerk II	Municipal Court				
65	Dispatcher I	Police-Staff Services				
65	Evidence & Property Specialist	Police-Staff Services				
65	Maintenance Worker II	PW				
65	Mechanic I	PW				
			\$24.49	\$26.94	\$28.77	\$33.06
			\$50,937	\$56,030	\$59,851	\$68,765
70	Deputy Court Clerk	Municipal Court				
70	Maintenance Worker III	PW				
70	Mechanic II	PW				
70	Police Administrative Specialist	Police - Administration				
			\$26.94	\$29.63	\$31.65	\$36.37

New PG	Proposed Title	Department	2022 Min	60th Percentile 2022 PP	2022 Mid	2022 Max
			\$56,030	\$61,633	\$65,836	\$75,641
75	Building Inspector	Codes Admin				
75	Crew Leader	PW				
75	Dispatcher II	Police-Staff Services				
75	Police Officer	Police - Patrol				
75	Special Events Coordinator - PT	Parks & Recreation				
75	Urban Forestry Specialist	PW				
			\$29.63	\$32.59	\$34.82	\$40.00
			\$61,633	\$67,797	\$72,419	\$83,205
80	Assistant to the PW Director	PW				
80	Crime Analyst-PT	Police - Patrol				
80	Information System Specialist	Info Systems				
80	Master Police Officer	Police - Patrol				
80	Project Inspector	PW				
			\$33.19	\$36.51	\$38.99	\$44.80
			\$69,029	\$75,932	\$81,110	\$93,190
85	Accountant	Finance				
85	Assistant Field Superintendent	PW				
85	Construction - Right of Way Inspector	PW				
85	Police Corporal	Police - Patrol				
85	Public Information Officer	City Clerk				
			\$36.51	\$40.16	\$42.89	\$49.28
			\$75,932	\$83,526	\$89,221	\$102,509
90	Dispatch Supervisor-NEW	Police-Staff Services				
90	Sr Building Inspector	Codes Admin				
			\$40.16	\$44.17	\$47.18	\$54.21
			\$83,526	\$91,878	\$98,143	\$112,760
95	Police Sergeant	Police - Patrol				
			\$42.57	\$46.82	\$50.01	\$57.46
			\$88,537	\$97,391	\$104,031	\$119,525
100	Project Manager	PW				
			\$46.82	\$51.50	\$55.02	\$63.21
			\$97,391	\$107,130	\$114,434	\$131,478
105	City Clerk	City Clerk				
105	Court Administrator	Municipal Court				
105	IT Systems Administrator	Info Systems				
105	PW Field Superintendent	PW				
			\$50.57	\$55.63	\$59.42	\$68.27
			\$105,182	\$115,700	\$123,589	\$141,996
110	Building Official	Codes Admin				
110	Police Captain	Police - Patrol				
110	Sr Project Manager	PW				
			\$56.64	\$62.30	\$66.55	\$76.46
			\$117,804	\$129,584	\$138,420	\$159,035
115	City Engineer	PW				
			\$63.43	\$69.78	\$74.53	\$85.63

New PG	Proposed Title	Department		2022 Min	60th Percentile 2022 PP	2022 Mid	2022 Max
				\$131,940	\$145,135	\$155,030	\$178,120
120	Human Resources Manager	Human Resources					
120	Information Technology Manager	Info Systems					
				\$66.60	\$73.27	\$78.26	\$89.92
				\$138,537	\$152,391	\$162,782	\$187,026
125	Deputy Police Chief	Police					
125	Finance Director	Finance					
				\$69.93	\$76.93	\$82.17	\$94.41
				\$145,464	\$160,011	\$170,921	\$196,377
130	Assistant City Administrator	Mgmt & Planning					
				\$73.43	\$80.77	\$86.28	\$99.13
				\$152,738	\$168,011	\$179,467	\$206,196
135	Deputy City Administrator	Mgmt & Planning					
135	Police Chief	Police					
135	Public Works Director	PW					
				\$90.32	\$99.35	\$106.13	\$121.93
150	City Administrator	Mgmt & Planning		\$187,867	\$206,654	\$220,744	\$253,621

Appendix B: Definitions

The following are definitions that helped guide the development of the compensation system for the City:

Benchmark Position: A job that is commonly found and defined, used to make pay comparisons, either within the organization or to comparable jobs outside the organization.

Classifications: Job titles.

Compensation System: A system developed to compensate employees. This system includes a balance between internal equity and external competitiveness.

Compensation Data: Data derived from information regarding the salary range and the rate of pay of the incumbent(s) holding a benchmark position of the identified labor market.

Comp Ratio: The ratio of an actual pay range to the established position point (or average market rate). The comp ratio is used to measure and monitor an individual's actual rate of pay to the position point of the established pay range.

Compression: Pay differentials too small to be considered equitable. The term may apply to differences between (1) the pay of supervisors and subordinates; (2) the pay of experienced and newly hired personnel of the same job; and (3) pay range midpoints in successive job grades or related grades across pay structures.

CPI-U: Consumer Price Index – Urban: A measure of the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for a market of consumer goods and services. It reflects the spending pattern for three population groups: (1) all urban consumers, (2) urban wage earners, and (3) clerical workers. This group represents approximately 87% of the total U.S. population.

