



Unified Government Clerk's Office

Monica L. Sparks
Unified Government Clerk

701 North 7th Street, Suite 323
Kansas City, Kansas 66101-3070

Phone: 913-573-5260
Fax: 913-573-5299
<http://www.wycokck.org>

NOTICE OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE MEETING

A meeting of the Business Development Task Force of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, will be conducted in person only on Monday, May 12, 2025, at 3:00 pm. in the Fifth-floor conference room of the Municipal Office Building, 701 N. 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

We invite you to view the meeting in person in the 5th-floor conference room, Suite 515, 701 N. 7th Street, Kansas City, Kansas,

Business Development Taskforce

May 12, 2025

3:00 pm- 4:30 pm (1/2 hour longer than usual)

City Hall

5th Floor Conference Room

701 N 7th Street

Kansas City, Kansas 66101

AGENDA

Commissioner Tom	Burroughs	Chair
Commissioner		Co-
Chuck	Stites	Chair

Nate	Brungardt
Edgar	Galicia
Renee	Hadley
Lynn	Holcomb
Greg	Kindle
Gabe	Munoz
Richard	Napper
Mindy	Rocha
Jim	Schraeder

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call of members**
- 2. Review of April 28, 2025, Meeting Minutes**
- 3. Signage Presentation- Alyssa Marcy, Long Range Community Planner**
- 4. Public Comment**
- 5. Adjourn**
- 6.**

Mayor's Business Development Taskforce

Monday, March 24, 2025

City Hall

701 N 7th Street KCK

5th Floor Conference Room

Meeting Minutes

Introduction: Chair: Commissioner Tom Burroughs and Commissioner Stites opened the meeting at 3:02 pm

Members Present: Nate Brungardt, Edgar Galicia, Renee Hadley, Lynn Holcomb, Greg Kindle, Mindy Rocha and Jim Schraeder. **Members Excused:** Gabe Munoz, and Richard Napper. **UG staff and advisors present:** Chelsea Chism, Alan Howze, Wendy Green, Greg Talkin, Jim Neath, Lavert Murray and Michael Farley. **Guest:** Dawn Rattan.

- Commissioner Burroughs called the meeting to order and roll call taken.
- Minutes of the 4-14-25 Committee meeting were reviewed, Edgar Galicia moved to approve the minutes as written. Mindy Rocha seconded the motion. Minutes unanimously accepted.
- **Update on Resolution for Parking Minimum Standards** – Wendy Green, Legal Counsel, and Michael Farley, legal department. Wendy reported the changes seen in red lines made will be discussed and with Mr. Farley, will answer any questions.

Parking Moratorium Resolution for Downtown (redlined copy) changes made:

- Wendy Green explained the specific changes were taken from the new construction or rehabilitation discussion. It is now written as any new business, whether they go into an existing building or construction, would also apply. They do not have to build or rehab a building this includes ANY new business. Also, when they renew their business license this would also be taken into consideration. This will only exist for businesses east of 1-635.

Introduction Update:

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES REQUIRED BY BOTH-EITHER ZONING DISTRICT AND OR SPECIAL USE REGULATIONS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LEGAL NON-CONFORMING STATUS FOR ALL QUALIFYING REHABILITATION, EXPANSION, OR CONSTRUCTION OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS AND USES WITHIN THE TERM OF THE MORATORIUM, UNDER CHAPTER 27, ARTICLE VIII, DIVISIONS 4 AND 9 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES.

- **Section 2 Update:** Michael Farley explained the two sets of language in section 2. This is based on comments from the last meeting on how we would address mixed use buildings. They added two sentences split up by OR to be used exclusively. The first option for section two (before the OR) reads if it is a mixed-use building no additional parking will be required, even if there are present uses for that building. The second option (after the OR) makes it clearer that just commercial uses will be exempt and any residential uses that would apply to that building will still have to be met. Those are changes and we would need to pick one or the other. Wendy Green indicated the only thing left for discussion is to pick which one to move forward in section two

Section 2. For a single building, on a property within a zoning district represented by the code subsections identified above by section 1.A – 1.P, in which both commercial and residential uses lawfully occur, no parking spaces shall be required if there are six or fewer dwelling units in the building. OR All residential uses shall still be required to comply with all parking requirements, even if such residential uses occur within the same building as commercial or industrial uses exempted from the parking requirements identified by section 1 above. “New construction project” and “new rehabilitation

project” shall be defined as a construction or rehabilitation project that has not yet received permits issued by the Building Inspections Division of the Neighbor Resource Center, including building, mechanical, electrical and plumbing permits.

