

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
January 22, 2013

The Council Committee of the Whole met on Tuesday, January 22, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. The meeting was called to order by Council President Charles Clark with the following members present: Mayor Ron Shaffer, Ashley Weaver, Dale Warman, Ruth Hopkins, Steve Noll, Michael Kelly, Andrew Wang, Brooke Morehead, Charles Clark, David Morrison, Ted Odell and David Belz. Staff Members present: Wes Jordan, Chief of Police; Keith Bredehoeft, Public Works Project Manager; Katie Logan, City Attorney; Quinn Bennion, City Administrator; Dennis Enslinger, Assistant City Administrator; Lisa Santa Maria, Finance Director and Joyce Hagen Mundy, City Clerk.

Council President Charles Clark noted the agenda for the evening is full and in order to ensure that those items which need to be discussed are he is requesting that the discussion of residency requirements for appointed positions be moved to follow the presentation of the Community Center Feasibility Study.

Presentation on Community Center Feasibility Study

David Belz, chair of the Community Center Feasibility Study, stated the presentation is for information only. The Council is encouraged to ask questions, but no action will be taken tonight. Discussion will be at a future meeting. Mr. Belz called upon Chris DeVolder with 360 Architects to present their findings.

Mr. DeVolder stated the study looked to address three questions: 1) will the proposed center fit on the available site; 2) what services will the center provide and 3) what will the facility cost. With a number of community center facilities in the area (13 facilities within the identified area), there needs to be a unique facility and program that will reach out and bring people in. The unique feature that has been proposed is the construction of a 50 meter aquatic center with the capability to host high school and regional events.

To establish a program and construct a facility that meets the requirements of the citizens, a random resident survey was conducted by Leisure Vision of Olathe to over 1500 homes in Prairie Village. A total of 376 surveys were completed and returned. The survey feedback indicated the following four features were desired in the facility:

- Weight room/cardiovascular equipment area
- Indoor running/walking track
- Aerobics/fitness/dance space/yoga/Pilates
- Indoor aquatics/swimming center

Eighty-one percent of household were either very supportive or somewhat supportive of the city partnering with Johnson County Park & Recreation District in developing and operating a new indoor community/aquatic center. Fifty-five percent would support paying at least \$125 per year in additional property taxes to fund the construction and sixty-sever percent would possibly vote in favor of a half-cent sales tax to fund construction. Thirty-five percent prefer a ½ cent sales tax for funding the costs of

operating and constructing a new indoor community center/aquatic center and 21% prefer a combination of a property tax increase and a ½ cent sales tax.

The proposed location for the facility is within Harmon Park. The following three program design options were presented:

Option 1: a community center similar to the Matt Ross Community Center in Overland Park, along with a full aquatics component that includes an indoor 50 meter natatorium pool with bleachers to accommodate 1,500 spectators for swim/dive meets and a leisure pool with slides and zero-entry features. This would be a 136,349 sf structure with an estimated construction cost of \$43,891,000. The estimated operation and maintenance costs are \$3,033,000 with projected revenue of \$2,246,000.

Option 2: a community center similar to the Matt Ross Community Center in Overland Park, along with full aquatics component that includes an indoor 25m x 25 yard natatorium pool with bleachers to accommodate 1,500 spectators for swim/dive meets and a leisure pool with slides and zero-entry features. This would be a 130,005 sf structure with an estimated construction cost of \$41,849,000. Estimated operation and maintenance costs of \$2,821,000 with projected revenue of \$2,101,000.

Option 3: a hybrid community center option modeled on the components of the Matt Ross Community Center and the Gamber Center in Lee's Summit. This option does not include aquatics features, an indoor track or a gymnasium. It is envisioned only as a community gathering area with smaller space exercise functions. This would be a 21,081 sf structure with an estimated construction cost of \$5,122,000. Estimated operation and maintenance costs of \$710,000 with projected revenue of \$420,000.

Mr. DeVolder reviewed possible funding scenarios and identified the following potential partners: Shawnee Mission School District, Johnson County Park & Recreation District, YMCA, City of Mission, City of Overland Park and City of Leawood. The proposed facility, by virtue of the competition pool, leisure pool, multiple gymnasium space, youth fitness, running track, fitness rooms, meeting/party rooms and hearth/community area differentiates this facility from other facilities in the area. The design team's focus can best be described as creating "Healthy Buildings for Healthy Bodies".

Ted Odell asked for further thoughts on the potential use of this facility by Missouri residents. Mr. DeVolder responded that the majority of the other facilities in the area are in Kansas and he believes the Prairie Village location would fill a need for Missouri residents with a strong potential for annual membership sales.

Brooke Morehead asked if any considerations were given to increased membership rates for members across the state line as the facility would be available to Missouri residents.

Ashley Weaver reported the Park & Recreation Committee received this presentation at their last meeting and the general feedback from the committee was relative to the high

cost with the committee feeling that those people using the facility should bear the primary costs for the operation of the facility.

