Unified Government Clerk's Office

Monica L. Sparks, CMC
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 COMMUNITY BENEFITS ADVISORY BOARD COMMITTEE MEETING

A meeting of the Community Benefits Advisory Board of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, will be conducted in a hybrid format on Tuesday, August 18, 2026, at 2:30 p.m.

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

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device:
Topic: Community Benefit Advisory Committee Meeting

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
Please click this URL to join.
https://wycokck.zoom.us/j/83306722266
Meeting ID: 833 0672 2266

One tap mobile
+12532050468,83306722266# US
+12532158782,83306722266# US (Tacoma)

Join instructions
https://wycokck.zoom.us/meetings/83306722266/invitations?signature=_I-p5fqIpvgbKIi30Q-j0YInciJsmmISmzH4BQFY-VQ

COMMUNITY BENEFIT ADVISORY BOARD

Location:	Hybrid / 5th Floor Conf Rm
Date:	8/18/2026
Time:	2:30 PM
Chair:	Dr. Nozella Brown

MEMBERS: Dr. Nozella Brown, Chair; Deaney Cole, LaRon Thompson, Mary Dorr, Stephanie Pujol' Burch, Kallie McLaughlin, Melissa Williams, Alfred Gutierrez.

AGENDA

I. Call to Order – Chair Dr. Brown

II. Approval of Minutes (action required): June 16, and July 14, 2026

III. Old Business

a. Updates from last meeting
b. Commissioner Davis: Background on Upper Story and Childcare Programs
c. Financial Report: $372,897.36

IV. New Business –

a. Adjust distribution of funds (action required)
b. Recommendations to the Economic Development and Finance (ED/F) Standing Committee (action required)

V. Next Steps

a. Proposed Ordinance Update for 2027 (October meeting)

VI. Adjournment

Community Benefit Advisory Board
Meeting Date: June 16, 2026
Meeting Time: 3:00 PM (CDT)
Location: Hybrid / City Hall 5th Floor

ATTENDANCE / INTRODUCTION

Name	**Role/Appointment**	**Background**
Dr. Brown	Chair; Mayor's Appointee	Retired Director, K-State Research and Extension
Mary Dorr	Member; Appointed by Commissioner Burns	Retired Director of Student Financial Aid, Kansas City, Kansas Community College
Stephanie Pujol' Burch	Member; Appointed by Commissioner Phil Lopez	Small business owner and landlord in KCK
Callie McLaughlin	Member; Appointed by Commissioner Kump (At-Large 2)	Director of Planning and Development, City of Lewisburg; former UG Planner
Melissa Williams	Member; Appointed by Commissioner Hill	Domestic violence advocate and President of the Turtle Hill Association
Alfred Gutierrez	Member; Appointed by Commissioner Stites	Retired; formerly worked with the Department of Health and Environment and Department of Aging in Topeka

Members Absent:

- **Laron Thompson** — Absent without notice.
- **Devaney Cole** — Absent. Notice of absence was submitted in advance of the meeting.

Vacancies;		
District 1 – Commissioner Howard	VACANT	
District 3 – Commissioner Ramirez	VACANT	
District 5 – Commissioner Pacheco	VACANT	

Staff and Officials Present:

Name	Role
Commissioner Davis	UG Board of Commissioners (non-voting, resource participant)
Jeff Conway	Legal Counsel, Unified Government
Reed Partridge	Legislative Auditor's Office, UG (Ethics Training Presenter)
Lisa Rangel	Staff Support

CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:00 PM and welcomed all members present in person and those attending virtually.

COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM 1: Brief History of the Community Benefit Ordinance

Commissioner Davis provided a historical overview of the Community Benefit Ordinance and Community Benefit Fund. He noted the following key points:

- The Community Benefit Ordinance was a "labor of love" developed over approximately three (3) years, originating from work done by Commissioner Davis and former Commissioner Harold Johnson.
- The foundational question was how to leverage the economic success concentrated in the western portion of the community and redistribute that revenue across the broader community.
- The effort was developed in close collaboration with Mayor Garner, Commissioner Burroughs, Commissioner Bynum, and others.
- The foundational ordinance is Ordinance Number O-3725, which establishes the fund, how it is funded, and how the advisory board is constituted, including the

provision that the mayor appoints the chair and that there are eleven (11) total members.

- There is a statutory October 1 deadline by which the board must submit its recommendations.
- The fund applies exclusively to Kansas City, Kansas (city-side) revenue — it does not impact or include the Wyandotte County budget.

Three Authorized Use Categories (Buckets):

Commissioner Davis explained that through a series of conversations and compromises, three categories of expenditure were established under the ordinance:

1. **Parks and Recreation Capital Projects**
2. **Home-Based Childcare (Micro-Grant and Rebate Program for Licensed Home-Based Childcare Providers)**
3. **Housing Trust Fund**, which includes two programs:
    - **KCK Homes for Generations** — managed by the Clerk's Office
    - **Upper Story Program** — managed by Community Development

Commissioner Davis noted that in the prior year, no dollars were allocated to the childcare category because federal dollars through the CDBG program were serving that purpose, allowing those funds to be redirected to Parks and Recreation.