- **Commissioner Burroughs introduced a new member:** Commissioner Burroughs introduced a new member, Dawn Rattan. Ms. Rattan is the new Executive Director of the Downtown Shareholders. She has an interest in this subject and is pleased to introduce her to the committee. Ms. Rattan had one question and one statement: She mentioned a correction in the first paragraph (Introduction), buildings is misspelled. Second: Is there a place in the resolution that sunsets this? Ms. Green indicated it is written in Section 6 and this will sunset in 2028 and that was determined at our last meeting.

Committee Questions or Concerns regarding Section 2:

- **Jim Schraeder** indicated he does not see a big problem with Section 2 but would like to discuss six or fewer dwelling units in a mixed-use building, eliminating parking requirements. How do people feel about that? He is leaning toward not being a problem but interested in what other committee members think. If he reads this correctly, and a developer builds a 6-unit apartment you would still have to follow minimum parking requirements for that dwelling. If you were putting 6 units in a downtown office building it would not require minimum parking requirements for the residential units. Mr. Farley indicated that was correct.
- **Edgar Galicia:** He would like to think about the fact that we are dealing with certainty and uncertainty of parking. Take into consideration businesses who open during day or night with specific business hours, we will not know exactly the flow of people, or amount of parking needed at a given time, but when it comes to residents. The number of units that the structure holds reflects the need for parking spaces. We should distinguish between residential and business. When we discuss mixed use, that should determine the parking allowance. Again, certainty comes with residency and uncertainty comes with service. Commissioner Burroughs asked for clarity- Mr. Galicia, would you like to see this ordinance broken out even more, in reference to one being commercial only and one dealing with residential keeping them as separate as possible? Mr. Galicia agrees because of the certainty and uncertainty of need. Commissioner Burroughs indicated that this would go back to the mixed-use issue.
- **Mr. Schraeder** is fine if we did the second part (after the OR) stating all residential uses regardless of where it is will still have to have minimum parking. He indicated when he first brought this up, it was for commercial use, it was not residential use. That is something we as a community need to continue to investigate, but for the purpose of this ordinance, we should keep them separate.
- **Commissioner Burroughs** asked Ms. Green or Mr. Farley if they had any additional comments regarding commercial only and not to mention residential in the ordinance.

Mr. Farley clarified that his understating is the Committee is interested in the language after the OR that reads: All residential uses shall still be required to comply with all parking requirements, even if such residential uses occur within the same building as commercial or industrial uses exempted from the parking requirements identified by section 1 above.

This would require all residential parking, even in a mixed-use building, to be met and simply exclude the commercial component in those requirements. This would mean in Section 2 striking everything before the OR and keeping the red line words after (copied above)

- **Commissioner Stites** indicated when we spoke about this, Mr. Hand mentioned we need more residential and he mentioned that someone may want to live downtown, who works downtown and does not have a car and there is not the need for the parking. Commissioner Stites is not sure he is on board with eliminating it, with all the vacant lots we have and us trying to get housing put in. If they want to move there they will move, if they have parking or they don't and they will make that decision.