There were no further questions of Mr. DeVolder. City Council will discuss the feasibility study at a future meeting.

Discussion regarding residency requirement of appointed positions

Quinn Bennion noted the City Code and Employee Handbook require that the City Administrator, Public Works Director and Chief of Police be residents of Prairie Village within two years of position appointment and remain residents. All other employees must live within a 35- mile radius of their place of work. The other appointed positions of City Clerk and Assistant City Administrator do not have a residency requirement beyond the standard 35 miles radius provision. Prairie Village is one of few cities in Johnson County that require the Department Head to reside in the city as depicted in the table included in the packet information.

City Administrator Quinn Bennion recommended removing the residency requirement for the Public Works Director and Chief of Police positions. The primary reason for his recommendation is to increase the applicant pool during a Director search. A residency requirement dissuades quality candidates who reside in nearby communities and place on high value on their current neighborhood, house or school. He does not feel the other Department Heads which are not required to live in the City are less qualified and dedicated to their positions. However, he noted it does make it easier for individuals living within the city to become more involved in the immediate community, schools and Prairie Village neighborhoods.

Michael Kelly stated he supports the current residency requirement and noted significant interest in the past in these positions. He noted that the Independence School District is looking to require its principals to reside in the District. Ted Odell agreed with Mr. Kelly noting as a resident the Public Works Director would be more aware of the City's needs relative to its parks and streets.

Ruth Hopkins stated she has discussed this issue with leaders throughout the country and most do not have the residency requirements and do not see it as a problem. She noted the 35-mile radius and asked if staff would be open to possibly using a smaller radius. She feels a 35-mile radius is too large.

David Morrison stated the City should hire the very best qualified individuals regardless of where they live.

Steve Noll stated he felt the City Administrator needs to reside in the City. The Chief of Police and Public Works Director are hired for their technical expertise and experience. He would be accepting of only requiring Johnson County residency. Individuals residing within the county know and understand the expectations of Prairie Village and adjoining cities and should have a choice.

Dale Warman noted the residency requirements were created prior to the transportation and communication technology that exists today. He does not feel that living in the city is going to result in more community involvement. As the information presented indicates, most cities have moved away from residency requirements.

Brooke Morehead prefers requiring Johnson County residency rather than a mile radius. He noted there is a “Johnson County Culture”.

Chief Jordan stated the 35-mile radius would go beyond Johnson County. He felt a 25-mile radius would stay within the Johnson County radius.

Ruth Hopkins asked if other cities required Johnson County residency. Mr. Bennion responded two area cities did.

Ruth Hopkins made the following motion, which was seconded by David Morrison:

**DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE AND AMENDMENT
TO THE EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK TO MODIFY THE RESIDENCY
REQUIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR AND
CHIEF OF POLICE POSITIONS TO REQUIRE JOHNSON COUNTY
RESIDENCY**

Michael Kelly stated he would rather have someone live in Brookside than in southern Johnson County. Andrew Wang noted as a resident you experience the same issues as the residents you serve. If you are not a resident, he feels the closer proximity to the city the better.

Brooke Morehead noted that as a Johnson County resident one would share many of the same issues i.e., taxes, school issues, streets, etc. These are not the same for Missouri residents.

The motion was voted on and passed by a vote of 8 to 3 with Michael Kelly, Andrew Wang and Ted Odell voting in opposition.

Presentation of Annual Report on 2012 Exterior Grant Program

Dennis Enslinger stated the City’s Exterior Grant Program began in 2007. The grant program is awarded as a 20% reimbursement of the actual cost of construction and/or material costs. The minimum required private investment is \$5,000 with no maximum investment amount. The minimum grant is \$1,000 up to the maximum grant amount of \$2,500. Eligible improvements include, but are not limited to: complete exterior house painting or siding, door/window repair or replacement, new roof, masonry, foundation repair, awnings, building additions, and landscaping. New construction is also eligible.

Three key areas identified for implementation were:

Area 1: All PV addresses from 69th to 71st from Reeds to Nall; 71st to 75th from Nall east to Roe and 71st and Nall to Tomahawk

Area 2: All PV addresses on Belinder and Norwood, 71st to Somerset, east to State Line

Area 3: All PV addresses from 75th to 79th from Walmer east to Delmar

Mr. Enslinger stated to be eligible for the grant the property must be located within a designated grant improvement area. In addition, all property taxes must be current, adequate property insurance must be in effect, and all improvements must conform to City of Prairie Village Municipal Code and other applicable building codes. There is a limit of one grant per property every ten years. The program applies to all residential property owners regardless of residency in the home. While a single owner may apply for multiple properties within a program year, these grants cannot run concurrently; only one property at a time will be approved. The City Council allocated \$37,500 from the Economic Development Fund in the initial year of operation and anticipated a private investment of \$150,000 as a result of the program. The program continues to meet the needs of residents with the following growth and participation:

Year	Grant Budget	Number of Grants	Grant Award	Private Investment
2008	\$37,500	16	\$30,133	\$174,214
2009	\$50,000	28	\$42,802	\$256,789
2010	\$50,000	19	\$37,024	\$274,663
2011	\$50,000	16	\$34,320	\$184,127
2012	\$50,000	26	\$39,252	\$273,209
Totals	\$237,500	105	\$183,531	\$1,163,002

Over the past five years, a \$1 investment by the City has returned a \$5.50 investment from the residents in improvements to their property. Approximately 110 hours are spent in administering the program from the initial site visit and application to the final inspection. He commended Nancy Ihle for her work with the applicants.