Fund Balance:

Commissioner Davis stated that the fund was very close to or had reached the $500,000 threshold. He noted that an additional senior housing project connected to the Home Field Master Plan was anticipated to add further dollars to the fund. He did not provide a current balance, stating that any number he provided would likely be outdated given the pending project(s). He committed to providing an updated fund balance to the board.

Prior Year Allocation: Dr. Brown confirmed, and Commissioner Davis affirmed, that $435,000 was allocated in the prior fiscal year (2025).

AGENDA ITEM 2: Discussion Regarding Prior Year Board Operations and Quorum Issues

Ms. Pujol' Burch raised a question regarding whether the $435,000 allocation reflected the advisory board's recommendations from the prior year. She noted that the resolution on record did not appear to reflect the committee's recommendations.

Dr. Brown explained that while the board had made recommendations in the prior year, those recommendations could not be formally presented because the board lacked a quorum at the final meeting.

Ms. Pujol' Burch clarified her recollection that the committee's inability to formally act was due to an appointee who did not reside within the district of the commissioner who appointed them, which rendered that individual ineligible, thereby reducing the board below quorum.

Dr. Brown confirmed that two individuals were removed from the board due to this eligibility issue, which caused the board to fall below the quorum threshold needed to formally vote on recommendations.

Legal Counsel Jeff Conway clarified:

- A quorum requires six (6) members of the eleven (11)-member board.
- Because the board fell below six, a formal vote on the final recommendation could not be taken.
- Staff conveyed the committee's recommendation to the governing body informally, as they were confident the recommendation reflected what the committee intended, and the full commission adopted the recommendation in its entirety via Ordinance O-2726 and Resolution R-6-26.

Ms. Dorr expressed concern about whether appointments for the current year have been verified to ensure all appointed members reside within the appropriate commissioner district. Dr. Brown confirmed that significant efforts have been made to verify this for the current year's appointments.

Mr. Gutierrez asked for clarification on the total board size and quorum requirement:

- Total board size: eleven (11) members
- Quorum for final recommendation: six (6) members
- Current vacancies: three (3)

Legal Counsel Jeff Conway further clarified that under the bylaws, general business during regular meetings may be conducted by a majority of members present; however, the final formal recommendation requires a minimum of six (6) affirmative votes.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Legal Counsel Overview — Governing Documents, Ethics, KORA, and KOMA

Legal Counsel Jeff Conway provided an overview of the governing legal framework applicable to the advisory board. Key points included:

Governing Documents:

- The foundational ordinance is Ordinance O-3725, which establishes the Community Benefit Fund and its general structure.
- Each of the three authorized categories is described in further detail by:
  - **Ordinance O-3825** (Parks and Recreation Capital Projects)
  - **Ordinance O-3925** (Home-Based Childcare)
  - **Ordinance O-4025** (Housing Trust Fund)
- The prior year recommendation was formally adopted by the Board of Commissioners via Ordinance O-2726 and Resolution R-6-26.

Ordinance vs. Resolution: Mr. Conway explained that both an ordinance and a resolution were required because the Parks Department straddles both city and county jurisdictions. Cities use ordinances; counties use resolutions. The UG uses both, so when funds may be applied to either a city or county park, the authority for county-side expenditures flows through the resolution.

Ethics: Mr. Conway noted that all advisory board members, as volunteers serving as an instrumentality of the Unified Government, are subject to the UG Ethics Code. He noted that Reed Partridge from the Legislative Auditor's Office was present to conduct ethics training following the adjournment of the formal meeting.

Board Term: Mr. Conway noted that the board's active term runs through approximately October 1, at which point the board's recommendation is due and the board enters a dormant period until the following year.

Fund Estimate: Mr. Conway noted that while the exact fund balance was unknown, a reasonable assumption based on prior years would place it in the approximately $400,000 range, though it could be more or less, based on the ordinance provision that one-half of administrative fees charged for incentive programs flows into the Community Benefit Fund, as specified in Ordinance O-3725.

Three-Bucket Allocation Structure: Mr. Conway explained that there is a presumption that funds will be split equally among the three authorized buckets, but that the board may allocate more to one bucket than another, provided such a reallocation is approved by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the board. He noted this occurred in the prior year, when Parks and Recreation received more than one-third of the total allocation.

Periodic Review: Mr. Conway noted that Ordinance O-3725 contains a provision requiring review of the general ordinance at least every two years, providing the board with an opportunity to recommend revisions to the structure, categories, and processes.

Kansas Open Records Act (KORA): Mr. Conway advised that as a UG entity, the advisory board is subject to KORA. All proceedings, minutes, documents, presentations, and materials provided to or by the board are public records subject to public records requests.

Kansas Open Meetings Act (KOMA): Mr. Conway advised that the board is also subject to KOMA, which prohibits conducting public business in private. Key points included:

- The UG must provide public notice of all meetings, including date, time, and location, published on the UG website.
- Members of the public have the right to attend in person or virtually to observe meetings.
- The bylaws provide the Chair with authority to open meetings for public comment.
- Mr. Conway specifically cautioned members regarding serial communications, explaining that a chain of emails, text messages, or social media interactions that progressively reaches a majority of the board's membership — even if indirect — constitutes a violation of KOMA.