- **Mindy Rocha** responded that if you want to live in an apartment complex or mixed used you will look for one with a parking space or not. Commissioner Stites agreed indicating that it will be based on needs, and most will move on to the next apartment if it does not fit their needs.
 - **Alan Howze** mentioned he is reminded of a statement by Mr. Napper who said developers think about this and what is best for their development. If you look deeper in the code the parking minimums for residential is not a one space for one unit, it varies based on the type. If we are saying the developer should be the one that makes the decision of what works for their development, it may be at or above what is the minimum or there may be adjustments made to it. Let the market have that say and if there are things we need to adjust because we see a problem, like overflow in neighborhoods, then deal with that. Let's create the opportunity to deal with that problem, but having too many people and too much development is trying to preemptively account for it in this instance.
 - **Dawn Rattan** indicated she thinks about the residential question, if you are a developer, is it an obstacle or helpful to say there are no rules for parking. You can play this out in your head. If a developer wants to set up apartments and is planning to have the minimum spaces- that attracts my residents to rent that apartment vs. if I do not have minimum spaces. Does this make a developer not want to build because they are afraid they will not fill those apartments because there are not dedicated parking spaces. She indicated she does not know how that works from the developers side. Does anyone here have that information to say it is an attraction or an obstruction for a developer and that is where we need to go. With that, she would lean more conservatively and keep residential parking standards in place and focus primarily on commercial and business.
1. **Greg Kindle** states he tends to default to what is written which is the six units are less, but he wonders if this is too arbitrary. When he thinks about the buildings downtown on Minnesota Ave. in particular, most are about six units except for the Brotherhood Building, and the Pilon building which can accommodate more than six units, most of the buildings, chamber building, or the tucker building, six is about as most you can accommodate in most of the building on one or two floors due to the way they are configured. He likes the idea we could take care of one more issue proactively, rather than waiting for that next project. If it becomes an issue we change the program, but he would rather take a more aggressive approach to this than what is proposed here. The bigger buildings have parking; it is the smaller and midsize buildings that struggle with it. They would still comply with daytime rules, between 8 am-5:00 pm, 1–2-hour time stamps, and will still have to think about what to do in the daytime when you have multiple cars. You want to leave spaces for retailers to do business but long and short of it is that every one of the buildings we are talking about has \$1M tied up if they want to build an elevator, have issues around parking, have plumbing issues. We know most of these buildings have a lot of expense tied up with them. Anything we can do to make it a little more palatable is worthwhile.
 2. **Commissioner Stites** reminded us of the parking available, the handout given to us in a prior meeting showed the abundance of parking that we have down here now. We need to see how we are going to activate those unused parking spaces and parking lots that are sitting unused. What does that look like. He asked if we remember the amount of parking we have in this downtown area.
 3. **Edgar Galicia** believes if we reactivate these parking structures and we have partnership with the developers, he will lean more into having a whole package. We do have structures that are not in use and if we can use those to promote an increase in residents, he will be for it.
 4. **Commissioner Burroughs** responded that the report he has seen on the parking garages is not a report conducive to what he would say that our parking lots are ready to be utilized at this time, there is work to be done on some of these lots. It would be money well spent to add security and address maintenance needed. Maybe to restripe or whatever is necessary to make them lit up and safe, which would encourage parking vs just saying these spots are available and a year down the road they are still not utilized because

people don't like parking there. He would encourage the committee if they were thinking about utilizing these parking spaces, which is a tremendous resource for us for downtown, we may want to get a report from Public Works about what kind of investment will need to be made to bring these up to a standard that the public will feel comfortable utilizing. That in and of itself may very well help us with what we are dealing with here.

5. **Commissioner Burroughs** mentioned he is hearing that we started with Mr. Schraeder's request for a commercially driven resolution, and brought in a residential discussion, but we want to ensure that whichever one we want to bring forward we are asking a larger ask with the commission until we get the parking situation addressed that is available for downtown. Word of caution as to how we move forward with this but as Chair, he will take the committees request forward.
6. **Jim Schraeder** mentioned we are talking beyond the downtown area. If we think of Armourdale, Rosedale and Central Avenue, or older areas east of 635, there are a lot of two-story buildings where the second floor is not utilized. As Mr. Kindle was speaking of 1-6 units and would encourage residential development in those types of buildings across our older areas then you don't have to have parking dedicated off street for those spaces. That may be a good reason for this. He does not know why Mr. Farley put that as an option but that might be why he put this as an option. It is a bigger issue than Minnesota Ave. He understands the discussion about Minnesota Ave., but this can help throughout the eastern part of the county.
7. **Commissioner Stites** stated as he thinks about Kansas City, Missouri, and getting these lots well-lit where we feel safe and feel your car is safe. We should pay attention to at all the paid lots that they have. There is not even one person there; it is a card swipe. There are options there and he is not sure what it will take to get to downtown KCK to this point but maybe we in the process of getting developers to talk about residential, there is a conversation of asking would you be willing to do X for this parking lot. For your folks, not requiring having a minimum but would you be willing to stripe or add lighting or card swipe. Like what Mr. Napper said in a meeting. It is on the developer. If they do not think they can rent these, they are not going to do it. He personally thinks it is a big ask from where we are to ask for both, but remember it is a three-year test period. We can get out at any time if there is a problem we have language in there that will stop and determine it is not working
8. **Commissioner Burroughs** appreciates Chelsee pointing out in section two the discussion has been striking everything before the word OR and eliminating the word OR All residential uses shall still be required to comply with all parking requirements, even if such residential uses occur within the same building as commercial or industrial uses exempted from the parking requirements identified by section 1 above. If this is not clear, please guide the chairs.
9. **Chelsee Chism** explained what is being deliberated is if there is a desire among the taskforce to allow for six units or less to not adhere to the current parking standards or no matter what if there is a residential component to the project they do have to adhere to all current parking requirements.
10. **Wendy Green** responded and said that is correct, because as the ordinance is written now it only applies to commercial projects and businesses, residential is not contemplated at all, which is why with mixed use, legal department had to determine and Michael had to add section 2 in the resolution to deal with mixed use, if 6 or less units then everything before the OR, For a single building, on a property within a zoning district represented by the code subsections identified above by section 1.A – 1.P, in which both commercial and residential uses lawfully occur, no parking spaces shall be required if there are six or fewer dwelling units in the building. If it does not matter the number of units and you still want to have a parking requirement and if there is residential and that would mean select everything after the OR. All residential uses shall still be required to comply with all parking requirements, even if such residential uses occur within the same building as commercial or industrial uses exempted from the parking requirements identified by section 1 above.

11. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if the magic number is six? Michael responded, it could be different but chose six because that is typical for downtown with two or maybe three story buildings. Six is not a magic number per say but encompasses any of the current residential or residential spaces in the downtown area. It makes it easier and that typically has been found to have less parking requirements and once get above six or eight units it is considered an apartment building than residential uses of all the commercial space.
12. **Mindy Rocha** mentioned this is also a test, so let's test it
13. **Commissioner Stites** states the easier we can make it, when we talk about trying to invigorate or bring economic development downtown - make it easy. People who bring a coffee shop, barber shop or restaurant need residents to support them. Those are the residents that are not the ones coming in and working and leaving, they are here at night after work, to support those types of places. Those businesses must have patrons to make it. Mindy Rocha mentioned also if you take your family to dinner and there is no parking, you will not go there.
14. **Alan Howze** reminded us of Greg Kindle's point -these buildings can have a residential with stable rent that helps commercial business underneath, certainly to a degree on your residential rents and allow to do more with those buildings.
15. **Commissioner Stites** mentioned he personally likes the number six, and it makes sense to Mr. Kindle's discussion points, and if we go above that it will be more of an apartment complex. We must have a number that makes sense and this is a test. Let's see what it does.
16. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked the Taskforce members if they understood what is before us, we have two different statements in section 2 and must choose a statement before or after the OR to finalize the resolution.
17. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if there is a lot of development proposed for our area, asking if Greg Kindle can fill us in on the KU corridor. If we were to do this, would there be any issues coming forward that we may need to prepare for in reference to businesses being proposed. We do not want any projects discussed that should not be discussed, but if there is anything you can share. We would not like this to come forward and find out there are issues somewhere, but if we can handle these issues before we get started that would be a benefit. Greg Kindle stated a project that comes to mind is Project Mission, CHWC's project on 43rd on Mission Road. This is a 12-unit project, and this would be above what we are discussing but the issue if you recall with this project was parking-there was not enough parking for residents and neighbors. If we keep this at six it does not absolve them from resolving that issue, which would get negative pushbacks from neighborhood. Many of the other projects around KU are much bigger than this. This would apply some in Armourdale, Central Ave. and mostly in the downtown area. If we exclude Bank of Labor, Pilon building, and 2220 Central Ave. which are much larger projects. He cannot think where this would potentially create a new problem, yet.
18. **Greg Kindle** asked Chelsee Chism about the project they are working with 18th and Quindaro with Steve Hooks. It is a six-unit project, and this would change the dynamic of their project even though this project may be later down the road. Ms Chism feels like this project is different because there is not the density in that location and they have an abundance of street parking currently. If a lot more units are in the immediate area then a developer would need to evaluate. Again, to the point what Mr. Napper raised, the developers should weigh in to ensure there is sufficient parking or amenities to support their development and investment.
19. **Greg Kindle** asked for clarification of the area this is applying to: East of 635
20. Jim Schraeder would recommend to move forward, keeping everything before OR and eliminating everything after including the OR For a single building, on a property within a zoning district represented by the code subsections identified above by section 1.A – 1.P, in which both commercial and residential uses lawfully occur, no parking spaces shall be required if there are six or fewer dwelling units in the building. Even though we started out only discussing commercial or industrial, the new section 2 would allow a mixed use commercial building that has no more than six residential units to also be able to eliminate any amount of parking requirements. Greg Kindle agreed if that was a motion.

