

STATE OF KANSAS)
WYANDOTTE COUNTY)) SS
CITY OF KANSAS CITY, KS)

SPECIAL SESSION, THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2023

The Unified Government Commission of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, met in Special Session, Thursday, May 25, 2023, with eleven members present: Bynum, Commissioner At-Large First District (left the meeting at 6:46 p.m.); Burroughs, Commissioner At-Large Second District; Townsend, Commissioner First District; McKiernan, Commissioner Second District; Ramirez, Commissioner Third District; Johnson, Commissioner Fourth District; Kane, Commissioner Fifth District (left the meeting at 6:33 p.m.); Markley, Commissioner Sixth District; Stites, Commissioner Seventh District; Davis, Commissioner Eighth District; and Garner, Mayor/CEO, presiding. The following officials were also in attendance: David Johnston, County Administrator; Bridgette Cobbins and Alan Howze, Assistant County Administrator's; Patrick Waters, Acting Chief Legal Counsel; Brett Deichler, Unified Government Clerk; Debbie Jonscher, Acting Chief Financial Officer; Reginald Lindsey, Budget Director; and Jeff Fisher, Executive Director of Public Works.

Mayor Garner said before I call this meeting to order, I want to announce that we have individuals attending remotely as well as on-site. All participants joining by phone should mute their phones when not speaking to avoid background noise. During the meeting, please make sure that you announce yourself by name every time you speak so the public that is observing knows who is speaking. This is critical given the number of remote participants and is current guidance from the Kansas Attorney General's Office. When you speak, make sure you speak clearly into the microphone to ensure that all your comments are heard and an accurate record can be made.

Mayor Garner called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL: Ramirez, Johnson, Kane, Markley, Stites, Davis, Bynum, Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Garner.

NOTICE OF SPECIAL SESSION of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, to be conducted in a hybrid format on Thursday, May 25, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. in the fifth floor conference room of the Municipal Office Building for a Budget Workshop.

CONSENT TO MEETING of the governing body of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, accepting service of the foregoing notice, waiving all and any irregularities in such service and in such notice, and consent and agree that we, the governing body, shall meet at the time and place therein specified and for the purpose therein stated.

Mayor Garner said this is a scheduled budget workshop. I'll now turn it over to our County Administrator David Johnston and he will lead the meeting from here.

David Johnston, County Administrator, said I appreciate the opportunity to start these budget workshops with the Commission. We're going to be starting it with reminding us where we get our money. It's the revenue sources that make up both the City and County budget and all the levy funds. As always, we will have Reggie and staff lead us through this presentation.

Reggie Lindsey, Budget Director, said I'm going to turn it over to Debbie Jonscher, our Interim CFO. She is going to get us started off.

Debbie Jonscher, Interim CFO, said I'm going to start off the presentation. We're going to be showing a long-range forecast for all of our funds and kind of going through what revenue sources those are and if they are restricted by either state statute or ordinance that the Unified Government has and then showing you what the forecast looks like out through 2028 on each of the funds.

the services. Then, we also have the one Fiduciary Fund which is usually for assets that are held in trust and that's the Environmental Trust Fund.

Fund Forecasts Assumptions

- Revenues
 - Property Tax
 - 15% growth in 2024, 6% in 2025, 4% onward
 - Sales Tax, Liquor Tax, Transient Guest Tax
 - 2.9% growth in 2024, 2% onward
 - Charges for Service
 - Trends deciphered on a case-by-case basis
- Expenditures
 - Personnel
 - Projected with vacancy trend based on departmental vacancy rates
 - Operating expenses
 - 3% growth based on 2022 Estimated Actuals
 - Capital based on Capital schedule

wycokck.org/budget

This next slide kind of shows the assumptions that we've built into our forecast. On the Revenue side, since we don't have final valuations yet from the Clerk's Office, those are set to be finalized by June 15th, but for now we are—for property tax revenues we are assuming a 15% growth for 2024, a 6% in 2025, and then out through 2028 we're looking at 4%.

Sales Tax, Liquor Tax, and the Transient Guest Tax: As we all know sales tax is a little more volatile and it's sensitive to economic conditions so we tend to be a little more conservative with our estimates there, so we're projecting 2.9% growth in 2024 and then 2% going outward. Charges for Service, we kind of look at that on a case-by-case basis depending on what kind of contract for service we might have.

On the Expenditures, personnel would include all union contracts that have been approved going forward as well as we do have a projected vacancy built into that trend.

Operating Expenses, we've estimated a 3% growth based on 2022 Actuals and the Capital is based on what we currently have in the Capital schedule.

Commissioner Markley asked, for personnel there is no raise for non-union folks figured in as an assumption? **Mr. Lindsey** said there is. **Commissioner Markley** asked, do we know that percentage? **Mr. Lindsey** said 4%. **Commissioner Markley** said 4% we have figured in for everybody. **Mr. Lindsey** said everyone. That's all 14 unions.

Commissioner McKiernan said regarding personnel again, are you projecting that current authorized, but unfilled positions, will stay status quo that is unfilled? **Mr. Lindsey** said yes. **Commissioner McKiernan** said okay.

Commissioner Kane asked, is there a reason why we're not going to fill them and then what are we doing with the money that we would have paid somebody if they'd have been here? **Mr. Lindsey** said we do have overtime that happens with positions that aren't filled right now and so once we fill those positions, overtime will free up money to fill positions. **Commissioner Kane** said we do plan on filling the positions. **Mr. Lindsey** said yes. **Commissioner Kane** said great.

Commissioner Burroughs said the sales tax is projected at 2.9% and 2% on out, I believe that's what you stated Debbie. Do we know what the sales tax has been for the last three years as a moving average? **Mr. Lindsey** said we don't have that number right now. **Commissioner Burroughs** said I just remember two years ago it was 5% and we took a pretty conservative approach with that and 2.9 seems, you know, even more conservative. I don't mind being conservative, trust me, I just don't want to also chip away an opportunity to recognize income that we may have, but not having to be able to look at it in the budget. **Ms. Jonscher** said right. I think last year we did include a 5% and that was based on how we were trending earlier in the year. I don't know, I'm going to probably let Reggie answer on what they've looked at for this year. **Mr. Lindsey** said we came up with a 2.9% just based on economic factors that are going on. There have been some layoffs in the area and we have noticed where spending is not been as high in some retail service areas, so that's what we based our 2.9% on.

Commissioner Burroughs said I would encourage us to maybe look at what the State Department of Revenue took in in sales tax statewide. I think they blew past their projected budgets too and I don't mind a conservative approach, but 2.9 just kind of sticks out to me. **Ms. Jonscher** said we can certainly look at that and make adjustments to our forecast. **Commissioner Burroughs** said on a lot of money there (inaudible).

Ms. Jonscher said I'll turn it over to Reginald Lindsey to talk about the Tax Levy Fund.



†%& a! фы f Ъ P i Ж

- [illegible]

wycokck.org/budget 6

On the City side there are two tax Levy Funds being the City General Fund and the City Bond & Interest Fund.

f b P i f n Ÿ l l %ЖД

$$g \vdash P \rightarrow \exists x (P(x) \wedge \forall y (P(y) \rightarrow y = x))$$
[illegible]

County General Fund	2022 Amended Budget	2023 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 76,700,000	\$ 75,992,912	\$ 77,980,000	\$ 84,427,431	\$ 80,118,263	\$ 93,300,389	\$ 97,020,343	\$ 106,650,628
16.0M allocation for CRI	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (8,820,000)	\$ (1,925,000)	\$ (2,006,368)	\$ (2,028,624)	\$ (2,170,388)
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 76,700,000	\$ 74,759,213	\$ 80,556,050	\$ 84,454,407	\$ 87,466,263	\$ 94,679,460	\$ 98,266,969	\$ 107,486,666
16.0M Change in Fund Balance	\$ (1,000,000)	\$ (2,424,698)	\$ (2,576,050)	\$ (2,773,476)	\$ (2,773,476)	\$ (2,369,071)	\$ (2,246,344)	\$ (2,338,866)
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 12,403,538	\$ 15,354,337	\$ 15,008,447	\$ 11,281,531	\$ 12,540,071	\$ 16,678,014	\$ 16,937,704	\$ 19,706,614
Percent % of expenditures	16.25%	24.24%	12.84%	16.92%	17.06%	15.42%	21.09%	22.89%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$ 20,336,300	\$ 20,336,300	\$ 20,336,300	\$ 24,391,240	\$ 24,391,240	\$ 30,300,000	\$ 30,619,000	\$ 30,619,000

wycokck.org/budget

May 25, 2023

The first one we're jumping into is the County General Fund. Basically, here in this fund how we can kind of see looking at the chart 2022 Estimated Actuals and how we ended the year. We ended up bringing in \$1.2M more dollars in revenues than expenditures that we spent. That left us at a fund balance of like 24%. As we move over into 2023 Amended Budget we can see that we have like a \$3.6M structural deficit there where we brought in or spent more, \$81M in expenses and we had \$77M go out and that dropped our fund balance down to almost 18%.