Dr. Brown directed members to communicate questions individually with her or to bring matters before the full board at a properly noticed meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Discussion — Community Benefit Fund Use Categories, Expansion, and Leveraging

Expansion of Fund Categories:

Ms. Pujol' Burch raised the question of why the fund's eligible use categories were not expanded beyond the three established in the current ordinances, noting that Parks and Recreation, for example, can also receive CDBG funding.

Commissioner Davis explained that the three categories are defined by local ordinance, and that adding new buckets would require the passage of a new ordinance and the identification of a department responsible for administering and accounting for those additional dollars. He acknowledged the timeline may make expansion for the current year difficult, but noted that for future years, the board could recommend additional categories. He cited small business grants as one potential example.

Dr. Brown affirmed that the board, as an advisory body in its second year, has the explicit opportunity to recommend changes to the ordinance structure, and encouraged members to take notes throughout the year on improvements they would like to propose.

CDBG and Parks Funding:

Ms. Pujol' Burch questioned whether Parks and Recreation can receive CDBG funds. Commissioner Davis confirmed that parks projects can be funded through CDBG; however, he noted that UG's Community Development Director had communicated with HUD, which funds the CDBG program, and that HUD had indicated the UG had over-extended spending on parks through CDBG, requesting a shift of CDBG dollars to other categories and communities. Much of the prior CDBG parks spending had been concentrated in the Northeast, which Commissioner Davis affirmed absolutely needs investment.

Using Community Benefit Funds as Grant Match:

Ms. McLaughlin raised the question of whether Community Benefit Funds could be used as matching funds for grant applications — for example, providing a $3,000–$5,000 match to leverage a $50,000 or $100,000 grant. She cited the Kellogg's grant for Parks and Recreation as a specific example.

Legal Counsel Jeff Conway responded that the ordinance language does not explicitly address grant matching, and that the use would need to be evaluated under each individual ordinance for each authorized category. He indicated the use might not be prohibited, and that using Community Benefit Funds to leverage a larger grant award could be an allowable use, but he recommended reviewing each ordinance's language carefully. He noted that the periodic review provision in Ordinance O-3725 provides a vehicle to recommend clarifying or expanding the language.

Dr. Brown expressed support for exploring this option and indicated that staff would be asked to look into it.

Other Departments' Budget Allocations:

Mr. Gutierrez asked whether the board could receive information about what other funding sources are being allocated to the departments covered by the Community Benefit Fund, in order to understand the full funding picture.

Legal Counsel Jeff Conway responded that Parks and Recreation is underfunded and maintains a list of priorities that it cannot fully address with its base budget; the Community Benefit Fund serves as a supplement.

Commissioner Davis recommended that each relevant department be invited to present to the board, including information about their overall budget allocations. He noted that this information is all public record and can be accessed through the most recently adopted UG budget. He specifically noted that the Capital Improvement Plan is also publicly available. He further clarified that of the three program categories:

- **Upper Story Program** — has no other dedicated ongoing funding source; the closest alternative is CDBG home dollars, which carry stringent federal requirements.
- **Parks Capital Projects** — included in the general parks budget, but demand far exceeds available resources across the system's more than 43 parks (including Parkwood Pool and other facilities).
- **KCK Homes for Generations** — this Community Benefit Fund allocation is the **only funding source** for this program.

Ms. McLaughlin added that the Parks Department also manages publicly owned cemetery grounds, which may account for differences in reported park counts found on various websites.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Video Clip — Prior Year Parks Allocation in Action

A brief video clip was shown demonstrating how the Community Benefit Fund dollars allocated to Parks and Recreation in the prior year were utilized in the community. The Chair noted that a more detailed departmental presentation from Parks and Recreation and the other funded departments would be scheduled for a future meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Childcare Program — Prior Year Funding Status

Ms. Pujol' Burch asked whether the childcare program (Micro-Grant and Rebate Program for Licensed Home-Based Childcare Providers) was returning to the fund this year, given that it had stepped aside in the prior year due to the receipt of federal CDBG funding.

Commissioner Davis explained that through the CDBG annual action plan, Community Development had received $200,000 in federal funds for home-based childcare, which is why the Community Benefit Fund allocation for childcare was not needed in the prior year. He noted that if federal CDBG dollars are not spent, HUD may reduce future allocations as a result of poor stewardship.

Ms. Pujol' Burch recalled that the childcare program had only requested approximately $40,000–$50,000 from the Community Benefit Fund in the prior year, and asked whether the program would again seek Community Benefit Fund support this cycle. Commissioner Davis indicated he did not know and recommended the board direct that question to Kay Sharp (the relevant staff contact) when she presents to the board at a future meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 7: Meeting Schedule, Upcoming Departmental Presentations, and Process for Recommendations

Dr. Brown outlined the planned schedule and process for the board's work during the current term:

- **Next Meeting (July 2026):** Lisa Rangel will send out a meeting date in July. Each relevant department will be invited to present to the board, sharing their proposals and needs for the upcoming fiscal year.
- **August 2026 Meeting:** The board will hold a substantive discussion on funding recommendations based on departmental presentations and the confirmed fund balance.
- **September 2026 Meeting:** Final discussion and formal vote on the recommendation to be submitted to the commission.
- **October 1, 2026:** Deadline for submission of formal recommendation.
- **October or November 2026 (Additional Meeting):** Dr. Brown expressed the desire to hold an additional meeting in October or November to review the board's two years of experience and develop recommendations for changes to the ordinances, program categories, or processes for submission to the full commission.