21. **Commissioner Burroughs** indicates this has now gone the opposite direction and that when this is brought before the committee, we understand the foundation of why we chose to go in the direction we are going. As residential is important to the discussion of development, so is the commercial aspect. If we are trying to be soft with this, that is one thing, by eliminating all residential except for 6 units or less, then more than 6 units must comply with the current parking standards. **Ms. Green** mentioned Section 2 is specific to mixed use, all other sections to the ordinances are discussed above. This is only dealing with special uses or zoning sections for commercial only, none of these would apply for other residential. **Mindy Rocha** stated we should leave it as it is. **Wendy Green** mentioned If we did everything above the OR that would still let a mixed-use property that was commercial that had 6 units or more because that commercial may still have to have a parking requirement if it has residential ties to it. If we strike everything past the OR that would be redundant because nothing else in the resolution talks about residential. **Michael Farley** mentioned this is correct and clarified the two parts of section 2 were meant to be separate from each other- it is an either/or.
22. **Dawn Rattan** asked If there is a mixed-use development and the mixed-use development has 10 residential units, everything after the OR applies, is that correct? Wendy Green replied that it is correct, everything after OR applies.
23. **Jim Schraeder** stated as an example the City Hall Place that is under construction now, it is a mixed-use project technically because it has retail uses on the ground floor and 60 residential units. This new resolution would not apply to this project. They would still have to comply with the parking requirements for their commercial and residential use.
24. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked by consensus what the taskforce is thinking. **Mindy Rocha** states to leave it as is. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked by a show of hands what is the consensus of the group and whatever the group decides we can carry it forward as the will of the committee without someone speaking at another meeting declaring I was on the committee but did not agree with this. His preference is to iron any conflicts out now. **Commissioner Stites** does not believe it is going to be a very tall ask as long as we state why with facts and people will be on board making it easier for residential and Commercial development downtown. **Mindy Rocha** agreed, stating especially because it is a test and we will not change everything for the entirety of life if it does not work.
25. **Jim Schrader** mentioned we cannot leave it as it is written, it must be one or the other because it is redundant if we use both.
26. **Commissioner Burroughs** asked for a show of hands to move forward with this portion of Section 2: For a single building, on a property within a zoning district represented by the code subsections identified above by section 1.A – 1.P, in which both commercial and residential uses lawfully occur, no parking spaces shall be required if there are six or fewer dwelling units in the building. Everything after OR goes away. All raised hands were raised to move forward with above and strike word OR and everything after.
27. **Next Steps: Commissioner Burroughs** will have Alan Howze check with Public Works and provide some kind of report as to the condition of the parking lots identified. It would be an opportunity to look at our assets, their condition and what it might take to regain parking in a majority of those in a safe and effective manner, including lighting, patching, striping, or security. It would provide the opportunity to offer it up to developers, not just changing parking requirements but also offering parking opportunities downtown. When we have the World Cup, with Memorial Hall as one of the centers we will need ample parking. This will give us an opportunity before it is dumped in our lap. If this is the will of the body, we will take the resolution with Section 2 striking OR and everything after and send it to the Planning Commission and then will come before the full commission. It will be added to the June Planning Commission and go to full commission at the end of June.
28. Alan Howze asked a clarifying question: Mr. Farley, you said commercial and residential, so this contemplates mixed use. If someone came and built a fourplex that was just residential, would they still be under the residential parking requirements in the code? Mr. Farley said that is correct even if they were constructing it in a commercially zone district.

29. Commissioner Burroughs thanked the taskforce for the work and appreciates watching it grow from just downtown business corridor to the entire east side of Wyandotte County and it was well vetted and appreciate legal, planning and zoning and all input, making it easier for he and fellow commissioner to answer the questions that may come forward and ask all to attend the meetings as this progresses. We will send the dates to the members as this moves forward.