As we look into 2024, we can see that we have a—our structural imbalance is like \$226K and that does drop our fund balance down to around 17%, which leaves us in pretty good shape. As we look out into the years going out to 2025, 2026, 2027 and 2028 we can see the fund balance does gradually start to go up each year.

One of the things that's also within this fund is last year during the budget process we did commit to putting in a mill for CIFI which is our County Infrastructure Fund for financing and what that does is provide funding for Bonner Springs, Edwardsville, and the city of Kansas City, Kansas, the funding for infrastructure needs. We can see in 2024 we're committing that mill and will have \$1.8M and it does grow each year. So, those numbers are factored into these numbers so the revenues that we have going out and the expenses that we do have going into the outyears reflect those numbers. Also, within the fund there are 676 FTE's that are funded from here.

f b P i f q M I % K P

> q b P Q M = q P i N u P Q M J K P

n. a. ...
n. b. ...
n. c. ...

o. ...
p. ...
q. ...

County Bond & Interest	2022 Amended Budget	2022 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 5,713,853	\$ 5,796,322	\$ 6,100,345	\$ 6,780,411	\$ 7,086,332	\$ 7,384,398	\$ 7,606,879	\$ 7,888,628
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 6,107,241	\$ 5,880,639	\$ 6,112,175	\$ 5,980,290	\$ 6,579,044	\$ 6,980,023	\$ 6,988,348	\$ 7,043,496
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (393,388)	\$ (84,257)	\$ 49,000	\$ 785,021	\$ 507,287	\$ 404,375	\$ 618,531	\$ 845,132
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 1,786,333	\$ 2,147,204	\$ 2,195,394	\$ 2,980,415	\$ 3,487,702	\$ 3,891,577	\$ 4,510,110	\$ 5,355,041
Reserve % of Expenditures	29.45%	37.02%	33.92%	49.84%	53.01%	57.26%	65.40%	76.60%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$1,035,251	\$966,309	\$1,036,070	\$1,016,665	\$1,118,438	\$1,173,069	\$1,183,019	\$1,197,394

wycokck.org/budget

Ms. Jonscher said the next fund is the County Bond & Interest Fund. The primary revenue source for this fund is the Property Tax Levy. Funds are restricted for the payment of principal and interest on bonds and just to note, once the money comes into this fund, the only way it can be taken out if it's not used for the payment of principal and interest on debt would be that all outstanding debt issuances have to be retired and that is by state statute and that's both for the City

and the County. So, once the funds are in here they stay in here to pay for—until all outstanding debt is retired.

I just wanted to note here this fund actually has a pretty good fund balance going out to 2022. We do have a little bit of structural imbalance in 2022, but we're still ending with a reserve percentage of about 37%. Going into 2023 and out it is structurally balanced. As I said, the primary source of revenue is the property tax. There is also a transfer from the County General Fund of 1.5M that goes toward the debt service on the Juvenile Justice Facility. When that facility was built and we issued the bonds there was a commitment that savings due to farmouts in the County General Fund would go toward the payment of that debt so we do have that transfer built into the revenues.

There are also other revenues that are included within there. BPU does pay a portion of the Emergency Radio Project debt that was issued back in 2013, so that's also coming into this fund. As you can see, we projected out the fund balance grows to about 5.3M by 2028.

f b P j f h M I % 80
! f P f

! f P f f b P j. 7 n. u. 78.27 k b j N 86 N p 6 U d r e C p a N s p U s p 6 N y e a d e p a N s i U h f d U s a n a N s i d U u g e h a s E U e g a b N p 6 a Y a j p N a j d a e p a N s j a j h a e p p o j U e p U O C E a j a Y a e O a e N e i p a N s a Y a e a d e j p p i p i U a j i e U o p

Aging Levy	2022 Amended Budget	2022 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 2,058,310	\$ 2,033,704	\$ 2,051,647	\$ 2,357,166	\$ 2,564,949	\$ 2,647,044	\$ 2,762,743	\$ 2,887,553
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 2,069,125	\$ 1,502,549	\$ 2,152,283	\$ 2,049,457	\$ 2,372,298	\$ 2,216,749	\$ 2,558,652	\$ 2,398,887
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (10,815)	\$ 531,155	\$ (90,636)	\$ 307,709	\$ 142,651	\$ 430,295	\$ 204,091	\$ 488,666
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 563,923	\$ 1,105,874	\$ 1,005,238	\$ 1,312,947	\$ 1,455,602	\$ 1,885,897	\$ 2,089,988	\$ 2,580,925
Reserve % of Expenditures	31.07%	78.97%	50.40%	68.09%	64.70%	88.72%	84.94%	113.06%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$350,751	\$205,437	\$340,888	\$348,408	\$403,289	\$276,847	\$434,071	\$480,425

wycokck.org/budget

Mr. Lindsey said the current fund that we're looking at is our Aging Fund and what it does is provide funding for service programs for the elderly throughout the county. Looking at the budget for our 2022 Actuals, we have \$1.5M in expenses go out, but we did have \$2M of revenue come in, so this fund is structurally balanced in 2022. As we move over into 2023, there is a \$100K structural imbalance where we have \$100K less revenue coming in as it's compared to expenditures. As we look out over the years going out to 2024 all the way out to 2028, we see this fund has a healthy fund balance where some years we have like a 60—68% fund balance in 2024 and by the time we get out to 2028 we have 111% fund balance.

balance is going down each year, so by the time we get out to 2028 that fund balance does drop to 4%.

In this Health Levy Fund we have 39 employees that are paid from it and the Health Department also has 79 employees that are paid from grants, which equal 118 employees within that department, but within this fund there are 39 employees.

f b P i f n Ÿ I % K D
ñ l P F / E o l % E F W

[illegible]

Mental Health Levy	2022 Amended Budget	2023 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 707,881	\$ 704,360	\$ 738,329	\$ 926,469	\$ 1,007,242	\$ 1,094,029	\$ 1,144,040	\$ 1,200,095
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 718,419	\$ 708,491	\$ 844,148	\$ 899,872	\$ 895,357	\$ 922,123	\$ 950,096	\$ 978,947
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (10,608)	\$ (5,147)	\$ (135,819)	\$ 66,988	\$ 111,683	\$ 162,505	\$ 193,944	\$ 231,159
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 67,692	\$ 24,668	\$ 18,842	\$ 76,330	\$ 281,613	\$ 350,019	\$ 543,963	\$ 775,366
Reverse % of Expenditures	9.42%	10.50%	2.23%	8.72%	20.64%	37.90%	57.25%	79.23%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$227,143	\$250,548	\$425,050	\$417,810	\$522,243	\$596,812	\$671,790	\$760,367

wycokck.org/budget 15

We also have the Mental Health Fund which has a levy attached to it and the purpose of this is to contract services out with non-profit corporations to provide either mental services or services for clients with mental health needs. We do contract out with Behavioral Health for this contract where the amount of the contract that gets paid from this mill is \$750K a year and there's also \$150K that comes from the County General Fund for a total of \$900K a year.

