



**CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF PRAIRIE VILLAGE  
NOVEMBER 4, 2024**

The City Council of Prairie Village, Kansas, met in regular session on Monday, November 4, at 6:00 p.m. Mayor Mikkelson presided.

**ROLL CALL**

Roll was called by the City Clerk with the following councilmembers in attendance: Cole Robinson, Terry O'Toole, Inga Selders, Ron Nelson, Lori Sharp (via Zoom), Chi Nguyen, Tyler Agniel, Greg Shelton, Nick Reddell, and Terrence Gallagher. Staff present: Byron Roberson, Chief of Police; Major Eric McCullough, Deputy Chief of Police; Keith Bredehoeft, Director of Public Works; Melissa Prenger, City Engineer; City Attorney Alex Aggen, Hunter Law Group; Wes Jordan, City Administrator; Nickie Lee, Deputy City Administrator; Tim Schwartzkopf, Assistant City Administrator; Meghan Buum, Assistant City Administrator; Jason Hannaman, Finance Director; Cindy Volanti, Human Resource Director; Adam Geffert, City Clerk.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Gallagher made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reddell and passed 10-0.

**INTRODUCTION OF STUDENTS AND SCOUTS**

Two students from Shawnee Mission East High School were present as a requirement for their U.S. Government AP class.

**PRESENTATIONS**

- Ms. Nguyen read a proclamation declaring November as Native American Heritage Month, as well as an acknowledgement noting that the land on which Prairie Village was located once belonged to several native tribes.
- Mayor Mikkelson stated that the planned LEED presentation listed on the agenda had been postponed due to speaker availability, and would instead be given at the December 2 meeting.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

- Pam Justus expressed her views on the City's fiscal responsibility to residents.



- Leon Patton shared his thoughts about Veterans Day and the national anthem.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

1. Consider approval of regular City Council meeting minutes - October 21, 2024
2. Consider memorandum of agreement with Little Government Relations for government relations and lobbying services in 2025
3. Consider approval of Kansas Gas franchise agreement

Mr. Reddell requested that item #2 be removed for further discussion.

**Mr. Gallagher made a motion to approve items #1 and #3 on the consent agenda. A roll call vote was taken with the following votes cast: “aye”: C. Robinson, O’Toole, Selders, Nelson, Sharp, Nguyen, Agniel, Shelton, Reddell, Gallagher. The motion passed 10-0.**

Mr. Reddell said that he appreciated the legislative updates that Little Government Relations (LGR) provided, but was interested in putting lobbying services for the City out for bid. Mr. Jordan stated that the services provided by LGR were part of an agreement with several other cities in Northeast Johnson County, which resulted in a significant cost reduction for Prairie Village.

Ms. Sharp said that she also liked the updates, but preferred that the City not use LGR for lobbying services because they did not always take the same position as that of the council. Mayor Mikkelson said that the lobbying provided by LGR was based on the legislative platform approved by the council each year. He added that the council would be considering its 2025 legislative platform at an upcoming meeting.

**After further discussion, Mr. Cole Robinson made a motion to approve item #2 as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Selders. A roll call vote was taken with the following votes cast: “aye”: C. Robinson, O’Toole, Selders, Nelson, Nguyen, Agniel, Shelton, Gallagher; “nay”: Sharp, Reddell. The motion passed 8-2.**

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- Mr. Nelson noted that there would be an Arts Council reception on November 6 at 7:00 p.m. at city hall.
- Mr. Gallagher stated that registration for the Prairie Village Foundation’s gingerbread house decorating event would be open through the end of the month.



### **MAYOR'S REPORT**

- The Mayor noted that he had attended both MARC and United Community Service board meetings since the prior Council meeting on October 21.
- The Mayor shared the following upcoming events:
  - The Johnson County Community College's "Some Enchanted Evening" event on November 9
  - A meeting with a cub scout troop on November 12 to discuss local government and public service
  - A Johnson County / Wyandotte County Mayors meeting on November 13
  - The Mayor's annual tree lighting ceremony on December 5
- The Mayor added that he had recently attended his 35<sup>th</sup> college reunion at Stanford University, at which a discussion about political polarization was held. He also encouraged residents to vote in the general election on November 5.