4. Accela Update: Crystal Sprague

- **Crystal Sprague** reminded the committee she is the project director for the Accela upgrade or the migration and any sub projects that follow that. It has been several months since she presented to the committee. She explained the stages of the project for the migration and ancillary projects we might be encountering. She reported on April 21st, Accela was successfully migrated to the cloud. We have had very few issues as we moved forward. She remembers several of Mr. Talkin's team members who came through and asked if we were sure we were done. We are good and all is working out well with the migration.
- **Migration:** The migration is an important behind the scenes step to take. If you are familiar with software and how it is handled, we managed through servers at the UG. That means if we had a power outage and our systems went down and we could not access the online servers, citizens could not access the Accela portal, but neither could the employees. The cloud is a behind the scenes step that was critical to protect our data and to protect the platform. It provides additional performances and redundancies, meaning we can increase the types of functionalities that we can use within the selected platform: Accela because we are now in the cloud. It keeps us moving and we can work remotely regardless of what is happening at the UG. It also increased the mobile application ability for people in the field, like code enforcement officers or building expectation officers to access Accela mobile for them to do their work. This important behind the scenes structure improvement can materialize other benefits. Now that it is in cloud, and that was not an easy move, it is moving a lot of data with configuration and a lot of integrations along with it. This gives us a lot of ability to double down on the improvement of the business processes.
- **30 Day Stabilization/DRC process:** We have a 30-day window for stabilization to make sure everything is stabilized with users, internally and externally. Then we will start on DRC processes. Those DRC processes will be evaluated and have been evaluated many times, but we have now put them in a digital format and will also move this to the cloud, allowing us to bring in other people that are participatory in that DRC process. For example, if Greg Talkin is doing a building inspection, it requires the DRC process and the fire department must weigh in, there is a delicate dance that happens through emails today to get through that DRC process. By moving this process to the cloud it allows us to give the fire department personnel access to that business process, digitize that business process and have things traceable and trackable, wherever they are in the process. We have started on the DRC process and will also be completing a website integration. This allows us to improve the citizens experience when applying for a permit or when checking their DRC case or when looking at codes enforcement case. It will also include a menu for citizens so an average citizen who would like to build a coy pond in their back yard will be able to come into the website and answer a few questions. This will give them a description of what they actual need to do and then push them into the Accela portal and allow them to start that application process without filling it out on PDF or piece of paper they must print off and scan back in or present to the office. Moving to the cloud also allows the website integration and that piece happens now, so we able to get that integration done. We will also be moving very quickly on payment options that happen outside of Accela which are cumbersome for the average citizen to do. We will be moving those inside Accela so we will take payment in one place, so it is trackable and post appropriately. We are also implementing a governance process and expanding the Accela modules. Right now, Greg Talkin's team uses them, and Gunnar Hand's team uses

some of the modules but we will be expanding in some of the other places within the UG so citizens can come to one place to get those permits taken care of instead of going to different platforms and products.

- **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if the migration is complete? If we have someone come in and wants to do some development, everything is going to be online and they will not have to submit on paper nor will this application be sent from one agency to another, waiting on a department? Which is some of what we heard here in these meetings as being a problem. Will this expedite the process from A-Z? **Crystal Sprague** asked to focus that question some: the migration to the cloud is complete. That will allow us to improve those digital business processes. That was the first step: getting it to a cloud solution, which opened different types of avenues, and we must digitize more of that process for citizens.
- **Alan Howze** indicated the groundwork has been laid through this collaboration and we will now start to work on things to improve the experience and will go out and engage with Accela to do whatever our businesses need, whether paying, licensing, and permitting. Crystal Sprague mentioned there will be certain waves of improvements that unfold over the next six to eight months with a focus on the website and DRC processes that have been identified as the two primary issues of focus: how syncs interact digitally and how we are working behind the scenes on the DRC processes. Other improvements during migration were made tweaks and closing the gaps along the way and they will identify others as they focus on those top two.
- **Commissioner Burroughs** asked if there is any training or retraining of staff? Do we have contractors to help with this? Is this something we would like to advise our community on, regarding what is occurring? Strategic communications did a great job with customer relations and publications in the news and with announcements. She is smiling a little broader than she should, but she is lucky to have a change in management and trainer on staff. She does not go out to other people to teach our own business processes we do this in house. The teams we worked with at NRC and Planning were very nimble and did a lot of testing. We did about 500-600 tests with those resources so they can get used to any changes they might see. From where she stands our end users are adjusting quite nicely with support from our internal change management person.
- **Greg Kindle** mentioned he is excited about the transition. Recently, he could not find dates for meetings on the website, is this due to the transition that was occurring with Accela? Are all the dates for EDF or Planning Commission going to be under this platform. **Crystal Sprague** mentioned Accela is permitting and processing of permitting. There is a different platform for handling dates. Alan Howze stated there is a different platform that handles agenda management. That is out of the clerk's office. They have been in the process of adding all the agendas to make sure they are all in the same format and one place. The last one to be added is the planning agenda. Planning agendas have been set up outside of that platform but will now be pulled into the Civic Clerk software. That will finish in the next several months and all meetings will be listed in same format and one platform.
- **LaVert Murray** asked for clarification: with Accela payments now being tendered on permit issues but then with different schedules for the planning department, which is part DRC. There are publications fees collected related to development, is that all on schedule. **Crystal Sprague** responded that publication fees are not handled inside Accela itself, she cannot address where publication fees are managed. Accela handles any fee coming from the DRC process or accessed through the DRC process including code enforcement, any permit being sold, application for a building inspection, license, etc. **Lavert Murray** mentioned sometimes you will have DRC processes that involves a grant, and the publication fee related to that comes before permits can be issued so he wondered if Accela will take care of this. **Alan Howze** indicated that is something they will investigate as they work on these type of improvements. **Crystal Sprague** said she would venture to say that publication piece starts at the clerk's office, but she thinks it is something they can look at since they now have a cloud solution and will be moving clerk's office in. They