We see in 2022 the estimated actuals that went out were \$708K in expenses and revenues of \$704K, so we have a very minimal structural imbalance of \$3K, having a cash ending fund balance of \$74K which is 10%. We can see as we go out into the years, 2023 we do end up spending \$55K more in revenues than we have coming in and it does drop our fund balance, but as we go out we see the fund balance does by the time we get to 2028 go up to 80%.

f b P i f η Ÿ Ĩ % Ⓢ
> H Ÿ Ÿ Ⓢ † Ĩ Ĩ W P η E f H

[illegible]

Clerk's Tech Fund	2022 Amended Budget	2022 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 60,000	\$ 48,390	\$ 60,000	\$ 62,090	\$ 63,942	\$ 65,849	\$ 67,884	\$ 69,123
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 83,000	\$ 51,960	\$ 83,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 72,300	\$ 74,263	\$ 76,491	\$ 78,788
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (23,000)	\$ (3,570)	\$ (23,000)	\$ (7,910)	\$ (8,358)	\$ (8,414)	\$ (8,607)	\$ (8,665)
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 109,175	\$ 128,605	\$ 106,605	\$ 97,695	\$ 89,337	\$ 81,123	\$ 72,776	\$ 62,786
Revenue % of Expenditures	109.44%	92.46%	165.14%	184.57%	167.82%	151.60%	135.94%	119.62%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$14,110	\$8,833	\$14,110	\$17,900	\$12,257	\$12,625	\$13,003	\$13,394

The first one we're going to look at is the Clerk's Technology Fund and the purpose of this fund is to acquire equipment and technology service for storing, recording, archiving, retrieving, maintaining and handling of data recorded, stored and generated in particular offices and this is particularly for the Clerk's fund. The revenue for this comes from filing of deeds and so we can see that 2022 estimated actual where we had expenses go out was \$51K and had revenues come in

May 25, 2023

f b P i f n Ÿ I %Ж

Ü/%E>ή O O ÿK&ŸH ··ñ HS hzΓœ Ójð

U008 U00c n0 w Nc U00d No Eac U00e dñe Ópze Ó FNsAg! U00f dñe Óp

$$\delta \hat{U}_{\phi} \delta \hat{U}_{\psi} \phi \psi \psi \psi \delta \hat{U}_{\pi} \hat{U}_{\pi} \pi \pi$$
[illegible]

Jail Commissary Fund	2022 Amended Budget	2023 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 60,000	\$ 168,949	\$ 60,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 100,000	\$ 77,025	\$ 130,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (40,000)	\$ 148,844	\$ (70,000)	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000
Cash Balance Ending Fund Balance	\$ 307,809	\$ 459,653	\$ 419,653	\$ 495,553	\$ 482,280	\$ 515,847	\$ 546,827	\$ 583,700
Revenue % of Expenditures	381.25%	185.63%	330.82%	149.178%	154.533%	160.233%	166.544%	166.229%
Budget Balance (% Variance)	\$27,000	\$4,984	\$27,000	\$5,250	\$5,481	\$5,823	\$5,740	\$5,882

wycokck.org/budget 22

The next fund is the Jail Commissary Fund. This is a fund that's based in the Sheriff's Department and the revenue source of Canteen Funds where items are bought and resold to inmates. We can see in 2022 estimated actuals were \$168K in revenues and total expenses were \$27K. They did have a payback from a vendor that owed some money from a few years ago that paid into this. That's why we have over \$100K more in revenue that came in, but we can see in outer years we still project like \$60K to come in each year. The fund balance here is pretty healthy and this fund I mean is strictly for canteen funds for inmates at the Sheriff's Department.

f Ъ P i f њ Ÿ Ĩ ƆЖD

..l f ЪФ Ÿή ê E l l i Ж п ъ, жѡкы ꙗ, ѱ, якъзѡй ꙗ, ѱ, якъзжэ

$\delta \hat{U}_{\text{eff}} = \delta \hat{U}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{N}} + \delta \hat{U}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{P}} + \delta \hat{U}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{D}}$

[illegible][illegible]

3. ¹¹ *Ule Ono¹ Umal² Uqum³ Uq⁴ Uq⁵ Uq⁶ Uq⁷ Uq⁸ Uq⁹ Uq¹⁰ Uq¹¹ Uq¹² Uq¹³ Uq¹⁴ Uq¹⁵ Uq¹⁶ Uq¹⁷ Uq¹⁸ Uq¹⁹ Uq²⁰ Uq²¹ Uq²² Uq²³ Uq²⁴ Uq²⁵ Uq²⁶ Uq²⁷ Uq²⁸ Uq²⁹ Uq³⁰ Uq³¹ Uq³² Uq³³ Uq³⁴ Uq³⁵ Uq³⁶ Uq³⁷ Uq³⁸ Uq³⁹ Uq⁴⁰ Uq⁴¹ Uq⁴² Uq⁴³ Uq⁴⁴ Uq⁴⁵ Uq⁴⁶ Uq⁴⁷ Uq⁴⁸ Uq⁴⁹ Uq⁵⁰ Uq⁵¹ Uq⁵² Uq⁵³ Uq⁵⁴ Uq⁵⁵ Uq⁵⁶ Uq⁵⁷ Uq⁵⁸ Uq⁵⁹ Uq⁶⁰ Uq⁶¹ Uq⁶² Uq⁶³ Uq⁶⁴ Uq⁶⁵ Uq⁶⁶ Uq⁶⁷ Uq⁶⁸ Uq⁶⁹ Uq⁷⁰ Uq⁷¹ Uq⁷² Uq⁷³ Uq⁷⁴ Uq⁷⁵ Uq⁷⁶ Uq⁷⁷ Uq⁷⁸ Uq⁷⁹ Uq⁸⁰ Uq⁸¹ Uq⁸² Uq⁸³ Uq⁸⁴ Uq⁸⁵ Uq⁸⁶ Uq⁸⁷ Uq⁸⁸ Uq⁸⁹ Uq⁹⁰ Uq⁹¹ Uq⁹² Uq⁹³ Uq⁹⁴ Uq⁹⁵ Uq⁹⁶ Uq⁹⁷ Uq⁹⁸ Uq⁹⁹ Uq¹⁰⁰ Uq¹⁰¹ Uq¹⁰² Uq¹⁰³ Uq¹⁰⁴ Uq¹⁰⁵ Uq¹⁰⁶ Uq¹⁰⁷ Uq¹⁰⁸ Uq¹⁰⁹ Uq¹¹⁰ Uq¹¹¹ Uq¹¹² Uq¹¹³ Uq¹¹⁴ Uq¹¹⁵ Uq¹¹⁶ Uq¹¹⁷ Uq¹¹⁸ Uq¹¹⁹ Uq¹²⁰ Uq¹²¹ Uq¹²² Uq¹²³ Uq¹²⁴ Uq¹²⁵ Uq¹²⁶ Uq¹²⁷ Uq¹²⁸ Uq¹²⁹ Uq¹³⁰ Uq¹³¹ Uq¹³² Uq¹³³ Uq¹³⁴ Uq¹³⁵ Uq¹³⁶ Uq¹³⁷ Uq¹³⁸ Uq¹³⁹ Uq¹⁴⁰ Uq¹⁴¹ Uq¹⁴² Uq¹⁴³ Uq¹⁴⁴ Uq¹⁴⁵ Uq¹⁴⁶ Uq¹⁴⁷ Uq¹⁴⁸ Uq¹⁴⁹ Uq¹⁵⁰ Uq¹⁵¹ Uq¹⁵² Uq¹⁵³ Uq¹⁵⁴ Uq¹⁵⁵ Uq¹⁵⁶ Uq¹⁵⁷ Uq¹⁵⁸ Uq¹⁵⁹ Uq¹⁶⁰ Uq¹⁶¹ Uq¹⁶² Uq¹⁶³ Uq¹⁶⁴ Uq¹⁶⁵ Uq¹⁶⁶ Uq¹⁶⁷ Uq¹⁶⁸ Uq¹⁶⁹ Uq¹⁷⁰ Uq¹⁷¹ Uq¹⁷² Uq¹⁷³ Uq¹⁷⁴ Uq¹⁷⁵ Uq¹⁷⁶ Uq¹⁷⁷ Uq¹⁷⁸ Uq¹⁷⁹ Uq¹⁸⁰ Uq¹⁸¹ Uq¹⁸² Uq¹⁸³ Uq¹⁸⁴ Uq¹⁸⁵ Uq¹⁸⁶ Uq¹⁸⁷ Uq¹⁸⁸ Uq¹⁸⁹ Uq¹⁹⁰ Uq¹⁹¹ Uq¹⁹² Uq¹⁹³ Uq¹⁹⁴ Uq¹⁹⁵ Uq¹⁹⁶ Uq¹⁹⁷ Uq¹⁹⁸ Uq¹⁹⁹ Uq²⁰⁰ Uq²⁰¹ Uq²⁰² Uq²⁰³ Uq²⁰⁴ Uq²⁰⁵ Uq²⁰⁶ Uq²⁰⁷ Uq²⁰⁸ Uq²⁰⁹ Uq²¹⁰ Uq²¹¹ Uq²¹² Uq²¹³ Uq²¹⁴ Uq²¹⁵ Uq²¹⁶ Uq²¹⁷ Uq²¹⁸ Uq²¹⁹ Uq²²⁰ Uq²²¹ Uq²²² Uq²²³ Uq²²⁴ Uq²²⁵ Uq²²⁶ Uq²²⁷ Uq²²⁸ Uq²²⁹ Uq²³⁰ Uq²³¹ Uq²³² Uq²³³ Uq²³⁴ Uq²³⁵ Uq²³⁶ Uq²³⁷ Uq²³⁸ Uq²³⁹ Uq²⁴⁰ Uq²⁴¹ Uq²⁴² Uq²⁴³ Uq²⁴⁴ Uq²⁴⁵ Uq²⁴⁶ Uq²⁴⁷ Uq²⁴⁸ Uq²⁴⁹ Uq²⁵⁰ Uq²⁵¹ Uq²⁵² Uq²⁵³ Uq²⁵⁴ Uq²⁵⁵ Uq²⁵⁶ Uq²⁵⁷ Uq²⁵⁸ Uq²⁵⁹ Uq²⁶⁰ Uq²⁶¹ Uq²⁶² Uq²⁶³ Uq²⁶⁴ Uq²⁶⁵ Uq²⁶⁶ Uq²⁶⁷ Uq²⁶⁸ Uq²⁶⁹ Uq²⁷⁰ Uq²⁷¹ Uq²⁷² Uq²⁷³ Uq²⁷⁴ Uq²⁷⁵ Uq²⁷⁶ Uq²⁷⁷ Uq²⁷⁸ Uq²⁷⁹ Uq²⁸⁰ Uq²⁸¹ Uq²⁸² Uq²⁸³ Uq²⁸⁴ Uq²⁸⁵ Uq²⁸⁶ Uq²⁸⁷ Uq²⁸⁸ Uq²⁸⁹ Uq²⁹⁰ Uq²⁹¹ Uq²⁹² Uq²⁹³ Uq²⁹⁴ Uq²⁹⁵ Uq²⁹⁶ Uq²⁹⁷ Uq²⁹⁸ Uq²⁹⁹ Uq³⁰⁰ Uq³⁰¹ Uq³⁰² Uq³⁰³ Uq³⁰⁴ Uq³⁰⁵ Uq³⁰⁶ Uq³⁰⁷ Uq³⁰⁸ Uq³⁰⁹ Uq³¹⁰ Uq³¹¹ Uq³¹² Uq³¹³ Uq³¹⁴ Uq³¹⁵ Uq³¹⁶ Uq³¹⁷ Uq³¹⁸ Uq³¹⁹ Uq³²⁰ Uq³²¹ Uq³²² Uq³²³ Uq³²⁴ Uq³²⁵ Uq³²⁶ Uq³²⁷ Uq³²⁸ Uq³²⁹ Uq³³⁰ Uq³³¹ Uq³³² Uq³³³ Uq³³⁴ Uq³³⁵ Uq³³⁶ Uq³³⁷ Uq³³⁸ Uq³³⁹ Uq³⁴⁰ Uq³⁴¹ Uq³⁴² Uq³⁴³ Uq³⁴⁴ Uq³⁴⁵ Uq³⁴⁶ Uq³⁴⁷ Uq³⁴⁸ Uq³⁴⁹ Uq³⁵⁰ Uq³⁵¹ Uq³⁵² Uq³⁵³ Uq³⁵⁴ Uq³⁵⁵ Uq³⁵⁶ Uq³⁵⁷ Uq³⁵⁸ Uq³⁵⁹ Uq³⁶⁰ Uq³⁶¹ Uq³⁶² Uq³⁶³ Uq³⁶⁴ Uq³⁶⁵ Uq³⁶⁶ Uq³⁶⁷ Uq³⁶⁸ Uq³⁶⁹ Uq³⁷⁰ Uq³⁷¹ Uq³⁷² Uq³⁷³ Uq³⁷⁴ Uq³⁷⁵ Uq³⁷⁶ Uq³⁷⁷ Uq³⁷⁸ Uq³⁷⁹ Uq³⁸⁰ Uq³*

