

**NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
Monday, December 7, 2015**

The meeting of the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee was held on Monday, December 7, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Walker, Chairman; Commissioners McKiernan, Townsend, Murguia, and Walters. The following officials were also in attendance: Joe Connor, Assistant County Administrator; Melissa Mundt, Assistant County Administrator; Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Ken Moore, Chief Legal Counsel; Angie Masloski, Public Safety Business Office; and Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager.

Chairman Walker called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and members were present as shown above.

Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 – 15245...DISTRIBUTION: 2016 SPECIAL DRUG AND ALCOHOL TAX FUNDS

Synopsis: Recommendation of the Alcohol and Drug Fund Advisory Committee to disburse 2016 Special Drug and Alcohol Tax funds to the following agencies, submitted by Angie Masloski, Public Safety Business Office.

- Associated Youth Services: \$127,536 (flat funding)
- Friends of Yates: \$73,474 (increase of \$2,558)
- Mirror, Inc.: \$48,490 (decrease of \$2,558)

Angie Masloski, Public Safety Business Office, said each year the Unified Government receives state money on taxes that are due to mix drinks that are served and one-third of those funds go the General Fund, one-third goes to Parks and Recreation, and the remaining one-third is split between Community Corrections and then \$249,500 is issued to community organizations for grant funds for prevention, education, intervention and treatment of drug and alcohol abuse.

For the 2016 grant funds there were three applications. The first one was Associated Youth Services. They requested \$135,669 and the Advisory Board is recommending that they receive flat funding from their 2015 down to \$127,536.

The second was Friends of Yates. They requested \$88,474. The Advisory Board is recommending \$73,474 for their funding which is an increase of \$2,557.

Then Mirror Inc. requested \$70,523. The Advisory Board is recommending that they be funded \$48,490 which is a decrease of \$2,557.

Chairman Walker said, Ms. Masloski, I think last time I raised a couple of questions. Did you get answers? **Ms. Masloski** said I sent the Advisory Board a request that they attend tonight's meeting so they can advise you as to why they made the recommendation to increase funding for Friends of Yates and decrease the funding for Mirror Inc. Commissioner Townsend's representative Scott Robinson is here. **Chairman Walker** asked, Mr. Robinson, would you like to speak on this. **Mr. Robinson** said I will come forward.

Scott Robinson said I am a representative for Commissioner Townsend and I have been on the board approximately 2 ½ years now. Yes, I was one of the ones that voted that we decrease for certain people and increase for others. Is there a particular question you had in mind? **Chairman Walker** said no. I just wondered the reasoning for the particular amount of money what was behind that thought process? I noticed that one went up in the amount, the other one went down. It was an odd number. It wasn't a rounded figure and I thought well do they want to buy something for \$2,558 or was there any particular cost increase that one had and the other is bearing the—it just struck me as interesting. **Mr. Robinson** said part of what we did we had a long discussion about Mirror Inc. and they had a certain number of contracts for phones they were using as part of their treatment process. It was a fairly new concept that's being used throughout the state of Kansas. We bought \$10,000 worth and that should have been 100. They used 23 of them and they did not use those until the last quarter of the fiscal year. So we saw no reason to give them more money when they had not used what they already had. Of the ones that were left they still could use those repeatedly because some of the clients gave them back. We decreased their request because we didn't feel that it had been used properly nor do we feel that it was the best investment of our money going forward. We used that money then and split it

between other programs. We were a little bit dismayed also with the fact that Friends of Yates we've noted there had been an increase in violence and the number of people served. Therefore, we used some of that increase to supplement their request and then what was leftover; again, we left with the other third member.

Chairman Walker asked does any member of the committee have any questions.

Commissioner Townsend said, Mr. Robinson, I would like to thank you for your work and the rest of the committee for going over these applications and being very analytical in your approach about how this is done. Just a general question, how much money this year did we have totally to allocate and was all of this allocated? **Ms. Masloski** said the past approximately five years it's been \$249,500. **Commissioner Townsend** asked we didn't allocate all of that to these three groups. **Ms. Masloski** said yes. **Commissioner Townsend** said we did.