In 2012 the City funded 26 grants. As of January 1, 2013, 25 projects have been completed with a City investment of \$39,251.64 and resident investment of \$233,956.93. The \$273,208.57 total investment in 2012 exceeds the total for 2011 projects by \$89,081.33.

Area	Number of Grants	Total Investment
1	6	\$51,641.58
2	8	\$82,783.14
3	11	\$138,783.85
Totals	26	\$273,208.57

The top uses for the grant funds in 2012 were for 1) landscaping, 2) windows, 3) Siding/Paint, 4) Roof and 5) Doors. Before and after photos were shown of several of the properties receiving grant funds.

Mr. Enslinger noted that Channel 5 will be doing a feature on the grant program in the future.

David Morrison asked how much of this work would have been done if grant funds had not been available. Mr. Enslinger responded this has not been tracked.

Ted Odell asked if the recipient had to reside in the home. Mr. Enslinger replied the grant can be awarded for a registered rental property. The program was initially created to address property maintenance issues that were most visible from the street and some of these were rental properties.

Michael Kelly confirmed the grant area does include those housed that front 75th Street.

Dennis Enslinger recommended that in the future the grant applications be overslated to realize a cost closer to \$50,000 annually and increase the grant opportunities. Council did not have objections or changes to the program.

Discussion regarding naming of public facilities

Quinn Bennion stated at an earlier meeting the Council approved new facility identification signs and questions were raised regarding the identification of the R.G. Endres Art Gallery and Public Works Facility named for former Public Works Director Bob Pryzby. Research by staff confirmed that the naming of the Art Gallery was recommended by the Arts Council and approved by the City Council. However, the naming of the Public Works facility was never voted on by the City Council. Staff is seeking direction on how to proceed as this issue is not addressed in any city code or policy. Mr. Bennion noted that no action has been taken on either of the signs pending ratification of past action and or new direction.

Michael Kelly stated he felt any naming of facilities should be approved by the Governing Body.

Ruth Hopkins provided background on the naming noting when the City Administrator retired she stated she would like a statue. When the Public Works Director retired he was asked if he would like the newly acquired public works building named after him. There was no written agreement.

Ted Odell stated he felt there should be a policy going forward.

Charles Clark stated there were two issues to be addressed - 1) whether or not to confirm the naming of the public works facility and 2) direction on how to proceed in the future.

Ruth Hopkins moved the City Council reaffirm the naming of the Public Works Facility after former Public Works Director Bob Pryzby. The motion was seconded by David Belz.

Brooke Morehead questioned setting a precedence of having building named for a staff member. She feels there needs to be a strong reason to name a building after a public employee.

David Morrison stated at the time he asked Diana Ewy Sharp what the City was doing for Bob to which she responded they were naming a building after him. He was surprised that there was no discussion or action taken by the City Council. Therefore, this action would not really be reaffirming Council action as previous action was not taken.

Steve Noll stated markers/signs need to be generic. People are seeking City Hall or Public Works - the signs need to identify the building function.

The motion was voted on and passed by a 6 to 5 vote with the following votes cast in opposition: Weaver, Kelly, Morehead, Morrison and Odell.

Steve Noll moved that henceforth city facilities/structures shall not be named for employees; however, that it is appropriate to acknowledge an individual with the placement of a plaque. The motion was seconded by Michael Kelly. The motion was voted on and passed by a vote of 6 to 5 with the following votes cast in opposition: Warman, Hopkins, Wang, Clark and Belz.

Steve Noll moved to amend the motion to include such action shall take place with the approval of the Governing Body. Mr. Kelly accepted the amendment.

The motion as amended was voted on and passed.

STAFF REPORTS

Public Safety

- Chief Jordan distributed the 2012 crime statistics noting they reflected an overall decrease similar to the 2008 level.
- Chief reported their had been ten residential burglaries since the first of the year. A map showing the locations was distributed and Chief discussed briefly the actions being taken by the City.

Public Works

- Keith Bredehoeft reported the Franklin Park Trail that was constructed in 2010 has several cracks. Staff is working with the contractor's bonding company and the trail will be repaired this spring.
- Maintenance crews are focusing on catch basins and the trimming of trees in the parks.

Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Council Committee of the Whole, Council President Charles Clark adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Charles Clark
Council President