6 ΓΟΥΥΠ! ΝΡΕ ΘΝΣ Ψ ΠΩΘΝΘΕ ΟΥΔΕ ΘΝΣ! ΠΙΛΟΥΘΟΥΘΕΘΝΣ! ΠΕΝΘΕ ΓΗ
 ΕΠΑΝΟΥΥΠΙΔΕΙΔΕΘ ΠΙΛΩΕΘ ΠΑΠΛΩΘ ΕΠΕΝΘΟΕ ΕΠ ΡΥ 7 ΝΘΕ ΓΗ 7 ΙΔΑΡ Π. Α. , ΓΥΔΗΘ Δ ΟΥΥΠΙΔΕΘ= ΟΟΟΥΘ Π. Α. , ΧΥ
 ΘΥΔΗΘ ΟΕ 07 ΝΘΕ ΓΗ 8 ΠΟΥΘΘΘΠ. Α. , ΧΥ21 ΔΗ

Register of Deeds Tech Fund	2021 Amended Budget	2021 Estimated Actuals	2022 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 250,000	\$ 135,560	\$ 250,000	\$ 258,108	\$ 264,623	\$ 274,372	\$ 282,387	\$ 288,004
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 100,170	\$ 129,889	\$ 100,170	\$ 126,646	\$ 132,505	\$ 136,481	\$ 140,675	\$ 144,796
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ 149,830	\$ 6,660	\$ 149,830	\$ 131,462	\$ 132,118	\$ 137,891	\$ 141,712	\$ 143,208
Cash Balance Ending Fund Balance	\$ 298,545	\$ 367,000	\$ 388,172	\$ 518,217	\$ 652,156	\$ 790,044	\$ 932,030	\$ 1,073,242
Revenue % of Expenditures	100.00%	104.44%	250.00%	320.36%	400.44%	545.66%	603.93%	733.29%
Fund Balance 12/31/2020	\$27,079	\$5,753	\$27,079	\$1,820	\$2,591	\$5,903	\$12,604	\$26,461

wycokck.org/budget 23

Here we have the Register of Deeds Fund which is very similar to the Clerks Technology Fund that we covered a couple slides back. Revenues here come from filing of deeds and it does have a pretty hefty fund balance. Between the three departments of the Clerk and Register of Deeds and also Treasurer, they're looking to buy a new Land Management System and the Appraiser is also involved in that, so this was the fund balance being built up here.

That transfer would come from the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund, but if we determine we don't need that transfer, then we would leave the funds in the Solid Waste Fund.

Commissioner Burroughs said, Debbie, I appreciate that. When I start seeing a 853% reserve number that's quite high, but I also know that all it takes is one event to wipe that fund out and then some, but I do have a question for Legal and I don't need an answer tonight. Is there a chance that when we start seeing funds that are generating large reserves to the extent they are, it tells us that we're not providing services or we're not spending the expenditures hypothetically on technology we're waiting for the contract to come in, but is there a way for us to stop the revenue on those and spend that down and then re-implement it or is it something that we can—how would we go about addressing that. We could lower the mill on those particular funds and readjust those mills to do it, but when we see large reserves I think we need an explanation to why those reserves continuing to grow beyond the 17% especially when they get up to nearly three digits. I don't mind having some reserves, but when we're sitting on millions of dollars that should be going out into services for these particular programs, I'm just trying to see where we might be able to find some money for the budget.

Patrick Waters, Interim Chief Legal Counsel, said I'm happy to look into that. That's probably something that needs a little research. Do you mean in between budget cycles making adjustments or do you mean—**Commissioner Burroughs** said well if we get to a critical point. Hypothetically, if we set the 17% target as the amount of reserves, we may want to have the target raised up a little higher to 20% and once it exceeds the 20% that we either halt it or it goes into another account to be set off to the side. I mean we are collecting dollars that aren't being spent and if they're not being spent this year, but there to be spent next year on technology, which we know you need to save up for that, that's one thing and we should have an explanation as to why those reserves are as large as they are. These reserves have come down considerably from what they were five years ago, but when I still see a projection of 853% that's possible, that tells me that either services aren't being provided or we're not spending the money as designated as need be and we may want to look at either eliminating that mill or lowering that mill for a period of time and we can do that during the budget cycle.

Mr. Johnston said those are the same type of questions that we asked at a meeting two days ago with our Finance staff. Why are we sitting on a lot of this positive large pots of money. I mean, remember these are taxpayers money and either we need to make sure they're kept in their pocket or we're providing services to them. I think the discussion that we had was the very questions that you asked. Are there service levels that we should be providing to our citizens and not, are they saving the money for a particular reason and I think what was perplexing to all of us, we didn't have answers to that and, therefore, that's part of this year's budget process is to get those types of answers and incorporate them in my final budget.

Hopefully, we'll see good news either way. Either where we can expand services, fine; if we can do mill relief, fine. Those are good news, but that can only be for where we can deal with these large reserves that we're seeing here, so we've had those discussions and you'll see how we will apply them in the budget process.