### **STAFF REPORTS**

- Chief Roberson noted that 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter crime statistics were included in the meeting packet, and that crime had fallen since the prior quarter and remained on par with previous years.
- Mr. Jordan said that the November plan of action was included in the meeting packet.
- Chief Steve Chick gave a third quarter report for Consolidated Fire District #2 and shared updates from the department.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**COU2024-56      Consider adoption of Resolution 2024-05 establishing 2025 employee compensation ranges**

Ms. Volanti said that the City annually adopted a resolution adjusting salary ranges for all positions based on market data from both the national level and the Kansas/Missouri region. When developing the 2025 budget, staff utilized a 1.5% range adjustment to maintain the City's competitiveness with the labor market, protect its ability to compete for skilled employees, and maintain ranges adequately to minimize increases/adjustments to the compensation study that was completed in 2022.



Changes to police officer and corporal ranges were approved mid-year 2024 to move officers through their salary range in ten years. The changes were a part of the overall 2025 budget discussion.

Ms. Volanti noted that the compensation consultant previously used by the City, McGrath Consulting, was contacted to obtain an outlook of external markets. McGrath indicated the 1.5% adjustment could be too low if the City intended to stay in the higher percentile as previously approved by council. Staff recommended staying with a 1.5% range adjustment, but would monitor salary trends in the market to ensure the City did not fall behind.

**Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve Resolution 2024-05 establishing 2025 compensation ranges, including a 1.5% range increase as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shelton.**

Ms. Sharp asked if any employees were at the top of their positional ranges. Ms. Volanti said all employees were within their respective ranges, but some were near the top based on tenure. Ms. Sharp said she preferred to wait to adjust ranges until the council could discuss them at a work session. Mr. Jordan said the approved budget for 2025 already included a merit pool and the proposed range increase, which were needed for end-of-year employee evaluations. He added that another salary study would be conducted in 2026.

Mr. Shelton asked how recruitment costs for new employees compared to retention costs of existing employees. Ms. Volanti said recruitment costs for new employees were higher.

**After further discussion, the motion passed 9-1, with Ms. Sharp in opposition.**

**Mr. Shelton 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. Reddell and passed 10-0.**

#### **COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Discuss purchase of 7820 Mission Road property and municipal complex improvement options**

Ms. Prenger stated that the city council had approved a contract to purchase the property at 7820 Mission Road (Mission Road Bible Church) at its August 19, 2024, meeting. Staff was directed to perform a feasibility study of the building to consider its condition, what updates or modifications would be required, and whether it could be used by the City. She noted that staff presentations and council discussion would happen over three council meetings:



- November 4 - Council Committee of the Whole:  
Facility assessment, asbestos report, and cost/options for uses at 7820 Mission Road
- November 18 - Council Committee of the Whole:  
Questions about the November 4 presentation and any follow up needed  
Direction regarding purchase and construction options
- December 2 - City Council:  
Formalize decision made at November 18 Council Committee of the Whole meeting

Ms. Prenger shared information gathered from the assessment of the property at 7820 Mission Road. She said the building did have fire protection via sprinklers, but was minimally insulated, and would need both HVAC and plumbing replaced. She also provided information about the following items:

- Easements: An easement for the fire department (CFD#2) driveway would remain in effect upon sale of the property. The driveway is stipulated as being available for use by both CFD#2 and the owner of 7820 Mission Road, but CFD#2 would be responsible for all maintenance. Additionally, an easement for a Johnson County Wastewater main runs north to south on the property just west of the existing building.
- Asbestos: An asbestos investigation was performed, and asbestos was found in locations throughout the building. Asbestos abatement would cost approximately \$135,000, though staff budgeted \$150,000.
- Options for City programming and facility needs: Ms. Prenger said that there were three options for City programming: do nothing, place city hall at the site, or place the police department at the site. Floor plan layouts and site plans were developed by the architects for the design team to estimate costs and determine functionality of the renovated spaces. These options were then evaluated based on the following criteria:
  - Estimated cost
  - Life of project: 75 years for new construction and 40 years for renovation
  - Return on investment: annual cost over the life of the project
  - Programming: function of the layout of offices and public spaces in the building
  - Land use: functionality of the site based on use of the space
  - Sustainability: ability to obtain LEED certification
  - Disruption to residents and services: could the proposed option be constructed with limited disruption to the services provided by all three entities (administration, police department, court)



Finally, Ms. Prenger discussed options and associated costs:

Option 1: No build at 7820 Mission Road site

This option investigated leaving all programming/buildings at the current site regardless of whether the 7820 Mission Road property was purchased.

- 1A \$0 Do not purchase property
- 1B \$6M Purchase cost and turn site into green space

This option would be coupled with the approved project for municipal complex improvements currently estimated with escalation at \$31M including:

- \$4M Police department
- \$8M Court
- \$19M City Hall

Option 2: City Hall relocated to 7820 Mission Road site

This option investigated relocating city hall functions (including council chambers) to 7820 Mission Road while leaving the police department at 7710 Mission Road and renovating and rebuilding 7700 Mission Road for court.

- 2A \$31M-\$35M New construction of city hall at 7820 Mission Road site
- 2B \$32M-\$38M Renovation to existing structure for city hall at 7820 site

Option 2 estimated costs include:

- \$4.5M Purchase of property
- \$4M Renovation of the police department
- \$4M-\$8M Renovation and new construction for court

Ms. Prenger noted that renovation of the existing building was more expensive because it was 30,000 square feet, whereas a new building would only be 18,200 square feet. As a result, staff did not recommend the renovation option.

Option 3: Police department relocated to 7820 Mission Road site

This option considered both renovation and new construction for relocating the police department to 7820 Mission Road. However, analysis showed that the parking lot in front of the building would not be sufficient to support court programming. Locating court and the police department together was the preferred option; however, due to parking constraints for court attendees, programming was moved back to the current city hall site. For this option, city hall staff would be relocated into the existing police department building at 7710 Mission Road, and 7700 Mission Road would be renovated for court with the



council chambers remaining in its existing location to be used for both council meetings and court.

- 3A \$38M New construction of PD at 7820 site
- 3B \$41M Renovation to existing structure for PD at 7820 site

Option 3 estimated costs include:

- \$4.5M Purchase of property
- \$5M Renovation of 7710 Mission Road to relocate city hall
- \$4M Renovation of chambers and relocation of court to 7700 Mission Road

Ms. Prenger said that staff recommended option 2A, because it had a minimal impact to the approved budget for the project and would likely not affect the City's AAA bond rating.

Mr. Jordan added that another advantage of using the 7820 Mission Road site for city hall was that utilities were already present, whereas constructing a new building at the south end of the municipal complex parking lot would require utilities to be moved at a significant expense. Additionally, necessary grading changes would require the construction of retaining walls. As a result, purchasing the church property, tearing down the existing building and constructing a new building would be approximately the same cost as building new in the parking lot.

Mr. Hannaman noted that \$3.8 million was already allocated to the project through ARPA funds and budgeted debt service funding in 2024 and 2025. As a result, the amount to be borrowed for a \$31M project would total \$27.2 million, equaling an annual debt service payment of \$1,523,702.39, or \$373,702.29 more than what was already being funded in 2024 and 2025.

Mr. Cole Robinson asked when the Meadowbrook development's tax increment financing payment would be complete. Mr. Hannaman stated that it was anticipated to be completed in 2028 or 2029, after which tax revenues would be directed to the City. The estimated annual amount of the City's portion would total approximately \$700,000.