Demotion: The (re)assignment of an employee to a position in a lower pay grade or range in the organization's salary structure.

Labor Market: A location where labor is exchanged for wages. These locations are identified and defined by a combination of the following factors: geography, industry education, experience and licensing or certification required, and job responsibilities.

Market Data: The technique of creating the financial value of a position based on the "going rate" for benchmark positions in the relevant labor markets.

Minimum Salary Range (minimum): The minimum amount of compensation the organization has deemed appropriate for a position.

Maximum Salary Range (maximum): The highest amount of compensation the organization has deemed appropriate for a position.

Market Average: Employee pay based upon the "average" market rate, or the "average" prevailing wage rate in the external market.

Market Rate (market/position point): The organization's best estimate of the wage rate that is prevailing in the external market for a given position.

Market Average Range: A pay range in which the minimum and maximum of the range is established around the average market rate.

Pay Grade: The grade, or placement of a position, within the salary structure.

Pay Grade Evaluation: The (re)assignment of a job to a higher or lower pay grade or pay range in the salary structure due to a job content (re)evaluation and/or significant change in the average market rate in the external labor market.

Performance Increase: An adjustment to an individual's base pay rate based on performance or some other individual measure.

Promotion: The (re)assignment of an employee to a position in a higher pay grade or range in the organization's salary structure.

Red Circle: The freezing of a rate of pay until such time that the salary schedule catches up to the pay rate. This is commonly used when implementing a new pay schedule when a tenured employee is above the range maximum or when an employee is placed on a lower pay grade that is not related to performance issues.

Salary Schedule Adjustment: An adjustment to the salary structure - the increase or decrease of a pay range, minimum to maximum. This is a method to maintain the salary range in relation to external market conditions.

Salary Schedule: The hierarchy of job grades and pay ranges established within an organization.

Spread: The range of pay rates, from minimum to maximum.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-16

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of the City of Prairie Village is authorized to establish salary ranges for city positions; and

WHEREAS, the City completed a compensation study in 2022 and committed to completing a study every five years to ensure the City continues to provide adequate compensation and benefits for all employees; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Governing Body that these salary ranges be reviewed and adjusted annually, as needed, to ensure appropriate funds are budgeted and the salary ranges remain competitive;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved the Governing Body of the City of Prairie Village, Kansas, hereby adopts the following compensation ranges for November 2022 and January 2023:

The elected officers, appointive officers and employees of the city shall be compensated within the salary ranges provided in this section. The amount of compensation shall be fixed by the Governing Body in accordance with personnel procedures as adopted by the Governing Body from time to time, provided, however, that the salaries and compensation, shall be within and determined by the following ranges beginning October 31, 2022, and calendar year 2023. 2023 is a 1.5% range increase over 2022:

	November 2022		January 2023	
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Customer Service Representative	\$37,440	\$50,544	\$38,002	\$51,302
Accounting Specialist	\$43,670	\$58,955	\$44,325	\$59,839
Administrative Support Specialist I	\$43,670	\$58,955	\$44,325	\$59,839
Code Support Specialist I	\$43,670	\$58,955	\$44,325	\$59,839
Court Clerk I	\$43,670	\$58,955	\$44,325	\$59,839
Administrative Support Specialist II	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Code Enforcement Officer	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Code Support Specialist II	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Court Clerk II	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Deputy Court Clerk	\$50,937	\$68,765	\$51,701	\$69,796
Building Inspector	\$56,030	\$75,641	\$56,871	\$76,776
Information Systems Specialist	\$61,633	\$83,205	\$62,558	\$84,453
Accountant	\$69,029	\$93,190	\$70,065	\$94,588
Public Information Officer	\$69,029	\$93,190	\$70,065	\$94,588
Sr Building Inspector	\$75,932	\$102,509	\$77,071	\$104,046
City Clerk	\$97,391	\$131,478	\$98,852	\$133,450
Court Administrator	\$97,391	\$131,478	\$98,852	\$133,450
IT Systems Administrator	\$97,391	\$131,478	\$98,852	\$133,450
Building Official	\$105,182	\$141,996	\$106,760	\$144,126
Human Resources Manager	\$131,940	\$178,120	\$133,920	\$180,791
Information Technology Mgr	\$131,940	\$178,120	\$133,920	\$180,791
Finance Director	\$138,537	\$187,026	\$140,616	\$189,831
Assistant City Administrator	\$145,464	\$196,377	\$147,646	\$199,323
Deputy City Administrator	\$152,738	\$206,196	\$155,029	\$209,289
City Administrator	\$187,867	\$253,621	\$190,685	\$257,425