Commissioner Burroughs said I'm pleased to hear that because a few of the others they were a little low and we were running into having to chip at the reserves and was taking us down below that 17% level. If we have during budget discussion, if we can adjust those mills to level that out a little bit, then that's what I feel might be an opportunity for us to do, but thank you Mr. Administrator, I do appreciate that and thank you staff.

Commissioner Ramirez said Colleagues, correct me if I'm wrong, in our financial policy with fund balance it does state if it exceeds the fund balance target, we have the ability to take that fund balance elsewhere. Am I correct? **Commissioner Burroughs** said if it goes to a similar type issue in most cases. In other words, if it's a technology fund that's overfunded and then it has to go to technology somewhere else within our business acumens, doing with another agency, but yes, you're correct. **Commissioner Ramirez** said that's what I thought I remember from reading the fund balance policy.

for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of city streets and highways. I just wanted to note we're getting about—in 2022 we got about \$7.6M in revenues and we've got from—we're estimating \$7M all the way out to \$8.2M in revenues as those revenues grow. We've kept expenses—we are a little—the net change going out for the future years is negative, but we can correct that if we need to or what it's simply doing is spending down the fund balance in those funds.

We do pay for some personnel from the Street Department in this fund as well as the snow removal contract and street and maintenance equipment.

Commissioner Bynum said question. The Special Street & Highway money, does it come in through the state? **Ms. Jonscher** said yes. **Commissioner Bynum** said so the motor fuel tax is collected and then disseminated, again like it says, by population of city and county. So, this is not a tax that we levy or collect. **Ms. Jonscher** said right. It comes in quarterly from the state.

Commissioner Stites said why would we have a fund balance at all in that collection. If it's something we're not collecting, we're not going to be issuing or worried about a catastrophic event, but yet at the end of the day, today we're looking at having \$3.4M left in there with nowhere for this money to go. **Mr. Lindsey** said we do have 42 employees that are paid from here so we do have employees that are being paid from this fund. We do like to have a reserve there. **Commissioner Stites** said \$3.5M—(inaudible). **Mr. Lindsey** said also I was going to add that we do projects from here also so some years we'll have some projects that hit here. One of our plans to do here is to move our street preservation all the way into this fund. It was probably about three years ago, right before COVID, we did have more employees here and we moved them to the City General Fund and we plan to try to do more street maintenance here. The fund balance has not always looked like this, but with us moving the people from this fund to the City General Fund has allowed this fund to grow more.

Commissioner Stites asked, how are the dollars allocated to—I don't remember seeing it and if we did, just tell me where it's at, but this is the City's forecast, right, but if you go up and you look, it says that population based on the city and county. Are dollars going out of this revenue that we're getting from the state back to the County General Fund? **Mr. Lindsey** said I believe—

we don't have anything going to the County General Fund—like the other cities within the county, they receive their own allotment from the state.

Ms. Jonscher said we receive the city portion and then the city's portion of the county and I would believe the county—the other cities would receive the same thing. **Commissioner Stites** said we're not collecting any money off of Bonner Springs, Edwardsville or Lake Quivira. They're collecting their own. We're only receiving our own. I say our own, KCK's own. **Ms. Jonscher** said that's correct. **Commissioner Stites** said got it.

Ms. Jonscher said I will also just note that if you look at the expenditure budget, the 2022 Amended Budget was about 8.7, but it looks like we only spent about 6.9 so there is about 1.8M there and I'm not sure what that's related to, but we can look into that. That also did contribute to some of the increase in the fund balance.

Commissioner Stites said I'll just make one more short comment. Last year I think a City mill was equivalent to 1/6 roughly, right, if I'm not mistaken, so times two there is about 3.2. There's two mill reduction that we held that we could have passed to our citizens for tax relief instead of that setting in a bank account. **Ms. Jonscher** said we would have to—if you're saying lowering two mills within the City General Fund, if you were going to shift cost here, it would have to be related to street maintenance. You would either have to move street employees that are being paid out of the General Fund back into here or if there's any street expenses in the City General Fund, those could be moved here.

Commissioner Stites said I guess I'm a little confused because we have a surplus of money of \$3.5M, right? Those employees that you're talking about were still getting paid and we still—I'm not talking about moving anybody and we still had \$3.5M that we did not spend last year. **Ms. Jonscher** said this mill—there's no tax levy in this fund, so the tax levy you would have—reducing two mills in the City General Fund would not affect this fund, but you're suggesting that if we had done that, we could have shifted cost to this fund. **Commissioner Stites** said correct. **Ms. Jonscher** said we could have done that, but they would have had to been cost related to street maintenance. **Commissioner Stites** said got it.

Commissioner Johnson said Commissioner Stites just kept asking questions until I finally decided to jump on there. Why couldn't we move the cost for employees back from the General Fund to this fund for those specific employees as a means of reconciling the structural deficit that we have in the General Fund. Does that make sense? **Ms. Jonscher** said we could do that. We could move more personnel back into this fund because we have over the course of several years moved personnel out of here because, you know, to try to free up additional money for street maintenance. But, if you move additional personnel into here, then that reduces the amount you will be able to use for street maintenance and actual infrastructure. **Commissioner Johnson** said you can play it either way though because Jeff Fisher might say I want to use this extra money next year, you know, and so has that discussion been had with this department, with Public Works, the discussion of moving the employees over to this area? **Ms. Jonscher** said we can have additional discussions. We've had those discussions before which is partly why we've been trying to move personnel out of this fund to allow them to spend this money on capital infrastructure. That would reverse some of what we've done over the past several years.

Commissioner Johnson said I don't have a recommendation one way or the other, but we have a pot of money here that can be used one way or the other.

Mr. Johnston said I think these questions are very interesting because we can make trade-offs, but when you're talking about a pot of money that is specifically collected to address only infrastructure issues, when I see a balance of \$2M or \$3M, that's not much because Public Work projects, if we have to do an emergency, it's nice to have that nest egg. You don't want to zero it out, but maybe there is some adjustment that you could use. We have some flexibility, but just because you see \$3.4M, remember in Public Work projects, those are expensive and it has its own inflation rate of about 15 to 20% per year so the buying power of this gets less. But, yes, I understand what you're saying. There is flexibility that we could use within the budget.

Commissioner Burroughs said I would just state that the gas tax is being affected by the continued growth of electric vehicles and you're sensing it on your highway plan and for the State of Kansas, so those revenues will eventually shrink more statewide than they have as of late, but with the proliferation of more fuel efficient vehicles and electrical vehicles, you're going to see

that gas tax and the revenue stream shrink statewide. I don't know what kind of revenue we'll be receiving five to ten years from now.

Commissioner Kane said I don't want to take any money away from Public Works. I wish Fisher wasn't here, but I've got two roads that are out and it would be quite—I would love to see us spend that money to fix those. I don't want to take money where it's not needed, but I'd sure like to spend it where we could fix it. Isn't that right, Mr. Fisher? I can't hear you. **Mr. Fisher** was inaudible.

Commissioner Townsend said I guess in listening to the conversation we're talking about \$3.4M in the black here. That's a drop in the bucket. When I go back to the conversation—was it three on threes we had a couple weeks ago that talked about infrastructure and we need to be adding what about \$6M each year to Public Works for street and highway. I don't want to get things mixed up, but overall that's what I'm thinking. This is nothing. We don't have extra money. We need about \$6M annually just to stay at the same level we are in terms of road improvement and our constituents have said they want better, so I just want to make sure I'm following this conversation. We don't have extra money anywhere.

f b P i f h i i % 6 0

† h b y w o N > h P p l P o h P

7 + a b j c - d o a e b c p f i p f h n s y a a p a e o o p p o o a f c h a b ~ d o a e b o f e r c h

u o o o p p o e r o h v N o e N i l i a e o e N i l i j a e a a e p a e p

o o p p o e j u o o p o a d o o p p o e r o o

o d e N i p a e N o e N e p p o e p a e o j n o d e p p o p a e q u a p 7 1 / 2 n a e q u a p