Ms. Pujol' Burch requested that the board receive departmental proposals in advance of the presentations, so members have time to formulate questions. Chair Dr. Brown agreed and committed to requesting advance materials from the departments to the extent possible.

Mr. Gutierrez asked whether individual board members could contact the departments directly prior to meetings to gather general information. **Dr. Brown** indicated that members are free to contact departments for general informational purposes, but requested that members inform her of any such outreach, and that any information gathered that would be of general benefit to the board be shared through the Chair so it can be distributed to all members.

AGENDA ITEM 8: Officer Roles and Secretary Position

Dr. Brown briefly reviewed officer positions per the bylaws and ordinance:

- **Chair:** Dr. Brown (appointed by the Mayor)
- **Vice Chair:** Pastor Laurent (previously designated; absent from this meeting)
- **Secretary:** Position is currently vacant; Dr. Brown noted that a nomination and vote for Secretary would be deferred to the next meeting to ensure proper quorum and participation. She acknowledged that staff support (Lisa) and the meeting recording provide administrative support in the interim.

AGENDA ITEM 9: Turner Recreation Center — Clarification on Funding

Ms. Pujol' Burch raised a question regarding Turner Recreation Center.

Commissioner Davis clarified that while Turner is within the City of Kansas City, Kansas, the Turner Recreation Center is funded through a separate mill levy, making its funding structure distinct from UG-managed parks. However, he noted that Pearson Park, located in the Turner area, is managed by the UG Parks Department and is within the scope of Community Benefit Fund eligibility.

Chair **Dr. Brown** called for a motion to adjourn the formal portion of the meeting

Motion to Adjourn: Motion carries. Time of Adjournment: Approximately after 3:00 PM CDT.

ETHICS TRAINING CONDUCTED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE FORMAL MEETING:

***Reed Partridge** conducted Ethics Training for newly appointed members: Callie McLaughlin, Melissa Williams, and Alfred Gutierrez.*

COMMUNITY BENEFIT ADVISORY BOARD
Regular Meeting Summary
July 14, 2026 – 1:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Brown, Chair.

ATTENDANCE

Board Members Present:

Name	Role/Title	Attendance Status
Dr. Brown	Chair / Board Member	Present
Devaney Cole	Board Member	Present
Mary Dorr	Board Member	Present
Stephanie Pujol Burch	Board Member	Present
Callie McLaughlin	Board Member	Present (via chat only — no camera or microphone)
Melissa Williams	Board Member	Present
Alfred Gutierrez	Board Member	Present

Board Members Absent:

- **Laron Thompson —** Absent without notice.

Vacancies;		
District 1 – Commissioner Howard	VACANT	
District 3 – Commissioner Ramirez	VACANT	
District 5 – Commissioner Pacheco	VACANT	

Staff and Presenters:

Monica Sparks	UG Clerk, Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas
Angel Ferrara	Parks and Recreation Department Representative
Kay Sharp	Director of Community Development
Jeff Conway	Legal Counsel, Unified Government
Lisa Rangel	Administrative Assistant/Commission Office

Public/Additional Attendees:

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Dr. Brown noted that the minutes from the previous meeting (the board's first meeting) had not yet been finalized and cleaned up and therefore were not presented for approval at this meeting. No motion was made to approve previous minutes. Dr. Brown indicated that the finalized notes from the prior meeting would be distributed to board members.

Overview of the Community Benefit Ordinance:

- The Community Benefit Ordinance was originally enacted by the Unified Government Commission in December 2023.
- Fees collected from certain development projects that received incentives from the Unified Government (UG) are deposited into a designated "community benefit" pot of money.
- In March 2025, the ordinance was amended to clarify language, relocate the program within the code of ordinances, and formally create the Community Benefit Advisory Board.
- Under the ordinance, there are three programmatic areas:
    1. **KCK Parks and Recreation —** Capital projects and equipment in parks facilities.
    2. **Community Development / Affordable Housing Trust Fund —** Upper Story Housing Development Reimbursement Fund and childcare-related activities.
    3. **Clerk's Office —** The Kansas City Homes for Generations Program.
- Funding was voted on and approved by the Commission at the end of 2025 (fiscal year 2025), with actual fund distribution beginning in 2026. Program activities commenced this year.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Presentation — Kansas City Homes for Generations Program (Clerk's Office)

Program Overview

Monica Sparks, UG Clerk, presented on the Kansas City Homes for Generations Program, administered by the Clerk's Office. Ms. Sparks provided the following information:

Purpose of the Program: The Homes for Generations Program was established to assist residents whose family home has a defective or unclear property title — situations in which a home has been passed down generationally, but paperwork was never properly completed to transfer legal ownership. Ms. Sparks noted that this is the only program of its kind in the Kansas City metro area, and possibly in the state of Kansas.