can look at that process as an improvement. As far as payment goes, Accela has been able to take digital payment through the Accela portal, but one of the weaknesses to that portal is when we had our cyber incident, citizens could not make payments. The team quickly rallied and created an additional way to take citizen payments but introduced some risk because we were taking payments in two different places. Our goal now is to take what has become a normal way for people to pay for permits, putting that back in Accela where it belongs in a more citizen friendly way where outages would not occur if they needed to make a payment.

- **Alan Howze** stated this committee has talked about resources and sustaining resources to support the development of the processes. You mentioned that in your presentation. We are on the front end of the budget season, reiterating what the needs are and how to maximize the investments made in the product. Crystal responded, saying that is a good point as we made investments in platforms, platforms are like infrastructure. We make investments and if we do not take care of them, the investment falls apart and does not work the way we thought it would work. The executives on the team from NRC, planning, Public Works and the department of technology has been really scrapping and renegotiating contracts for existing services, looking at dollars saved, and declamation hardware so they can take those resources and add any investments that were made several years ago to pay for the implementation, to pay for the licensing, but now getting to a place the money will run short. There will be a short fall for the 2026 calendar year to continue paying the licensing for this product. It is a good time to reflect on NRC budget, planning budget or IT budget for this type of investment. In addition, we were able to purchase management services, internally we might have some strong resources, but we do not have all the resources we need to support reconfiguration of new businesses processes digitally, so we may need to grab a contractor for that to occur. In this investment we were able to obtain dollars for a managed service agreement for the first year. The experts at Accela help us with that DRC reimaging process digitally and we do not expect to have those dollars for year two. Based on the way we can amplify the use and consumership of the Accela product, once we lose those managed service dollars it would impact our ability to move quickly and nimbly. We do not have the bandwidth internally and from a technological standpoint to be able to make some of those changes.
- **Crystal Sprague** asked that when we see those from DRC and Planning here to thank them- they were here on Saturdays, worked them through a bunch of tests, made them uncomfortable with a different type of governance around a project installation. She can't say enough about the teams work to get this across the finish line successfully. Commissioner Burroughs expressed the same for her team.
- **Commissioner Burroughs** indicated at the next meeting we will discuss signage that the committee wanted to address. After we finish the signage discussion, we may want to consider how we can streamline small business applications, so that those that come forward in our community to get started, how do we make it a one stop shop, or easy application process. By the time as a committee we get through Accela we will be up and ready to utilize it. If there are other discussion items, we have been going off the CitieWorks report and many of us were here when they presented. We just discussed one of their recommendations which was parking minimums. He thanked the committee for working this out and Jim Schraeder for bringing forward something that was needed. Collectively moving it forward to the Planning and Zoning committee.
- Commissioner Stites wanted to bring this to everyone's attention: He was at NRC speaking with Mr. Neath. Mr. Neath suggested Commissioner Burroughs and he come out to a meeting at NRC, and set up time to meet with staff. They went through, from start to finish, making an application for DRC project, and what triggers a DRC project. It helped him to see what they are doing and what needs are. He thanked Jim Neath for going through that process and seeing what they deal with and as we begin discussion on budgets,

understanding where needs may be, and some were identified while he was there. This paid dividends in the big picture.