Ms. Nguyen asked if the construction timelines were the same for all the presented options. Ms. Prenger said they were not, because the contract to purchase the property at 7820 Mission Road included a stipulation that the church would continue to use the building for an additional 12 - 18 months. If the selected project did not include the church property, construction could begin sooner.

Ms. Sharp asked if the City would host another open house event to give residents the opportunity to provide input. Mr. Jordan stated the project timeline was dictated by the agreement with the church, but an open house could be held if staff were directed by council to do so.



Ms. Sharp asked if council policy 56 stating that the percentage of direct City debt scheduled for retirement in the next 10 years should exceed 50% of the total outstanding debt would need to be modified. Mr. Jordan said that it would.

Mr. Reddell shared concern at the cost of remodeling the church building.

At 7:55 p.m., Mr. Cole Robinson made the following motion:

*"I move the City Council recess into executive session for a period of 20 minutes for a discussion of the acquisition of real property, pursuant to K.S.A. 75-4319(b)(6). The Governing Body, City Administrator, Deputy City Administrator, Assistant City Administrators, Finance Director, Public Works Director, City Engineer and City Attorney will be present. The open meeting will resume at 8:20 p.m."*

The open meeting resumed at 8:20.

**COU2024-57            Consider contract with Axon for police in-car and body-worn cameras, tasers, VR training system and associated software**

Chief Roberson stated that the police department's current in-car and body-worn camera systems had reached end of life and needed to be replaced. The department solicited quotes from multiple vendors and identified Axon as the preferred vendor for the replacement of the system. During the search, Axon presented a proposal that included cameras, Tasers, a VR training system, unlimited data storage, and a host of software packages that allow one interconnected configuration.

Deputy Chief McCullough gave a presentation showcasing how each element of the product suite worked. He said that the department's strategic plan included a goal of utilizing technology to increase officer safety and wellness, improving and expediting the clearance of cases, improving oversight and transparency, and engaging the community. The purchase of the Axon officer safety bundle would help the department move toward that goal, and over the ten-year contract provide a cost savings by purchasing the products at current prices and avoid escalating costs due to inflation. Further, he noted that other agencies in the region already used the Axon product suite, which would allow for greater interconnectivity.

Deputy Chief McCullough stated that the purchase price of the bundle would total \$3,622,077.00, paid in equal installments of \$362,207.70 per year for ten years with no finance charges. The 2025 department budget included \$388,042.00 for the purchase of in-car and body-worn camera systems, which would cover the cost of the 2025 payment. He added that the department had been budgeting \$150,000.00 per year in equipment reserve, and that the City of Mission Hills would pay for its portion of hardware in the





amount of \$28,779.72 per year. Ultimately, the department would need to plan for an increase of \$183,427.98 annually in the 2026 budget and beyond.

The proposed agreement would also include new hardware at regular intervals throughout the contract to ensure officers had the most up-to-date equipment available. In-car video systems would be refreshed three times, body-worn cameras would be refreshed five times, Taser devices would be refreshed two times, and the virtual reality hardware would be refreshed four times. The contract would also include all future updates to purchased software, and an ongoing warranty for all hardware.

Mayor Mikkelson asked if the Mission Hills City Council would be voting to determine whether they wanted to use the product. Deputy Chief McCullough said that after receiving approval from the Prairie Village City Council, the department would give a presentation to the Mission Hills council. Chief Roberson added that he had spoken to Mission Hills staff and that they were supportive of using the product.

**After further discussion, Mr. Shelton made a motion to recommend approval of the ten-year contract with Axon for the purchase of products from the Axon ecosystem to the City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Toole and passed 9-0 [Ms. Sharp left the meeting prior to the vote].**

**Mr. Shelton moved that the City Council end the Council Committee of the Whole portion of the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Agniel and passed 9-0.**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Announcements were included in the Council meeting packet.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Mikkelson declared the meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Adam Geffert  
City Clerk