Ms. Sparks described a common scenario: a grandparent raises a grandchild in the family home, promises the home to that grandchild, but passes away without completing formal title transfer. The grandchild is then unable to qualify for homeowner assistance programs — such as utility, sales tax, or property tax rebates administered through the Clerk's Office — because the home is not legally in their name.

Ms. Sparks noted that the Kansas Department of Revenue had contacted the Clerk's Office to inquire about programs of this nature, and that the Homes for Generations Program was shared with them as a potential model for adoption at the state level.

Program Timeline:

- Funding was approved at the end of 2025.
- Funds became accessible in approximately April 2026.
- A formal contract with Kansas Legal Services was executed and approved as of July 5, 2026.
- Three pending cases have already been referred to Kansas Legal Services.

Partnership with Kansas Legal Services: Ms. Sparks explained that the Clerk's Office has established a formal partnership with Kansas Legal Services to provide legal representation for program participants. Key features of this arrangement include:

- Fees are paid directly to Kansas Legal Services — funds are not disbursed to individual recipients.
- Monthly invoices are provided detailing costs for each case, enabling compliance monitoring and auditing.
- Legal fees are tiered by attorney level (senior attorney, regular attorney, and support staff) to manage costs.
- The contract specifically covers:

    - Assistance with obtaining death certificates and other documentation required for title transfer.
    - Legal assistance with probate, contract for deed issues, evictions, foreclosures, and other matters preventing title transfer.
- One expense that cannot be paid through this program is back taxes.

Case Examples: Ms. Sparks described three active pending cases:

1. A woman in her 60s who has lived in her home for over 45 years. Her mother, who co-owned the home, passed away 13 years ago. The home remains in the mother's name. The Clerk's Office located a prior divorce court order awarding the property to the mother, but the subsequent ownership history is unclear. Kansas Legal Services is now working on this case.
2. A family with five siblings whose mother is deceased. The family believed a will existed but could not locate it. The case will likely require probate proceedings.
3. A third case still in the document research phase; it is not yet determined whether it requires Kansas Legal Services.

Communication and Outreach: Ms. Sparks reported that program communication efforts have begun, including:

- Posters displayed in all UG facility locations.
- Strategic communications through the UG communications department.
- Approximately four to five phone inquiries in the last two months (those callers did not qualify).
- Plans to expand outreach through:
    - Translation of program materials into the most common languages identified by the UG Health Department.
    - Targeted mailers (noting that postage rates have recently increased and are projected to increase again in July).
    - An insert in the BPU (Board of Public Utilities) utility bill to reach a wider resident audience.

Funding Request: Ms. Sparks confirmed that the Clerk's Office is requesting a total of $90,000 for the program. This amount maintains legal fees and document costs at the same level as the prior year's proposal, with the addition of funding for expanded communication and outreach activities.

Eligibility Criteria (Current Ordinance):

- Applicant must be 65 years of age or older or have a qualifying disability.

- Applicant must meet income guidelines consistent with the Kansas Homestead Program income thresholds.
- The property must be the applicant's primary residence.
- Properties with dangerous conditions are screened through the application process; applicants are asked whether the home is livable and safe.

Recommendation from Clerk's Office: Ms. Sparks indicated that the Clerk's Office has prepared a formal recommendation to the board for improving the program, specifically regarding barriers to eligibility. Ms. Sparks noted that the board would have an opportunity to discuss those recommendations at a future meeting.

Tracking and Reporting: Ms. Sparks described the statistical tracking to be provided to the board, including:

- Commission district and zip code of applicants.
- Timeline for case resolution.
- Case outcomes.

Ms. Cole requested greater specificity regarding what constitutes "legal fees," noting that the ordinance is fairly specific about covered legal fee types. Ms. Sparks responded by reading directly from the contract with Kansas Legal Services, which mirrors ordinance language and limits covered activities to: (1) assistance with death certificates and documentation for title transfer; (2) legal assistance with probate, contract for deed, evictions, foreclosures, or other title-transfer impediments. Jeff Conway, UG Legal, further clarified that the UG Legal Department represents the Unified Government as an entity and is not positioned to represent individual residents, making Kansas Legal Services the appropriate and logical referral partner for this type of case.

Ms. Cole asked whether funds were paid out to recipients or service providers. Monica Sparks confirmed that all funds are paid directly to service providers (Kansas Legal Services and state agencies for document fees), not to individual residents.

Ms. Pujol Burch noted that at the prior meeting, it had been indicated that the program could serve up to 75 individuals. She asked whether that figure had been achieved. Ms. Sparks clarified that 75 was the projected capacity, not actual applications received. Ms. Sparks confirmed that only three pending cases are currently active. Ms. Pujol Burch asked whether Ms. Sparks anticipated reaching the 75-person target given that the year is halfway complete. Ms. Sparks acknowledged the slower-than-anticipated start, attributing it to the program being brand new and the contract with Kansas Legal Services only recently being executed. Ms. Sparks noted that Kansas Legal Services has indicated they have four or five additional clients waiting to be referred.