Chairman Walker said I'm curious, I was under the impression that in our community there are a number of groups besides these three that do drug related work in some fashion. In the process for the application process were other groups reached out to? **Ms. Masloski** said yes. I have a list that I received from the Department of Children and Families that they sent to me with different vendors in the community who serve Wyandotte County and Purchasing did send information to each one of those agencies. **Chairman Walker** said we can only reach out to them. If they choose not to apply—**Ms. Masloski** said the other thing is that in 2014 the Advisory Board did meet and revamp the Request for Proposal and was more specific about what they were looking for in agencies. They had a certain age group that they wanted to focus on. We had somebody come in and present to us on risk factors and who are most likely at-risk, the age groups which was 13 to 25. Those were the groups we were working on or that are the demographic that we were looking at trying to target. Associated Youth Services, they specifically deal with youth up to 18, Friends of Yates deals with women and their children in the shelter and Mirror Inc. deals with anybody who has a drug or alcohol problem; adult that has drug or alcohol problems. **Chairman Walker** said we have at various times, various commissioners, some sitting here; have raised the issue of a general need to discuss the various committees and commissions that we have. I did receive a phone call from the Chairman,

December 7, 2015

Marian Augustus, today who spoke at some length. She has some personal issues that prevented her from being here tonight because she did want to speak on it. In general, how has the committee, and this could be to you Mr. Robinson, how has the committee's attendance and performance worked out? I know this one is not a committee that meets every month. Are the appointees showing up for the meetings? **Ms. Masloski** said no. This year we did not have a quorum at the first or the second meeting. A lot of the issue is not all of the commissioners have appointments and I know one person was sick, but the main problem is the majority—a lot of the commissioners do not have appointments on this committee. In reading the ordinance state statute does not require that the Unified Government have a Drug & Alcohol Advisory Board. The UG has an ordinance itself that requires the Drug & Alcohol Advisory Board and it also requires that each of the commissioner's representatives have some type of experience and education in drug and alcohol abuse. It's very hard to find that specification and, quite honestly, Mr. Robinson here is one of the only ones who has some type of educational background with substance abuse, education and prevention and treatment. **Chairman Walker** said it is difficult to find people willing to serve on all of these committees and while many will accept, then making the meeting every time proves it challenging. **Ms. Masloski** said I understand.

Commissioner Murguia said if we're not getting a quorum—**Ms. Masloski** said there is no quorum required. This is just an advisory board that makes the recommendations for the funding. Now, state statute does require that if the advisory board brings a recommendation in front of the commissioners, the commissioners either have to unanimously approve the recommendation or unanimously disapprove it. It has to be unanimous. **Commissioner Murguia** asked so anything in the middle what happens. **Ms. Masloski** said it would have to be unanimous to not accept the recommendation from the board. **Ms. Masloski** said to not accept, I apologize. **Commissioner Murguia** said so if one commissioner decides that they're not in favor of this, then what happens? **Ms. Masloski** said it gets funded as it is recommended.

Commissioner Murguia asked isn't there a committee that was supposed to work on appointments that was supposed to figure out a new procedure around that. **Ms. Masloski** said I met with Emerick—**Commissioner Murguia** said not just exclusive to this committee. **Ms. Masloski** said no, I know. I was just letting you know I did meet with Emerick and Commissioners Walters and Markley. **Commissioner Murguia** asked how hard is it to just make a policy that if your appointment doesn't show up for X number of meetings—if there are

12 meetings a year and they don't show up to three or more, that a letter is sent—**Ms. Masloski** said we have two meetings a year. **Commissioner Murguia** asked will the commissioner be notified. **Ms. Masloski** said I have not notified in the past. Before last year I never really had an issue with people not showing up. Last year was the first year that I think at the second meeting a couple of people didn't show up, but this was truly the first year where I did not have almost all the commissioners represented. **Commissioner Murguia** said if it's mine, which I don't know if it is, but if it is an appointment for me and I can only speak for—if my people that I appoint to committee's are not showing up, then I need to know so I can appoint someone else and tell them if they're not going to go and it's not that difficult. I know there are less than 20 appointments and I'm sure I can find 20 out of 20,000 people in my district that will show up so if you would just let me know, I would be more than happy to appoint someone else. **Ms. Masloski** said okay. **Chairman Walker** said the only echo to that is that I have been—I really think we need a, and again, this happens to be the committee we're looking at right now and it's not directed at this committee in particular in my thought process, but we have a number of committees that in part I think it is our responsibility to task them with something meaningful to do rather than just to meet and talk. I could identify them. I'm not going to but there are at least two in particular that I feel should have had a role in some recent issues that were brought before the Commission for consideration and were not even consulted. I think that the committee structure to have value, number one they have to have a purpose and that purpose has to have something meaningful to do and this is meaningful work in my estimation. I'm grateful for the people that did participate and make these recommendations. I've got several committees that I think could do meaningful work, but they lack a focus either from the Commission or themselves perhaps and I think it's our responsibility. We create these committees and if we're not going to do anything meaningful, then I shouldn't spend hours of my time asking people to be on committees and unfortunately I get more no's than I do yes's because people just don't want to do it, but if there is something meaningful that they feel like they're doing and there is real work, then I think that helps attract people to the process. I hope the message goes back to the Mayor or his representative, I assume someone is here from the Mayor's office. At some point we need to have some kind of discussion on committee's and committee's alone and if there are ones that are not needed any longer, get rid of them and if there are those that are underworked or have no work but could be meaningful, we need to decide what role we want them to play.