	November 2022		January 2023	
PUBLIC WORKS	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Maintenance Worker I	\$40,435	\$54,588	\$41,042	\$55,406
Maintenance Worker II	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Mechanic I	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Maintenance Worker III	\$50,937	\$68,765	\$51,701	\$69,796
Mechanic II	\$50,937	\$68,765	\$51,701	\$69,796
Construction Right of Way Inspector	\$56,030	\$75,641	\$56,871	\$76,776
Crew Leader	\$56,030	\$75,641	\$56,871	\$76,776
Urban Forestry Specialist	\$56,030	\$75,641	\$56,871	\$76,776
Project Inspector	\$61,633	\$83,205	\$62,558	\$84,453
Assistant to PW Director	\$69,029	\$93,190	\$70,065	\$94,588
Assistant Field Superintendent	\$69,029	\$93,190	\$70,065	\$94,588
Project Manager	\$88,537	\$119,525	\$89,865	\$121,318
Field Superintendent	\$97,391	\$131,478	\$98,852	\$133,450
Senior Project Manager	\$105,182	\$141,996	\$106,760	\$144,126
City Engineer	\$117,804	\$159,035	\$119,571	\$161,421
Public Works Director	\$152,738	\$206,196	\$155,029	\$209,289
PUBLIC SAFETY				
Police Records Specialist	\$43,670	\$58,955	\$44,325	\$59,839
Community Support Officer	\$43,670	\$58,955	\$44,325	\$59,839
Evidence & Property Specialist	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Dispatcher I	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$47,871	\$64,626
Police Administrative Specialist	\$47,164	\$63,671	\$51,701	\$69,796
Police Officer	\$56,030	\$75,641	\$56,871	\$76,776
Dispatcher II	\$56,030	\$75,641	\$56,871	\$76,776
Master Police Officer	\$61,633	\$83,205	\$62,558	\$84,453
Police Corporal	\$69,029	\$93,190	\$70,065	\$94,588
Dispatch Supervisor	\$75,932	\$102,509	\$77,071	\$104,046
Police Sergeant	\$83,526	\$112,760	\$84,778	\$114,451
Police Captain	\$105,182	\$141,996	\$106,760	\$144,126
Deputy Police Chief	\$138,537	\$178,120	\$140,616	\$189,831
Police Chief	\$152,738	\$206,196	\$155,029	\$209,289
SEASONAL/PART-TIME				
Special Event Coordinator	\$26.94	\$36.37	\$27.34	\$36.91
PD Crime Analyst	\$29.63	\$40.00	\$30.08	\$40.60
Concession Stand Worker	\$12.50	\$17.58	\$12.50	\$17.58
Bailiff	\$14.50	\$19.58	\$14.50	\$19.58
Lifeguard	\$14.50	\$19.58	\$14.50	\$19.58
Assistant Coaches	\$14.50	\$19.58	\$14.50	\$19.58
Head Swim/Dive Coaches	\$15.66	\$21.14	\$15.66	\$21.14
Assistant Pool Manager	\$17.23	\$23.26	\$17.23	\$23.26
Aquatics Supervisor	\$22.67	\$30.61	\$23.01	\$31.07

Employee/Consultant

A person may be compensated in a category defined as "independent contractor consultant". The rate of pay and other terms of employment for an individual in this category will be established and approved by the City Council.

Part-time Appointed Officials

Part-time appointed officials shall be compensated as follows in 2023:

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Treasurer (monthly)	\$400	\$500

Adopted this XXth Day of October, 2022.

Eric Mikkleson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Adam Geffert, City Clerk

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS
Monday, October 17, 2022

Planning Commission work session	10/25/2022	6:00 p.m.
Environmental Committee	10/26/2022	5:30 p.m.
National drug take back event	10/29/2022	10:00 a.m.
Tree Board	11/02/2022	6:00 p.m.
Arts Council arts reception	11/02/2022	6:00 p.m.
City Council	11/07/2022	6:00 p.m.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
October 17, 2022

1. Board of Zoning Appeals meeting minutes – July 12, 2022
2. Planning Commission meeting minutes – September 13, 2022
3. Parks and Recreation Committee meeting minutes – September 14, 2022
4. Consolidated Fire District #2 third quarter report

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANSAS
MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2022**

ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Prairie Village, Kansas was held on Tuesday, July 12, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Patrick Lenahan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present: Jonathan Birkel, Greg Wolf, Melissa Brown, Nancy Wallerstein, and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Board of Zoning Appeals: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Greg Shelton, Council Liaison, and Adam Geffert, City Clerk/Board Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Wolf moved for the approval of the minutes of the September 14, 2021, Board of Zoning Appeals meeting as presented. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

BZA2022-01 Variance of Required Site Setback
 5106 W. 69th Terrace
 Zoning: R-1A
 Applicant: Michael and Kelly Simonett

Mr. Brewster stated that the applicant was requesting a variance from Section 19.06.015 to allow an addition to be built closer than 14' to an existing building on an adjacent lot. The development standards for R-1A lots require a side setback that is:

1. At least 7' on each side
2. At least 20% of the lot width on both sides
3. At least 14' from any adjacent building

The existing house on the subject lot and the house on the adjacent lot were each built in 1947. The lot is 9,995.58 square feet (70' x 142') and the existing house is approximately 13.6' from the west side lot line and 19.6' from the east side lot line. The proposed addition would change that to 8.5' from the west side lot line, and 7' from the east side lot line.