Ms. Pujol Burch also asked how legal fee estimates were established before the Kansas Legal Services contract was finalized. Ms. Sparks explained that the ordinance had anticipated Kansas

Legal Services as the provider, so fee structures were estimated based on that anticipated partnership.

Ms. Pujol Burch asked whether the UG's own legal department could have been used instead of contracting Kansas Legal Services. Jeff Conway, UG Legal, responded that the UG Legal Department's client is the Unified Government as an institutional entity, and providing individualized legal services to residents would not be appropriate for that department. Kansas Legal Services was identified as the appropriate provider given the nature of the work and the income profile of likely applicants. Mr. Conway noted that Kansas Legal Services operates on a sliding scale based on need and client income.

Melissa Williams asked whether the program is income qualified. Monica Sparks confirmed that eligibility is based on: (1) age (65 or older) or disability status, and (2) income, at the same threshold established by the state of Kansas for the Homestead Program.

Callie McLaughlin asked how properties are selected for qualification, specifically whether properties that are nearly condemned or likely to be taken in a tax sale would be screened out. Monica Sparks confirmed that the application includes questions about dangerous conditions and whether the applicant can safely live on the property, and that primary residency is a requirement. Ms. Cole added that she believed a review of property maintenance history in the Acella system should be incorporated into the qualification review process.

Ms. Pujol Burch asked about a scenario in which grandchildren in their 40s inherit a family home from a deceased grandmother but do not yet meet the age-65 requirement. She questioned the logic of the restriction in those circumstances. Monica Sparks acknowledged the limitation, confirmed it is a current restriction in the ordinance, and noted that the Clerk's Office's formal recommendation to the board specifically includes a request to remove or revise the age restriction while maintaining an income eligibility component. Ms. Sparks stated that this would be up to the board to address through a future ordinance recommendation.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Parks and Recreation Department Capital Projects

Update on Prior Year (2025 CBO) Funded Projects

Angel Ferrara, Director of Parks and Recreation Department, provided the following status updates on projects previously funded through 2025 Community Benefit Ordinance dollars:

1. Shawnee Park Basketball Courts:

- Total project cost: approximately $368,000
- CBO dollars allocated: $255,000
- Department contribution: approximately $113,000 (used for sidewalk improvements and completion of the full project scope)

- Status: Approximately two to three weeks from completion as of the date of this meeting; anticipated completion by end of July 2026.

2. Security Camera Installation:

- CBO dollars allocated**:** $65,000
- Locations: Wyandotte County Lake (Shelter 10, Shelter 7, Boat Ramp, Marina area, and Sheriff's Park Services area); also scoped for St. John's Park and the John Brown statue.
- Status: Cameras are mostly installed; IT is actively working on connectivity and configuration. St. John's Park and John Brown statue locations are still pending installation.

Proposed Projects for 2026 CBO Funding

Project 1: Welborn Park Sport Court Renovation

- **Location:** Welborn Park, 2504 North 55th Street
- **Description:** Removal of two deteriorated existing tennis courts and replacement with two new multi-use sport courts. Community survey conducted in April and May 2026 indicated interest prioritized as follows: (1) Basketball, (2) Volleyball and Pickleball, (3) Sepak Takraw (a sport similar to volleyball in which players use their feet, popular in several Asian communities).
- **Approach:** Construction using post-tensioned concrete surfacing for long-term durability. Contractors to be consulted on maximizing multi-use configurations.
- **Estimated Cost:** $475,000

Project 2: Klamm Park Playground Replacement

- **Location:** Klamm Park, 2515 North 27th Street
- **Description:** Full replacement of an existing end-of-life playground (approximately 3,100 square feet). Portions of existing equipment have already been boarded up due to inability to source replacement parts. Surfacing to be converted from engineered wood fiber (EWF/wood chips) to turf or pour-in-play to achieve a more inclusive, accessible surface consistent with current department standards.
- **Estimated Cost:** $275,000

Ms. Ferrara noted that eligible expenditures under the Parks and Recreation section of the CBO are limited to capital improvements and equipment purchases — no programming expenses are eligible.

Ms. Pujol Burch asked where the 2025-funded cameras were installed. Ms. Ferrara confirmed the cameras are at Wyandotte County Lake (Shelter 10, Shelter 7, Boat Ramp, Marina, and Sheriff's Park Services area), with St. John's Park and the John Brown statue still pending.

Ms. Pujol Burch shared research she had conducted comparing recreational facility types and their costs and capacity:

- Pickleball courts: approximately $20,000–$30,000 per new court.
- Basketball courts: relatively expensive.
- Gaga Ball pits: lower cost, cited as popular among youth (referenced an Eagle Scout project at the Argentine Community Center that fulfilled a Gaga Ball pit request).
- Basketball: 10–20 players; Tennis: 2–4 players; Gaga Ball: 15–30 participants.