- Mindy Rocha thanked the commissioners and encouraged other commissioners to do the same to understand the process and how they function will open some eyes.
- There is no standing committee meeting on May 12th (our next meeting) night so we will extend the meeting by ½ hour

Meeting Adjourned at 4:02 pm. **Next meeting is May 12, 2025, at 3:00-4:30 pm. (Extended by ½ hour)**

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED FOR COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES BY EITHER ZONING DISTRICT OR SPECIAL USE REGULATIONS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LEGAL NON-CONFORMING STATUS FOR ALL COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS AND USES WITHIN THE TERM OF THE MORATORIUM, UNDER CHAPTER 27, ARTICLE VIII, DIVISIONS 4 AND 9 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES.

WHEREAS, the promotion of industrial and commercial businesses, especially small businesses, in Wyandotte County is a priority for the Unified Government;

WHEREAS, imposing a minimum number of off-site parking spaces for a business to create or secure before opening or expanding can create a significant barrier to opening or expanding said business;

WHEREAS, the PlanKCK Economic Development Strategic Plan, approved and adopted by the Board of Commissioners on December 6, 2023, seeks to identify and work to remove regulatory barriers to promote a thriving business mix in Downtown KCK;

WHEREAS, removing parking minimums is a specific identified strategic initiative in the PlanKCK Citywide Comprehensive Plan, approved and adopted by the Board of Commissioners on November 30, 2023;

WHEREAS, the goDotte Wyandotte County Strategic Mobility Plan, approved and adopted by the Board of Commissioners on August 25, 2022, advocates for the potential reduction or elimination of minimum parking requirements along identified “Opportunity Corridors”;

WHEREAS, the Downtown Area Plan, approved and adopted by the Board of Commissioners on June 7, 2007, notes that “much of the land in Downtown is too valuable to use as surface parking, especially along street frontages” and endeavors to “maximize on-street parking on all streets”;

WHEREAS, Chapter 32, Article IX of the 2008 Code of Ordinances and Resolutions of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (“Complete Streets”), approved and adopted by the Board of Commissioners on November 11, 2020, intends for streets to contribute toward the safety, health, equity, economic viability, and quality of life in Wyandotte County; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS:

Section 1. From the date of the passage of the Resolution, the Unified Government will place a moratorium on the requirement and enforcement the following sections and subsections of the Zoning Code, Chapter 27 of the Unified Government Code of Ordinances:

- A.) Section 27-463(e)
- B.) Section 27-464(e)
- C.) Section 27-465(f)

- D.) Section 27-466(e)
- E.) Section 27-467(e)
- F.) Section 27-468(e)
- G.) Section 27-469(e)
- H.) Section 27-470(f)
- I.) Section 27-471(n)(1)b
- J.) Section 27-741(n)(2)b
- K.) Section 27-741(n)(2)c
- L.) Section 27-741(n)(3)b
- M.) Section 27-741(n)(3)c
- N.) Section 27-741(n)(8)
- O.) Section 27-742(e)
- P.) Section 27-668

Section 2. For a single building, on a property within a zoning district represented by the code subsections identified above by section 1.A – 1.P, in which both commercial and residential uses lawfully occur, no parking spaces shall be required if there are six or fewer dwelling units in the building.

Section 3. Any automobile parking that is elected to be constructed shall remain subject to and in compliance with all other parking requirements, including setbacks, on-site location, parking space and drive aisle dimensions, paving materials, and landscaping. Such parking shall be considered “required parking” within the context of Sections 27-524, -670, and -671.

Section 4. This Resolution shall apply to all land under the jurisdiction of the Unified Government east of Interstate 635 (Harry Darby Memorial Highway).

Section 5. This Resolution shall become effective upon passage by the Unified Government Board of Commissioners and will remain effective until the same day in the year 2028 at 11:59 PM, or until a new Zoning Code becomes effective, or until a superseding resolution or ordinance becomes effective.

**ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COMISSIONERS OF THE UNIFIED GOVERNMENT OF
WYANDOTTE COUNTY/KANSAS CITY, KANSAS
THIS ___ DAY OF _____, 2025.**

Tyrone A. Garner, Mayor/CEO

Attest:

Unified Government Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Wendy M. Green
Deputy Chief Counsel