While this would meet the side setback standards for both the minimum (7') and the overall percentage (20% of width), due to the location of the house on the east adjacent lot the proposed addition would be approximately 11.8' from that house, which sits on a corner lot and is 4.8' from the side lot line, a preexisting non-conforming situation. In this circumstance it would require that any new building in the vicinity of the adjacent structure be setback 9.2', rather than the minimum required 7'. All other requirements of the R-1A district and accessory building standards would be met.

Mr. Brewster noted that if the variance were approved, it should be subject to the following conditions:

1. That the variance be granted only to the extent shown on the submitted plans
2. The variance be recorded with the County Register of Deeds within one year of approval

He added that zoning regulations required the Board to find that all five of the following "golden factors" be met to grant a variance:

1. Uniqueness - That the variance requested arises from such condition which is unique to the property in question, and which is not ordinarily found in the same zone or district and is not created by an action or actions of the property owner or the applicant.
2. Adjacent Property - That the granting of the permit for the variance would not adversely affect the rights of adjacent property owners or residents.
3. Hardship - That the strict application of the provisions of these regulations from which a variance is requested will constitute an unnecessary hardship upon the property owner represented in the application.
4. Public Interest - That the variance desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, or general welfare.
5. Spirit and Intent of the Regulation - That the granting of the variance desired would not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of these regulations.

Applicant and property owner Mike Simonett was present to discuss the variance.

Board members reviewed each golden factor and determined that the proposed addition met all requirements.

Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the variance with the conditions proposed by staff. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Wolf made a motion to reelect the current slate of officers:

- Mr. Lenahan, Chair
- Mr. Birkel, Vice-Chair
- Mr. Geffert, Secretary

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wallerstein and passed 6-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Patrick Lenahan adjourned the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals at 6:45 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Board Secretary

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 13, 2022**

ROLL CALL

The Planning Commission of the City of Prairie Village met in regular session on Tuesday, September 13, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 7700 Mission Road. Chair Greg Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Jon Birkel, James Breneman, Patrick Lenahan, Melissa Brown, Nancy Wallerstein and Jeffrey Valentino.

The following individuals were present in their advisory capacity to the Planning Commission: Chris Brewster, Multistudio; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Mitch Dringman, Building Official.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Breneman moved for the approval of the minutes of the August 2, 2022, regular Planning Commission meeting. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

NON-PUBLIC HEARINGS

PC2022-119 Site Plan Exception for Solar Panel Installation
7813 Canterbury Street
Zoning: R-1A
Applicant: Bob Solger, Solar Design Studio

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception related to the installation of ten solar panels on the principal dwelling and detached accessory car port. The panels were installed subject to a permit indicating the ordinance requirement that panels not project more than 5” from the surface of the roof. Upon installation and inspection, staff determined that the panels were too high and needed to be lowered. The applicant complied, but the lowest the panels can be set is approximately 5.8” from the roof surface. The panels are on the west (front) side of the principal structure and the rear pitch of the car port. The car port is situated in the front but is in a recessed front area due to the building footprint.

Mr. Brewster noted that the renewable energy provisions and solar energy standards of the zoning regulations have design compatibility standards, which require roof mounted panels to be generally parallel with the roof and project no more than 5” from the roof. The applicant submitted documents explaining why the selected panels can only be mounted approximately 5.8” to 6.0” above the roof, due to the mounting bracket mechanism and the general need for all solar panels to have appropriate ventilation.

Mr. Brewster stated that the solar panel standards allow for exceptions to be granted through the site plan review process. The exception criteria allow some leniency in application of the standards and account for energy design and technology issues, provided that the intent of the section is met, and the exception is necessary due to the design and function of the solar technology.

In this case, the following factors support an exception:

- The exception is a minimal deviation from the required standard (approximately 5.8” projecting rather than 5”), and will not be detectible from the ground, adjacent property, or streetscape
- The panels are otherwise parallel with the pitch of the roof and appear consistent with the existing scale and massing of the principal and accessory buildings
- The applicant has supplied specifications for the panels that justify the exception to promote the function of the panels and appropriate installation
- The panels are situated in a way that is not directly visible from adjacent property or the street due

Mr. Brewster said that staff recommended approval of the site plan with the exception to allow the panels to project approximately 5.8” to 6.0” above the roof surface due to the following:

- The limited nature of the exception request
- The panels remaining parallel to the roof structure and consistent with the scale and massing of the buildings
- The situation of the buildings and specific panel locations will have limited impact on the streetscape and adjacent property
- The specifications submitted demonstrate a need for the exception to allow property installation and maintain the function of the solar panels

Applicant Bob Solger, 23185 92 Highway, Platte City, MO, and property owner Steve McGuire were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Breneman made a motion to approve PC2022-119 based on the factors presented by staff. Mrs. Wallerstein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2022-120

Site Plan Exception for Fence

7401 High Drive

Zoning: R-1A

Applicant: Jere Sellers

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting an exception to the required fence setback on 74th Street, allowing a new 6' wood privacy fence to be approximately 5' from the property line, rather than 17.5' from the property line. The property is a corner lot on the southeast corner of 74th Street and High Drive, and the lot to the east (abutting the rear lot line) orients to 74th Street. The subject lot is an "end grain" lot, meaning it faces High Drive while other lots further south on the block are oriented to 74th Street.