Ms. Pujol Burch suggested the board consider alternatives that provide more community benefit per dollar spent. Ms. Ferrara acknowledged the feedback, confirmed that Sepak Takraw is genuinely popular in several parks and in Asian communities, and indicated willingness to research the Gaga Ball pit option. Ms. Ferrara noted that surfacing type significantly affects court costs, and that post-tensioned concrete has a longer lifespan than asphalt, making it a more cost-effective long-term investment.

Dr. Brown noted that both proposed project parks are in her district and asked two questions regarding Welborn Park:

1. Whether fencing exists or would be added to separate the park from the adjacent housing unit along the Parallel, noting that a past incident had occurred due to that proximity.
2. Whether improvements to the existing walking trail were included in the proposal, given the significant senior population in the area.

Ms. Ferrara responded:

- Fencing: She would need to verify existing fencing status and noted that the current proposal does not include fencing.
- Walking Trail: The trail was resurfaced approximately three years ago and is being maintained; no walking trail improvements are included in the current proposal.
- Ms. Ferrara committed to following up on the fencing matter.

Ms. Cole read from Ordinance 37, which states that the distribution of community benefit funds shall include distressed areas identified as Qualified Census Tracts (QCT) as defined by HUD. Ms. Cole asked whether either proposed park project is located within a HUD-designated qualified census tract. Ms. Ferrara stated she believes both are, noting that the department has met similar census tract requirements when pursuing CDBG and other grant funding, but committed to verifying and confirming.

Action Item: Angel Ferrara to verify and confirm that Welborn Park and Klamm Park fall within HUD-designated Qualified Census Tracts and report back to the board.

Ms. McLaughlin asked a three-part question:

1. Which projects address safety factors?
2. Which projects cover the largest population of affected citizens?
3. Which project areas would become defunct if not funded?

Ms. Ferrara responded:

- **Safety:** Both projects appear on the department's priority list due to deferred maintenance. The Klamm Park playground equipment has required partial closure and boarding-up; continued inability to source parts may lead to full closure. Sport courts that have not received investment have similarly become unusable.
- **Largest population served:** Ms. Ferrara stated this is difficult to precisely quantify but noted the department typically measures park impact using a half-mile radius population standard. She committed to providing that data for both Klamm Park and Welborn Park, as it had been assembled for recent grant applications.
- **Defunct if not funded:** Both projects are on the department's deferred maintenance list and would ultimately receive funding through the department's capital program if CBO funds are not awarded, but the timeline would be uncertain.

Ms. Ferrara also noted that the department is exploring cell phone location data software to better track park visitor volume; she indicated that Klamm Park visitor rates increased measurably following the tennis and pickleball court improvements there.

Action Item: Angel Ferrara to provide half-mile radius population data for Welborn Park and Klamm Park to the board prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Pujol Burch asked how the department determines which projects to submit to which funding opportunities, including CBO, CDBG, and others. Ms. Ferrara explained that the department maintains a prioritized capital project list. Projects are matched to funding opportunities based on eligibility and available funding levels. She noted that the CBO fund, given its size relative to the department's overall capital needs, is considered a supplemental resource that the department tries to right-size project proposals for accordingly.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Upper Story Housing Development Reimbursement Fund (Community Development)

Program Overview

Kay Sharp, Director of Community Development, presented on the Upper Story Housing Development Reimbursement Fund, administered by the Community Development Department.

Ms. Sharp acknowledged that there has been some confusion about this program's scope and administration, particularly regarding childcare.

Clarification on Childcare: Ms. Sharp clarified that while the ordinance as written includes both childcare enhancement and upper story housing development under Community Development, the department's CDBG-funded childcare enhancement program is robust and sufficiently funded through federal HUD dollars. Therefore, no CBO ordinance funds will be allocated toward childcare by this department. The childcare program has been operating for approximately one year under CDBG funding.

Upper Story Housing Development Reimbursement Fund:

- Allocated amount: $40,000, of which up to 10% ($4,000) may be retained for administrative costs, leaving approximately $36,000 for program awards.
- **Program purpose:** To reimburse business owners for the cost of converting unused upper-story space in commercial buildings into livable rental units, to increase the supply of affordable rental housing.
- **Reimbursement structure:** This is a reimbursement program — business owners must incur and pay for renovation costs first, then apply for reimbursement after the work is completed. The ordinance was written this way.
- **Tenant requirements:** The completed upper-story unit must be rented to a tenant at low-to-moderate income, HUD-eligible rates for a minimum of two years. The business owner/applicant cannot occupy the unit themselves.
- **Policy and Procedure Manual:** Community Development has drafted a policy and procedure manual for the program.

Ms. Sharp presented the board with several significant operational concerns rather than a simple proposal, and sought board guidance on how to structure the program:

1. **Insufficient funding for most projects:** Renovation costs for even a single system (e.g., a flat roof on a commercial building) can range from $40,000 to $70,000, which would exhaust the entire fund for one project — or exceed it entirely.
2. **Reimbursement model creates a barrier for low-income business owners:** Business owners in low-income or distressed commercial areas are unlikely to have $36,000–$40,000 available to spend upfront while awaiting reimbursement. This structural limitation was identified as a significant access barrier.
3. **Risk of partial funding without project completion:** Ms. Sharp expressed concern about funding one component of a larger renovation (e.g., electrical work) without assurance that the entire project will be completed, as this could result in funds being expended without the program achieving its intended outcome (a fully habitable rental unit).