Tourism & Convention	2022 Amended Budget	2022 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 3,763,566	\$ 4,383,136	\$ 4,301,781	\$ 4,387,796	\$ 4,475,552	\$ 4,565,060	\$ 4,656,365	\$ 4,749,482
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 5,294,087	\$ 3,439,789	\$ 4,799,050	\$ 3,701,136	\$ 3,895,078	\$ 3,940,593	\$ 4,019,605	\$ 4,048,382
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (1,530,521)	\$ 743,347	\$ (497,269)	\$ 686,660	\$ 580,474	\$ 624,467	\$ 636,760	\$ 701,100
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 1,489,566	\$ 3,762,334	\$ 3,265,065	\$3,951,705	\$4,532,180	\$5,156,651	\$5,793,350	\$6,496,681
Reserve % of Expenditures	49.74%	142.64%	91.80%	137.60%	145.74%	159.90%	172.50%	188.85%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$800,148	\$534,794	\$553,839	\$629,193	\$662,893	\$699,901	\$743,343	\$787,847

wycokck.org/budget 12

Mr. Lindsey said the current slide we're looking at is the Tourism & Convention Fund. Revenues here come from our hotels and motel transactions and there's restricted use of revenues for promotion, convention, and tourism within the city of Kansas City, Kansas. We do have \$1.4M annually that goes out for Visit KCK from this budget and the budget does have three FTEs in it. 2022 Actuals we have \$3.4M that went out. We had \$4.1 that came in in revenues for a fund

balance of \$3.7M. As we move into 2023, we can see we're planning \$4.8M going out and \$4.3M come in. We did, earlier this year, have a transaction where we were paying for a bridge raise for the Rock Island Bridge, that is coming out of here this year. We can see going into 2024 and out to 2028 we do have a really stable fund balance going out into those years where in 2024 we're estimating a \$3.9M fund balance and then going out to 2028 that fund balance grows to almost \$6.5M.

Commissioner Stites asked, at what percentage of growth do you show that? Is that pretty conservative or is it pretty aggressive? **Mr. Lindsey** said for 2023 we did adjust to a 3% sales tax increase and then in 2024 we have almost a 3% increase and then going out 2025 to 2028 there's a 2% each year. One of the reasons we did that, and again, just looking at what we're hearing about the economy as far as there are some layoffs in the area, certain retail services have noticed sales start falling off, so that's where we came up with those estimates.

Commissioner Ramirez said you may or may not know this answer. Do we know how many hotels and motels in general that we have within the city? **Mr. Lindsey** said we do have that information. I do not know it off the top of my head. We do have that information and we can get it. **Commissioner Ramirez** said okay. I was asking because we have to think—you know we're talking tourism and I know you're giving the growth, but you know two years, 2026, we're going to have a big event right next door to our city. They're not going to have all the hotels and motels to house everybody. It's the World Cup and so people are going to come over here to our side of town and come to our hotels and motels and book, which is going to increase the revenue coming in. Have we thought that when—I know it's kind of very, very hard to figure that in at the moment, but is that something that's been thought of or that's a conversation that's been had.

Mr. Johnston said we've had that conversation, but I think one of the things we caution when we talk about that is that's going to be a one-time and, therefore, we will take any that—any increase because of that event is gravy. It's hard to say what it's going to be, but we really don't want to have that be regular income because of that fact, so it's better to be conservative on current trends and then, hey, that's a great year we have, let's do something special with that extra money.

Commissioner Ramirez said I agree with that. I do agree that's going to be a one-time infusion that's going to be on our sales tax, on what have you, on everything that we—that's within this city and county. So, no, I agree with that.

Commissioner Kane asked, can we have Fisher come up and give a three minute talk about where he's at with his stuff? **Mayor Garner** asked, what specifically were you looking for. **Commissioner Kane** said just to see where he's at with some of his projects. **Mayor Garner** said I think what I'll do for you, Commissioner, I'll set up a Special Session just on infrastructure and Public Works. **Commissioner Kane** said perfect. **Mayor Garner** said I'll get with the Administrator and we can have that as part of the public budget process. **Mr. Johnston** said we are going to have a session on CMIP. **Mayor Garner** said, Commissioner Kane, did you pick up on that? The Administrator's saying he's already got a CMIP Special Session that he's going to work with me on—planned already. **Mr. Lindsey** said that'll be June 15th.

Commissioner Markley said I just want to make a suggestion for that little one-time bump. As some of you know I'm chairing the Mayor's Arts Committee. That committee is looking to start an Arts Commission—or to restart an Arts Commission. We had one many, many, many years ago here in the county. I think it would be nice to use that extra random bump as some seed money for them to get that commission started, so you'll probably hear from me again on that, but it would be nice because it wouldn't be out of the amount that we are expecting to get so much as a utilization of additional funds that are coming in. **Mr. Lindsey** asked, do you know the amount on the seed money that might be needed? **Commissioner Markley** said I don't, but we're working on it. That's the discussion right now is what does that look like and what do we think would be needed. **Mr. Johnston** said she's planting seeds, so let's respect that.

Mayor Garner said, Commissioner Markley, if you want to bring up—you brought that up and I believe you're going to want a resolution or an ordinance to solidify that. What's that looking like. Is that going to be in this budget cycle? **Commissioner Markley** said good question. We're in discussions right now about what that entity looks like and what sort of the makeup of that is. We haven't settled on anything yet. What I anticipate is that, at least initially, this organization is going to need some sort of administrative support and grant related support and so we're talking

to Arts KC about whether they have a role in sort of acting as a contract agency to bump us along so we can build a commission that is robust enough to sort of standalone. It could be what this seed money does is pay Arts KC to be our admin and apply for grants on our behalf until we are big enough to apply for grants on our own. That's kind of what I think we're starting to see come together, but we haven't settled on anything yet and I don't know that we're going to come to a complete conclusion by the budget season, but we're going to try to.

Commissioner Davis said speaking of the World Cup, if you all recall, the state is allocating funding. I was talking with Commissioner Stites about this for the purpose of Sporting KC and the fact that we are going to be hosting at least practices or something of that sort. I think it would behoove us to have some conversations with the Lieutenant Governor and the Secretary of Commerce on where those millions of dollars are going to go because Wyandotte County will absolutely have to bear the cost when we have those massive events. I'm thinking about our infrastructure, I'm thinking about Public Safety and what it's going to require of that and so as we're having those particular conversations, I think we should definitely think about what type of investment the state is willing to make as well.

Mayor Garner said, Administrator, can you bring the Commission and maybe the public up to where we're at and your assignment to that Metro Committee? **Mr. Johnston** said there's a committee that was named to really lead the efforts of the region's response to support the World Cup in 2026. I am the Wyandotte County representative and our other Kentucky representative is Senator—sorry, wrong K state, Senator Sykes from northern Johnson County is the Governor's appointee on that committee as well. That committee is charged to guide the efforts and support efforts of that massive tourism event for us and I think we're geared to have two waves of soccer. First a preliminary round and a quarter round, so having two waves of that is going to be a boon. Part of that discussion is that the committee will be discussing with both Governors Office because each state is allocating money, \$50M from Missouri, \$10M from Kansas and how will that be played out in the support for the World Cup. Since we're going to be on the national stage, we have to be up to par for that challenge and so that's just one focus area that this committee is charged to program, utilize; however, the state legislators and the governors have earmarked it.

We'll be hearing more and more of that as it gets defined out of the Statehouse and that's a windfall for us.

[illegible]

Mr. Lindsey said the next one we're going to look at is the Wyandotte County 911...

Commissioner McKiernan said we can come back to this in a minute, but would I be wrong to say that the high majority of the services we provide, City and County, come through our General Funds? That if we talk about the services that the citizens broadly receive from the Unified Government, they are paid for through our three City, County and Parks General Funds, would that be roughly correct? **Mr. Lindsey** said that is correct. **Commissioner McKiernan** said I want to come back to that in a minute because these are not trivial, these are concrete beneficial funds, but most of these are not Mill Levy—I mean not General Mill Levy. They are Special Mill Levy or Special Revenue or Enterprise and so I'm going to come back to something in a minute, if I could, about our Consolidated General Funds and how those look irrespective of these. Not to trivialize these because they're there, but as I'm looking at the Consolidated General Funds for the next couple of years, we talk about we have a \$3M balance in one of these funds, it doesn't even begin to make up the deficit that would exist in those other funds and once we use those funds one time, they're gone, they're not recurring. If I could just ask, I want to come back to the Consolidated General Funds in a minute.

Mr. Lindsey said the current funding we're looking at is the Wyandotte County 911 Fund. Revenue for this fund comes from \$0.53 per month per subscriber account for telephones, landlines, hardware and wireless and voice over internet protocol telephones, so that revenue goes

Commissioner Burroughs said, Debbie, with that, I noticed that we're still taking money out of reserves to make up for the shortfall. Do we know if it's because they're not renting all the units out because rent has gone up in most of these commercial facilities and so I'm just curious as to why we're still having to supplement it out of reserves. I mean that's the only question I have as to what may be causing—either they're not charging enough for the rent or we have vacancies down there that's impacting the amount of revenue. **Ms. Jonscher** said we have contracts for the two development agreements, so those revenues are fixed and they come in every year. They're set to pay a certain amount every year and I believe it's through—it's either 2025 or 2026. I probably need to look at that because I believe that's when the debt expires and those leases for the development were set to cover the debt that was still outstanding.