In this circumstance, the zoning ordinance requires the fence to be set back from the lot line on 74th Street the greater of 15' or one-half the front setback of the adjacent lots. The abutting lot has a front setback of 35' from 74th Street, so the required fence setback is 17.5'. Since the proposed fenced area is in the side and rear there are no restrictions on the design of the fence, other than the general height and design standards

In this circumstance, the proposed exception will not have a significant negative effect on the intent of the standard. The following factors affect the situation:

- The proposed fence would be located 5' from the property line, rather than the required 17.5', but remains approximately 17' from the curb of 74th Street
- A fenced yard meeting the standards would have a smaller rear fenced area and only allow approximately 3' to 5' of the street side yard between the house and the street to be fenced
- The lot is an end grain pattern with three lots on the west end of the block fronting on High Drive while the rest of the houses to the east front 74th Street
- The property most impacted by the proposed exception to the east is approximately 25' from the side property line where the fence will project, and is oriented in a way that the exception will not have a significant negative impact on the views of the streetscape for the home
- The proposed fence will meet all other fence requirements in Section 19.44.025, except for the location

Mr. Brewster said staff recommended approval of the exception given the following considerations:

- The proposed fence would be located 5' from the property line, rather than the required 17.5', but remain approximately 17' from the curb of 74th Street
- A fenced yard meeting the standards would have a smaller rear fenced area and only allow approximately 3' to 5' of the street side yard between the house and the street to be fenced
- The lot is an end grain pattern with three lots on the west end of the block fronting on High Drive while the rest of the houses to the east front 74th Street
- The property most impacted by the proposed exception to the east, is approximately 25' from the side property line where the fence will project and is

oriented in a way that the exception will not have a significant negative impact on the views of the streetscape for the home.

- The proposed fence will meet all other fence requirements in Section 19.44.025, except for the location

Applicant and property owner Jere Sellers was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Breneman made a motion to approve PC2022-120 based on the considerations presented by staff. Mr. Birkel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2022-121 Design review for Exception to Fenestration Requirements
5220 W. 69th Street
Zoning: R-1A
Applicant: Dan Wessel representing Patrick and Shannon O'Bryan

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was applying for a design exception to allow the east elevation of the proposed residence to bypass window requirements. Specifically, the exception is in regard to the requirement that a minimum of 8% of side elevations to be comprised of window or entrance openings. The proposed application is approximately 2.62% and is comprised of two windows associated with the second story (a third window appears in the elevation, but it is associated with a massing component that is more than 12' removed from the side elevation, and therefore is not subject to the requirement.)

Mr. Brewster stated that a subsection of the building massing standards breaks down the volume of the buildable area and height into smaller scale masses to improve the relationship of the building to the lot, adjacent buildings, and the streetscape. Garage doors are excluded since one of the objectives of the standards is to promote more "human-scale" design and reduce the emphasis on automobiles. However, this latter issue primarily deals with issues on front elevations.

In this case, the exception is requested for the 8% side elevation requirement, which also includes a side-oriented garage. The elevation has varied massing due to the setback of one of the garage bays, gables at two different depths, and a larger remainder of the elevation more than 12' beyond the forward part. Staff has measured the elevations as follows:

- Plane A (double garage and gable) 319 s.f.
- Plane B (single garage and gable) 262 s.f.
- Plane C (rear dormer) 25 s.f.
- Total elevation 606 s.f.
- Windows 2.62% + allowance for up to 3% to be trim and molding = 5.62% (8% required)

The lower level is only comprised of garage doors. Although they technically cannot count to the window and opening requirement, for this side-oriented garage and the overall elevation they accomplish many of the goals stated above. Further, the windows that are

shown on the elevation are appropriately placed in association with the gables and provide sufficient transparency for the upper-level space.

Mr. Brewster said that the application meets all standards except for the window and entrance requirement on the east elevation, and therefore meets the intent of the building and massing standards. Despite not technically meeting the 8% window requirement, the elevation has substantial interest and relief, and the location of the garage in relation to the overall building and site design also add to the “transparency” of this elevation. As a result, staff recommends approval the exception to the neighborhood design standards (window and entrance requirements on the east elevation) subject to the plans submitted.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked if regulations would be met if the proposed windows were enlarged. Mr. Brewster said they would.

Applicant Dan Wessel, 7244 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, MO was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had created a design that would meet the criteria, but that it would negatively impact the interior design of the home in his opinion.

Mr. Lenahan made a motion to approve PC2022-121 based on the information provided by staff. Mr. Valentino seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PC2022-122 Site Plan Exception for Impervious Coverage Area
 9119 Alhambra Street
 Zoning: R-1A
 Applicant: Jason Leiker

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was seeking an exception to build a pool and pool deck in the rear yard and requesting an exception to the 40% impervious surface limit. The application includes a 17' x 41' pool and surrounding pool deck in the rear yard. The applicant previously received an exception from the Planning Commission to the fence standards in May, for a fence to be built near the property line along 92nd Terrace.