Ms. Sharp recommended that the board consider structuring the program to award one grant per year for the full available amount, applied to a project that can be substantially completed within that funding level. She stated a preference for funding one completed project over distributing partial grants across multiple projects that may never reach completion.

Ms. Sharp indicated that she was seeking board guidance on these structural questions before advertising the program, as she did not wish to raise community expectations the program could not meet.

Mary Dorr asked whether there are already interested applicants. Ms. Sharp stated that no applicants have been solicited because the program has not yet been advertised, pending resolution of the structural questions she outlined. She anticipated that once advertised, there would be interest, but confirmed the fund would only be able to serve one, possibly two business owners per year at current funding levels.

Ms. Dorr also asked whether business owners who complete the renovation would receive rental income from the unit. Ms. Sharp confirmed yes — the business owner would rent the unit to a qualifying tenant and would collect rent income, but cannot occupy the unit themselves.

Ms. Pujol Burch asked whether business owners could also access HOME funds for this type of project. Ms. Sharp explained that HOME funds are for residential development and that this program involves a commercial property owner, which does not qualify under HOME program rules even though the end product is a residential unit above a commercial space.

Ms. Pujol Burch asked whether the business owner would have no financial investment of their own. Ms. Sharp clarified that her concern is the inverse — she does not want the CBO fund to be the sole investor in an incomplete project. She stated that ideally, a business owner would complete the bulk of necessary repairs with their own resources, and CBO funds would assist in reaching the finish line. She emphasized the importance of the business owner having "skin in the game."

Ms. Pujol Burch noted that the property value of the business owner's building would increase as a result of the renovation, and that the scope of the project results in housing for a relatively small number of people (one unit, one family). Ms. Sharp confirmed that upper-story projects would typically produce one residential unit per project.

Alfred Gutierrez asked whether this program was for childcare purposes. Ms. Sharp confirmed it is not — the program is specifically and exclusively for second-story/upper-story housing development. Childcare is handled separately under the CDBG program.

Ms. McLaughlin asked what safeguards exist to prevent predatory landlords from exploiting the program for general property repairs. Ms. Sharp responded that given the program's scale (one grant per year, approximately $36,000), the department would be in a position to thoroughly vet each applicant, including reviewing whether the applicant owns other rental properties. She also clarified that the program is intended for owner-operators of retail or service businesses (e.g., art studios, restaurants) who wish to create supplemental income through a rental unit above their business — not for individuals already operating in the rental property business. The nature of the commercial storefront requirement acts as a structural safeguard.

Ms. Sharp identified the following items requiring board guidance, to be addressed at the next meeting:

- Whether to award one grant per year or allow partial project funding.
- How to address the reimbursement-model barrier given the income profile of likely applicants.
- Whether to recommend any changes to the ordinance structure.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Available Funding Balance / Financial Summary

Dr. Brown provided the board with the current available Community Benefit fund balance as of the date of the meeting:

Total Available Fund Balance: $372,897.36

Dr. Brown noted that the board would use this amount as the basis for funding discussions and allocation decisions at the next meeting.

Financial Summary Table — Proposals Received

Program / Proposal	**Requesting Department**	**Requested Amount**
Kansas City Homes for Generations Program	UG Clerk's Office (Monica Sparks)	**$90,000**
Welborn Park Sport Court Renovation	Parks and Recreation (Angel Ferrara)	**$475,000**
Klamm Park Playground Replacement	Parks and Recreation (Angel Ferrara)	**$275,000**
Upper Story Housing Development Reimbursement Fund	Community Development (Kay Sharp)	**$40,000** (as allocated)
Total Available Fund Balance		**$372,897.36**

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Brown offered the following closing remarks and announcements:

1. **Next Meeting Purpose:** The next meeting will be dedicated to discussion and deliberation regarding the allocation of Community Benefit funds across the three program areas. Dr. Brown noted that the committee's goal is to make a formal funding recommendation.
2. **Questions Submitted but Not Fully Addressed:** Dr. Brown invited board members with outstanding questions to submit them to her or to Lisa (recording secretary) so that answers could be researched and provided before or at the next meeting.
3. **Ordinance Limitations:** Dr. Brown acknowledged that several challenges raised by presenters — including age restrictions in the Homes for Generations Program and the reimbursement model in the Upper Story Housing fund — are written into the current ordinance. Dr. Brown stated she intended to consult with Kay Sharp and Commissioner Davis regarding potential ordinance revisions. She noted the board will have an opportunity to recommend changes following this cycle's funding recommendations.
4. **Meeting Duration:** Dr. Brown requested that the next meeting be scheduled for one and a half hours rather than one hour, to allow adequate time for discussion and deliberation. She asked Lisa to coordinate scheduling accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair declared the meeting adjourned. Time of Adjournment: 1:12 PM (CDT)

Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August 18, 2026 at 2:30-4:00 PM