As far as 2022, I'm not sure what led to that. I know we have some operating charges in there. We have some storage I think that's paid out of there, so maybe that cost increased and we didn't get it put into the budget, but yeah, we should be able to budget and cover those costs within there. The fund balance stays around the \$200-\$300K range each year.

“I x I Y” BKH O

B : Cn Up Cnshp JCE wls Jnseswupns Oshw! Cnshw cshwupns E Cnshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns
7 Ne jnseswupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns
! Cnshw cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns cshwupns

Sewer System Fund	2022 Amended Budget	2022 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 49,014,500	\$ 49,281,633	\$ 50,604,197	\$ 52,621,806	\$ 54,789,944	\$ 56,901,794	\$ 59,170,700	\$ 61,530,168
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 48,564,910	\$ 41,392,034	\$ 50,121,970	\$ 53,591,258	\$ 58,134,687	\$ 61,785,673	\$ 64,887,644	\$ 68,865,777
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ 1,049,590	\$ 7,889,599	\$ 1,482,227	\$ (909,452)	\$ (3,414,744)	\$ (4,883,879)	\$ (5,716,944)	\$ (7,335,609)
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 14,594,838	\$ 21,434,847	\$ 21,917,074	\$ 20,947,632	\$ 17,532,889	\$ 12,649,010	\$ 6,962,075	\$ 1,626,466
Reserve % of Expenditures	30.05%	51.78%	43.73%	39.09%	30.16%	20.53%	10.73%	2.43%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$8,296,035	\$17,036,646	\$8,520,735	\$9,110,314	\$9,882,897	\$10,498,464	\$11,030,900	\$11,367,352

wycokck.org/budget 17

The next fund is the Sewer System Enterprise Fund. The sewer rates fund the expenses of the Water Pollution Control Division. All revenues fund the operations, maintenance, and debt service of sewer operations. As you can see, this fund has a pretty good fund balance. In 2022 estimated and even through 2023. Starting in 2024 we do start eating up the fund balance so we probably, to get that into balance, we just need to look at the expenditures that are sitting there. We may need to reduce those to get—because we do want to keep—since this one does pay for salaries, we do want to keep a reserve within there to cover if there's overtime or any charges like that.

The fees do have increases built in each year and that's related to the consent decree that was entered into several years ago and that helps to fund the debt that's issued for the consent decree.

As I mentioned, when I talked about the Debt Service Fund, this is one of the funds that does pay into the Debt Service Fund for its debt that's issued.

f b P j f h M I % K D

“ h E Y t % K D

Ad B 6 q ' U \ A = s f s i : B ' U n N y d z a p U t A s J U e O S / q U t J n e O z a a y U t y q ' O e N s J u Y a n p a Y a C U r d N y U e J U o a N s
S U p O U e J a a n a A e y U n e O z a U e p E a Y a n p a p E U p : B ' U n n e O E a A u p z a a y U n e N y d z a s N i p z N y U e J U o a n p E U t a U p
a n U a U s Y a n p a U e J u a s a y U p : U p e H U o a N y U e E U e j u N a p a n e E ' a N o a U p a n e O f N s U t a J E n e J E U ' N o a n o
q N y d z a p U t a n U

Solid Waste Fund	2022 Amended Budget	2022 Estimated Actuals	2023 Amended Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast	2028 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,490,000	\$ 10,722,300	\$ 11,043,969	\$ 11,375,288	\$ 11,710,547	\$ 12,048,043
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,260,464	\$ 10,578,853	\$ 10,807,872	\$ 11,247,553	\$ 11,597,898	\$ 11,958,686
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,536	\$ 143,347	\$ 135,997	\$ 127,735	\$ 116,549	\$ 109,427
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 149,536	\$ 292,883	\$ 428,880	\$ 556,615	\$ 675,163	\$ 784,591
Reserve % of Expenditures			1.46%	2.77%	3.93%	4.59%	5.82%	6.56%
Fund Balance 17% Target			\$1,744,279	\$1,765,422	\$1,854,335	\$1,912,064	\$1,971,660	\$2,032,965

wycokck.org/budget 17

The next one is the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund. This is the one that was newly established in 2023. It's to track the fees collected for residential garbage and recycling services and make it easier to track the services that are being spent, so that's why you don't see anything in 2022 because previously these charges were in the General Fund and the Environmental Trust Fund. Currently, as you can see, we do have this fund in balance and the rates will be reviewed each year to look at what expenses—because the trash contract has a CPI increase set for each year, so depending on how much that varies, we'll have to look at the rates each year to determine if the rates collected are covering the trash contract.

total expenses going out of \$1M, so left us with like \$67K more revenue coming in than expenses going out. The fund balance ended up being almost \$400K.

As we move over to 2023, we are estimating to spend \$121K in the fund balance here, but as we go out from 2024 to 2028 the fund balance does stay pretty stable within this fund. Some things that are also being paid out of this fund are four FTEs and then also capital that is being spent out of this fund also.

That is the last fund that we wanted to cover with you all tonight.

Commissioner Bynum said I have some questions. Mayor, before I ask my questions, you know, I learned ask not, receive not and so with that I'm going to ask again and I'm going to keep asking our Commission to consider the elimination of the PILOT for the target population we brought to you last week. I'm going to ask it next week and the week after that. **Mayor Garner** said with that said, Administration and staff, if you would, I guess, for our next round based on the information you've gotten from Commissioner Bynum's work in working with her, can you present those projections to this full Commission for debate and consideration as part of the budget conversation so that issue can be addressed. **Commissioner Bynum** said thank you on behalf-- and we brought—first of all, Mayor, they did all the work, you know, I convened the committee but they did all the work and we have some rough ideas, but given kind of some of what we're seeing here, I'm just putting it in the universe again that I would like to ask for that relief for that target population.

The questions I'm having tonight are around your special funds, but in the beginning you went to the Tax Levy Funds, Aging, Mental Health, etc. I want to make sure I understand. Multiple times, Reggie, as you walked us through those funds you said we could provide more services or we could shift the mill levy rate, so a couple of things. If we have a conversation about going revenue neutral on just the County side of the budget, it's all a hypothetical conversation, that would not necessarily change these rates, right? We could change these rates. Am I correct, these are all some portion of a mill that's funding these special tax levies at the dollar amounts that they're generating. I'm speaking of the Tax Levy Funds, specifically, right now, Aging, and we can adjust those up and down at our discretion. Am I right about that?

Ms. Jonscher said yes, you can move—there's eight levee funds on the County side and you can, without even changing it, you could shift from one of the levees to the General Fund or

vice-versa without even changing the levee. Now, if you're talking about going revenue neutral, that would probably reduce the total County levy and then you probably would have to reduce—**Commissioner Bynum** said okay, that's what I'm trying to get at I guess. To go revenue neutral on just the County side of the budget, last week that presentation was 37.328 mills down to 31.743. It looks to me like within some of these fund balances on these Tax Levy units on the County side, we might have room—and Brian makes a good point, because if you do that, if you go from 37.3 to 31.7, then that's next year and the year after that and the year after that. So, over here when we look at the levy funds, I'm just wondering if we don't go revenue neutral, and again, I'm just talking about the County side, we could still make adjustments in these rates that could even potentially still produce more revenue, just not as much as what's currently being produced.

I'm not trying to like scare any department. This is a part of why I was asking last week for this kind of deep dive. This is the beginning to me of the deep dive that we're asking you for because we want to bring mill levy relief and if we can bring that in the form of revenue neutral, fine, but we again, we must know where those expenditures will not occur. Some of it could be in very small increments of these Tax Levy Funds and I just want to make sure I'm speaking correctly and if I'm not, I need to be explained.

Mr. Johnston said I think when we presented both the PILOT option last week and the revenue neutrality, each of those would reduce the amount—well, would reduce the revenue pool for the County General—our General Funds in essence. The magnitude to—when you look at the adjustments that maybe you'll be talking to the Levy Funds to the magnitude of the impact to the General Funds, it's not going to be covering that magnitude. That's one thing to keep in mind that it's not the elixir that I think everybody would like it to be, but it's one of the options that we're going to be looking for.