In 2018, in association with the revisions to the R-1A and R-1B development standards and adoption of the neighborhood design standards, the City also adopted an impervious surface standard of 40%. This standard applies to any new homes built after the adoption date. This home was built in 2021, which means it is subject to all new neighborhood design and lot coverage standards. Based on a plan review, the proposed pool and deck area makes the total impervious surface coverage 40.9% on the property.

Mr. Brewster said staff recommends approval of this site plan with the lot coverage exception based on the following considerations:

- The limited nature of the exception (approximately 0.9% from the standard) and the negligible impact it will have on overall stormwater policies for the City
- The drainage plan for the specific improvements demonstrating no adverse impact on the abutting property or the overall stormwater system

Pool installer Stephen King, 19527 Stillwell Road, Linwood, KS, was present to discuss the application representing the applicant. He stated that the original permit only had one foot of decking around the pool, and that the request for an exception was to increase the amount of decking.

Mr. Valentino asked if the pool size could be reduced to allow for more decking and meet the impervious surface coverage limit. Mr. King said the pool would need to be reduced by approximately 50% in size to meet the 40% limit.

Ms. Brown noted that this was the second time that the property owner had come before the Planning Commission for an exception to building requirements, and that the amount of impervious area should have been considered prior to the first submission. Mrs. Wallerstein agreed, stating that a fence exception had already been granted to accommodate the pool.

Mr. Lenahan made a motion to approve PC2022-122 with the conditions listed by staff. There was no second to the motion; the application was not approved.

PC2022-123 Site Plan for Monument Sign
 8340 Mission Road
 Zoning: C-0
 Applicant: Dick Robinson, High Tech Signs of America

Mr. Brewster said that the applicant was requesting approval of a monument sign for a 1.97-acre commercial site. The sign would be placed at the mid-point of the landscape frontage along Mission Road, between the sidewalk and parking area. The proposed sign is double-sided and internally illuminated, with an aluminum cabinet, white acrylic letters, and individual tenant panels.

Mr. Brewster noted that the applicant has proposed the sign to be placed 6' from the property line and approximately 12.5' from the curb, centered in a landscape area between the sidewalk and parking lot. The sign is 20 s.f., 5' high and on a 4' wide brick base that matches the primary material of the building. He noted that the color of the cabinet was unclear from the application. Although there are no specific color standards, sections 19-48.080 (a) and (b) include guidelines to coordinate sign materials, colors, and styles with the site and building, particularly if signs include multiple tenants.

Mr. Brewster said the sign is properly situated in a landscape area at least 3' on all sides, but that detailed landscape plans were not included in the submittal. Some ground-level ornamental plantings may be necessary to integrate the sign better into the landscape buffer along the parking frontage.

Mr. Brewster stated that staff recommends approval of the of the proposed monument signs, subject to the following:

- The applicant confirms to the Planning Commission the color combinations of the sign panel and tenant backing, and particularly the conformance guidelines in 19.48.080 (a) and (b)
- The applicant submits detailed landscape plan for the base (number of plants, species, etc.) to be approved by the City’s landscape architect consultant prior to sign permits

Mrs. Wallerstein asked if the proposed sign would be compatible with the existing signs on the office building. Mr. Brewster said he believed the brick base matched the brick exterior of the building, which met the requirements for coordination.

Chris Eardley, Vice President of Tower Properties, was present to discuss the application, along with Dick Robinson, High Tech Signs of America, 1200 Romany Road, Kansas City, MO. Mr. Robinson stated that the sign would be brick along with white aluminum, which would match the building. Additionally, a landscape plan would be submitted.

Mrs. Wallerstein asked if the sign would be placed on a higher berm than the current sign currently sits. Mr. Brewster stated the height of the berm would not change.

Mr. Valentino made a motion to approve PC2022-123 with the conditions listed by staff. Mr. Breneman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion of Ad Hoc Housing Committee Recommendations

Mr. Brewster shared information about the committee’s recommendations, as well as a primer on housing, zoning districts, and the Village Vision 2.0 comprehensive plan. He stated that the recommendations fit into three categories:

- **Regulatory:** amend zoning to allow “missing middle” housing by-right in more districts
 - R-1: accessory living quarters, small lots / courtyard patterns, multi-unit housing
 - R-2: smaller lot duplexes, 3- and 4- plex multi-unit houses, row houses
 - R-3 / R-4: improve provisions for various scales of multi-unit types
 - C-0, C-1, MXD: improve mixed use options
 - Update zoning map to identify most appropriate location for “missing middle” housing
 - Monitor short-term rentals / research further regulations
- **Policy:** support rehabilitation of existing housing stock / preserve existing attainable housing
- **Administrative:** continue to engage in regional initiatives for housing attainability and transit connectivity.

Mr. Brewster said that the Village Vision 2.0 comprehensive plan was a long-term guide that was meant to allow flexibility over its 20-year timeframe. He noted that the plan's focus included development principles, such as the diversification of housing options while maintaining the integrity of neighborhoods, as well as policy plans, such as reinforcing existing neighborhood patterns and strengthening neighborhood design.