We're doing the deep dive at the staff level. We'll be explaining those to you and I'm going to say, like I said at the end of that meeting, it's going to be a tough budget process and maybe that's a segue into Commissioner McKiernan's desire to speak about the General Funds.

Commissioner McKiernan said the 2024, 2025 and 2026, so your forecasts up here are based on the model that you presented, the assumptions in the model. PILOT revenue shows up in City General Fund income, correct, so when we talk PILOT, we're talking City General Fund, not County, not Parks Consolidated, not Special Revenue, not Bond & Interest, City General Fund,

okay. At its core, a local government is basically a service organization and for a lot of service organizations it's pretty safe to say that about 75% of the total expense is personnel. Would you say that it's safe to say that 75% of our expense in our three General Funds ends up being personnel or is that overestimating that? **Mr. Lindsey** said no, that's about what it is.

Commissioner McKiernan said about what it is, so in 2024 out of the \$255M of combined General Funds, \$191M of that will be personnel. I don't see any way out of this without cutting personnel. Paper clips and pickup trucks are not going to balance this budget. I think we need to confront that, that if we're even thinking about revenue reductions, we have to think about what jobs will not be funded and filled, what services will not be provided because right now, as I look just at the General Funds, we have a deficit of \$10.5M in '24, a deficit of 9.9 in '25 and a deficit of 22.9 in '26 and that's if I add together City, County and Parks.

I don't see any way that paper clips and pickup trucks is going to balance that budget and erase those deficits, so I think that's something, we as a Commission, need to confront that as we talk about making big changes, big shifts to balance this budget, it's going to have to come—tell me if I'm wrong. I hope I am, but there's going to have to be some personnel shift, would that be correct? **Mr. Lindsey** said that is definitely correct and mostly in the City General Fund.

Commissioner McKiernan said I think one of the things that we as a Commission need to consider is what services currently being provided, what services that citizens are currently asking for increased levels of would we need to trim and cut back in order to achieve the personnel savings necessary to balance the budget. I'm just going to throw that out there that I think that's something we are going to need to confront one way or the other.

Mayor Garner said, Commissioner, before you move on, the Administrator is going to chime in.

Mr. Johnston said I appreciate the reminder of that. I think that's a reality that is at the staff side of the table are realizing too. I think for the first time even internal staff are seeing the same numbers that you are and we have to do this readjustment and it's going to be a few years process to get us back to a more stable environment. As I said last time, this did not happen over the last couple years. It's decades in the making, but now we're at a point where fiscal discipline has to be king and our focus and that means looking at personnel, looking at ways of how we do business, how we use debt to fund our things. Now it's also going to be a reality in discussions with you

because over the last couple years you have given staff priorities that you have expectations like 25% increase every year on infrastructure. I'm going to tell you right now, that's not going to happen. That's a reality. It's an ideal, but we're not going to be able to deal with it with our current situation. I'll say it that bluntly. That's going to have to be an expectation that's reduced.

There's got to be an expectation to community stakeholders that they can't come to the UG like they used to in the past to get the support that they want. That's got to be a hard fact to talk about our partners who we rely on to provide services. It's going to be a challenge and the fact that you overtly saying, hey, we got to face the elephant in the room, we're going to do that. I envision that once I present to you my work and then leave it to you to beat yourselves up over, you're going to have to confront individual priorities with fiscal realities that we can't continue to pay.

What you had here today is step one in the budget process, get an understanding of where all our revenue comes in for both budgets and the other budgets that we have, but you also—there was one thing I wanted all of you to realize, some of the comments that our two financial professionals mentioned, in a lot of these funds we have employees embedded in them and that usually is a game that those of us in large budget processes we took them out of the General Fund because we had pressures on the General Fund.

I'm at a point where I don't know how much I have that latitude in our budget processes, but we've shifted a lot and across the country why you've established Levy Funds is you wanted to keep your General Fund Levy below. If you look at some of those Levy Funds, those are typical services that you would find governments providing anyway, but to show that your General Fund is lower, you created a Special Levy Fund and took that out of it. It's a public sector tool that then you can say, well no, I maintain the General Fund, but you increase the Special Levy on the outside of the fund.

There are these mechanisms that have evolved over the years that we've used in the history of the UG, but it's used everywhere. I mean the joke in Illinois is it has the most taxing districts in the country because they wanted to keep County and City General Funds low, so they created Park Districts, they created Forest Districts, they created Drainage Districts, they created Mosquito Abatement Districts; all receiving a Tax Levy away from what normally used to be in it.

So, again, telling the citizen voter we've kept the General Fund down, they never talk about how we did it. Just understand that these are things that have happened over time and we have to deal with it maybe more dramatically on the front end, but it's going to be a multi-year process.

Commissioner Markley said just a two second note, I know the three of us—at least he's not even over there, he ran off, but remember when we first came on we were paying back some funds that we borrowed from, so we don't want to be doing that again. I would just make that side note. It's not fun to have to pay yourself back because it took money out of funds you shouldn't have, so something to keep in mind.

Commissioner Davis said this has been—listening I think a few thoughts, Administrator, just to consider. I would like to know the vacancy rate of our employees. We have seen a large, large number exit the Unified Government. What is the percentage, what are we at right now. I would also like to know what is the funding that goes with that, so with the exit of so many of our employees, what is the carryover funding that goes with that had they not left the Unified Government?

We, I think, have made it clear that whether it's local ordinances or resolutions or funds that are state statute generated that we may not be following some of them. So, I would recommend maybe either looking into a contractor or someone to do the work of going through these state funds or going through some of these resolutions and seeing if we are abiding by these funds and their purposes.

The last thing I'll say is I do agree we do need to revisit the conversation on our reserves. With that deficit in mind, on the City side, there's just no way I can justify taking away revenue via revenue neutral or tax relief. Until we change that number for expenses, it's just for us to deliver services to our citizens at the very minimum. It just doesn't make sense, but perhaps we can find some cost savings that can be returned to the General Fund so that we're not in as large of a ongoing deficit as we see right before us on the City side.

The last thing I'll say is, Colleagues, if you recall, our previous Administrator had suggested a mid-year budget adjustment, which would give us the opportunity to look at, you know, midway through the budget where we are at and whether or not we want to continue on that

road or whether or not we want to adjust. I also know there's been conversations on a two-year budget. I would just recommend that we consider all of those options so that we can have a heavy pulse on—a nice pulse on what's happening with our finances.

Commissioner Burroughs said, Colleagues, we had a discussion last week in reference to the revenue neutral rate and it's quite obvious from last year's budget discussion and this year's budget discussion revenue neutral rate was off the table. We have been mandated to do that by law, to have that discussion and if we're not going to do the revenue neutral, then we have to come public as to why we're not. What revenue neutral discussion forced us to do was give us the opportunity to look at this budget to the extent that we are and this is something that I'm looking forward to. I'm working with staff and since I've been here in the five years, we haven't had this thorough of a discussion by funds and had the debate and discussion that we've had tonight. So, there's promise here that now we're really, really drilling down to the budget. None of us want to see people lose jobs, none of us want to see a cut in services; however, we do have a responsibility to be efficient and effective and fiscally sound in our economy known as our government and this is what this revenue neutral discussion has kind of forced us to do.

I really appreciate the discussion. Staff, thank you for the work and the conversation and I appreciated the little conversations we had last night Reggie in Bonner Springs and Edwardsville that Chuck Stites and I attended in reference to what we're hearing from other communities. I stand ready to do my part. I know we're going to have differences of agreement, but the bottom line is we're elected to do this and I'm excited that now we're beginning to really, really do it, so thank you.

Mayor Garner said good discussion. Any more questions from our commissioners? Thank you staff for that presentation. I agree with Commissioner Burroughs, a really robust conversation that needs to be had as we continue to deep dive into this budget process to hopefully get to where the residents expect us to be.

We do have a 7:00 Commission meeting. Staff has indicated they're going to need about 15 minutes or so, maybe a little bit more to set up, so we're going to push that 7:00, and I apologize on behalf of the Unified Government Commission, just because of the importance of this meeting, we're going to have to push the 7:00 back to about 7:15. We will reconvene for our normal full

Commission Meeting at 7:15 in the Commission Chambers, but as such I will adjourn this Special Session. Do I have a motion?

Commissioner Markley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ramirez, to adjourn. Roll call was taken and there were seven “Ayes,” Ramirez, Johnson, Stites, Davis, Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan.

**MAYOR GARNER ADJOURNED
THE MEETING AT 6:55 p.m.**

Brett Deichler
Unified Government Clerk

dt

May 25, 2023