Mr. Brewster stated that the following issues should be considered by the Planning Commission for each zoning district:

- **R-1A and R-1B (single-family):**
 - Review conditions for accessory living quarters (ALQs)
 - Improve the process, criteria, and options for “planned” applications
- **R-2 (single-family and two-family):**
 - Consider smaller-lot options for duplexes
 - Consider other “house-scaled” multi-unit building types
 - Develop strategies and criteria for application of R-2 district at transition areas, along with design standards.
- **R-3 and R-4 (multi-family):**
 - Identify options for additional appropriate multi-unit building types (row houses, small apartments, medium apartments)
 - Improve design standards and expectations for applications
- **C-0, C-1, and MXD (commercial and mixed use):**
 - Consider options for allowing accessory residential in commercial districts
 - Improve design standards and expectations for MXD rezoning process

Mr. Brewster also presented the series of steps that would be followed to review and consider updates to the zoning ordinance:

1. Public engagement and discussion
2. Notice to the public
3. Planning Commission public hearing
4. Planning Commission recommendation
5. City Council meeting
6. Decision

The following proposed schedule was presented:

1. Public forum #1: issues and options (October)
2. Planning Commission work sessions: strategies and recommendations (November and December)
3. Public forum #2 (December and January)
4. Planning Commission work session: finalize recommendations (January and February)
5. Formal processes zoning code update (February - TBD)

Mr. Valentino suggested a third public forum might be warranted due to the proposed timeline. Mr. Wolf agreed, adding that there should be a 30-day notice for each public forum. Mr. Breneman stated that the breadth of information would require more meetings to address all items thoroughly. Mr. Lenahan agreed and recommended avoiding the months of November and December to hold meetings. Mrs. Wallerstein stated that the timeline needed to be lengthened significantly to clarify details and provide enough time for public comment. Mr. Wolf suggested holding the first public forum in October, the second in January or February, and a third in March or April. He also recommended holding the first work session in October prior to the first public forum. Mr. Brewster stated that he would create a revised schedule based on the Planning Commission's recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Wolf adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.

Adam Geffert
City Clerk/Planning Commission Secretary

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
6 p.m., September 14, 2022
City Hall – Council Chambers

MINUTES

Attendance: Chair Terrence Gallagher, Vice Chair Lauren Wolf, Carey Bickford, Randy Knight, Jayme Merklein, Caety Meyer, Matt Moeder, Kevin Murphy, Lauren Ozburn, Staff: Melissa Prenger, Meghan Buum, Scott Bingham (BBN Architects)

Public Participation: None

Reports

1. Chairperson's Report – Chairman Gallagher reported that at the September 7 City Council meeting, the budget was approved including the five year parks Capital Improvement Plan and an accelerated Harmon Park Pavilion and Restrooms project.

Mr. Gallagher recognized and congratulated Vice Chair Lauren Wolf on her appointment to the Mid-America Regional Council's Active Transportation Programming Committee.

2. Recreation Report – Assistant City Administrator Meghan Buum reported that the 2022 pool and recreation season came to a successful close, with more detailed information to be presented in October.
3. Public Works Report – Melissa Prenger reported on behalf on Field Superintendent James Carney:
 - a. The pool has closed for the year and crews will be performing routine year-end closing tasks through September and October. Bids for repairs to the lap pool will be received in October. Meghan organized a pool walk through with Public Works and the pool manager that was completed today so we already have our "to-do list" and our "wish list" started for 2023.
 - b. Ball diamonds should be getting a minor overhaul this fall to include additional product and grading where necessary.
 - c. A chemical use report is now being posted on the City website. This report illustrates the type and quantity of product that applied in the parks.
 - d. Aeration and over-seeding the parks began in September. The healthier and thicker grass grown; the less chemicals needed to prevent weeds.
 - e. The Grounds Crew recently removed the logs that separated the sand pit from the nature play area and replaced them with stones in an effort to remove a desirable location for wasps and hornets to nest.

- f. The Windsor Park light repairs have been put out for bid for a second time to include the upcoming restroom project. Public Works is hopeful that they will be able to complete the repairs this fall.
- g. Porter and Harmon Parks have been receiving quite a bit of graffiti in the restrooms this summer.

Melissa Prenger provided updates on park construction:

- a. Taliaferro – The new shelter and restroom are on schedule for completion in mid-October with final details including the placement of shelter furniture by the end of the year. The tennis court has been refinished to match Harmon and McCrum.
- b. Windsor – The park restroom plans are close to completion following the closure of the public survey. Construction on the restroom, trails, tennis and pickleball court will begin soon.
- c. Schliffke Park – The new layout of Schliffke park includes more linear park land with fewer parking spaces, additional trail/sidewalks, and benches, seat walls, and landscaping to be determined. Construction is expected to take place in 2024.
- d. Harmon Park – Four submittals were received for the new inclusive playset at Harmon Park. A selection committee of the chair, vice chair and staff selected two playsets to be put forward for public survey. Over 400 participants were engaged in this survey. Residents were asked to vote on look/feel of the play area. Participants chose the playset submitted by All Inclusive Rec.

The chosen concept as presented was more than the budgeted amount, with the proposal including a potential partnership with Variety KC who would bring an additional \$250k in exchange for certain branding elements and additional hard fencing to prevent children from straying or running from the park, as opposed to the landscape style and seat wall barriers the City originally included in the concept. Additional conversation with Variety KC will take place in the coming weeks with the City Council ultimately making the final decision related to the inclusion of another organization's funding and branding in our city parks.

Consent Agenda

- 1. Meeting Minutes – May 11, 2022: Kevin Murphy moved to approve the meeting minutes. Randy Knight seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

New Business

1. Community garden entry proposal (tentative) – This item was tabled to a later date.
2. Introduction to universal signing and park branding—Scott Bingham, BBN Architects, led a discussion among the committee.

Common features – What do we want to replicate in our parks to promote cohesion throughout the city? For example, restrooms and shelters may not be identical, but show consistent characteristics through colors, shapes, etc. Tennis courts are refinished in a similar color scheme. Benches will be consistent in material and finish. Ultimately, the goal is to create a brand standard to call back to when the City makes updates to the parks.

Information signs – All parks will continue to include a stacked stone entrance monument. Other sign content that could be included on signage would include park rules and maps as well as other supporting information such as park history, contact information, no smoking, and thunder warnings. Ultimately, the goal is to reduce or condense the amount of visual clutter in the parks.

What brand influences need to be considered – font, Prairie Village blue and other accent colors? Do we consider different signage based on the size of the park? How do materials and maintenance factor in? Would something more substantial be located in the larger parks? We want to be sure to plan for longevity.

Scott shared sign examples to help generate free form thought from the committee:

- Noticeable but blends in with the environment
- Design element on the back of the sign or secondary information like history
- Easy to clean, maintain, and update
- Timeless
- “One stop shop” for information
- Potentially add field markers
- Incorporate materials and shapes from the pavilions and restrooms
- Weathers well

Melissa thanked Scott and BBN for being a delight to work with and for their long history of good work with Prairie Village.

Information Items

Meeting Schedule

- October 12, 2022
- November 9, 2022

Adjournment – 7:09 p.m.

Activity Report | 3rd Qtr 2022



PROUDLY SERVING



MISSION • PRAIRIE VILLAGE • ROELAND PARK
FAIRWAY • WESTWOOD • WESTWOOD HILLS
MISSION WOODS • MISSION HILLS

In this issue:

- Service Calls Report
- Training
- Community News and Events
- Our CFD2 Team
- Fire Prevention Month



3rd Quarter 2022

Medical/Assist Calls	817
Fire Calls	578
Total Calls for Service	1395
Training Hours	3230
PR/Educational Activities	33

CFD2 FIRE TRAINING



A/O Paramedic Abdouch showing how to use the AutoPulse device that is now on BC21. The AutoPulse is a device that provides consistent, efficient mechanical compressions when someone needs ongoing CPR.



Crews attending Blue Card training. The "Blue Card" training program provides Fire Departments with a training and certification system that defines the best Standard Command Practices for common, local, everyday Strategic and Tactical emergency operations. This training and certification program produces Incident Commanders that make better decisions that will potentially eliminate costly

mistakes that cause injury, death, and unnecessary fire losses.



A/O Schulze at CMC Rescue Training

Tr23 sets up for Company Evolutions training at Overland Park Training Center.

COMMUNITY NEWS and EVENTS

MDA BOOT BLOCK



Labor Day weekend some of our crews collected money for the MDA Boot Block fundraiser, which raises money for the MDA Foundation that not only supports muscular dystrophy, but also other autoimmune neurological disorders, such as ALS. The crews that participated raised **\$6,431.80!** Way to go!

CFD2 BADGE PINNING CEREMONY

In September, CFD2 held a badge pinning ceremony for all newly promoted and hired employees since March 2020. Previous Covid restrictions delayed the ceremony, so a whopping 36 individuals were pinned! (7 additional individuals were unable to be in attendance for their pinning). Congratulations to all!





OUR CFD2 TEAM

CFD2 Member Highlight Captain Doug Flint



Our 3rd Quarter 2022 member highlight, is Doug Flint. Doug has been with CFD2 for 23 years. Click below for more on Doug's history with CFD2 and what he enjoys outside of work.

[Read Member Highlight](#)

Milestone Anniversary



Congratulations to Captain Justin Hensley on a milestone anniversary! Thank you for 20 years of leadership and service to CFD2!

Farewell to Luis



CFD2 Employee Appreciation 2020 CFD2 Employee Appreciation 2020



Luis Plascencia and family officially moved to Florida in September. We will all miss the camaraderie, the laughs, the hard work and dedication that Luis brought to CFD2. We wish the Plascencia family all the best on their new adventure in Florida!

FIRE PREVENTION MONTH

OCTOBER IS FIRE PREVENTION MONTH!

Our crews will be visiting several elementary schools in the month of October, to teach Kindergarten through 2nd grade students the importance of fire safety and fire prevention. Thank you to our firefighters, for presenting such an important subject to our youth! Check out the fire prevention week video below, brought to you by the NFPA.



Johnson County Consolidated Fire District No.2 | 913-432-1105 | ContactUs@cf2.org |
www.cf2.org

STAY CONNECTED



Visit our website