December 7, 2015

Action: Commissioner Walters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Townsend, to approve the recommendation. Roll call was taken and there were five “Ayes,” Walters, Murguia, Townsend, McKiernan, Walker.

Item No. 2 – 15249...GRANT: 2016 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT (VAWA)

Synopsis: Request to apply for VAWA funding in the amount of \$76,618 for partial salaries and travel with a match of \$25,313, submitted by Angie Masloski, PSBO. The match is the remaining salaries of Ms. Meyer and Ms. Thomas as well as their travel expenses to the Annual Governor's Conference on Domestic Violence.

Chairman Walker said this is a request, I assume, to reapply for the state program.

Angie Masloski said this year the Legal Department is requesting \$76,618 to assist in funding the Domestic Violence Prosecutor and the Victim Advocate. The match is \$25,313 and that is already in the budget for Vickie Meyer and Margaret Thomas.

Commissioner Townsend said the only question I have is in the way it was written. What is this with the match? Is the \$25,000 included in the \$76,000? **Ms. Masloski** said no. **Commissioner Townsend** said this is in addition to or—**Ms. Masloski** said its \$76,000 what we’re requesting for grant funding and then the match is \$25,313. The total grant itself, the total including the match, is \$101,931 and this does budget for the salary increases that will be coming. **Commissioner Townsend** said so that \$100,000 is the amount being requested. **Ms. Masloski** said its \$101,000, \$76,618 is what we’re requesting from the state and then we will match the \$25,000, 75/25 split.

Commissioner Murguia said so this grant we’re funding for domestic violence—**Ms. Masloski** it’s for the Domestic Violence Prosecutor and a Victim Advocate. This grant used to fund almost 100% of their salaries but as the economy went down they would only fund about 60% of the two employees. As the funding went down the Unified Government did pick up the funding

and so now it funds 75% of the 60% of their work. **Commissioner Murguia** asked is there a reason that they would not be applying for the same grant funding that's available for everyone else like the Casino Grant Funding or the—**Ms. Masloski** asked the Legal Department. **Commissioner Murguia** said yes; because we're calling it grant funding. I mean if we're funding a position like we fund a personnel position through the Unified Government why doesn't that just fall under Personnel in our annual budget? I mean if Mr. Bach, our Administrator, wants to take responsibility for funding personnel, then it should be under our Personnel budget and if we're giving out grant dollars, I'm unaware of any grant dollars we have to give away. Is this money coming from somewhere else? **Ms. Masloski** said from the state. **Commissioner Murguia** said so it is coming from the state and its state funding and it's just being passed through the Unified Government. **Ms. Masloski** said yes. **Commissioner Murguia** asked what are our options with that money; to go to domestic violence. **Ms. Masloski** said it goes to fund Vickie Meyer who is the prosecutor down on the second floor in Municipal Court for the domestic violence. We have a Domestic Violence Program in Municipal Court so she is the prosecutor and then we have one victim advocate. **Commissioner Murguia** asked does this grant money fund 100% of the—**Ms. Masloski** said no. **Commissioner Murguia** said that's what I thought you said. So we're funding what is no longer being funded by the state. **Ms. Masloski** said correct, I apologize. The Domestic Violence Prosecutor used to be able to be fully funded by this grant. **Commissioner Murguia** said I would propose this be part of budget discussions. This is not a grant in my opinion. If we're funding a personnel position for a program that's being offered that the Unified Government as a whole thinks is important, I don't know why it's not under Personnel and then we assume the financial responsibility for a Domestic Violence Program or if they want a grant and we decide we don't want to fund that, then they need to go through the grants that are available to everyone else.

Commissioner McKiernan said we do this with several other positions. We provide a local match for several positions but to your bigger point, where do we account for our local match. How do we account for that? Do we account for it through the Personnel Budget or do we account for it through another line and we don't know that here and so I think that point is well taken that we should see how we account for it and make sure that's consistent with our vision

and direction for this. Certainly this type of thing we do it with other positions pretty much across—I mean not many, but there are some across the organization.

Commissioner Murguia said so if I was to look up in our budget booklet to find this money, you said \$76,000 right—**Ms. Masloski** said \$76,000 yes. **Commissioner Murguia** said if I was to look for that in our budget book, where would I find that? **Ms. Masloski** said, commissioner, I would have to look that up for you and get back to you. **Commissioner Murguia** said I just think that's a problem and if it's happening with other positions, I think it's a problem. I have no problem with funding domestic violence, but then when we make that decision, we as a government, need to know that's coming from our General Fund budget and we're assuming responsibility for another salaried position or a contract position; however we want to structure that deal, but that's a personnel cost especially if it's going to be on an annual basis and in my mind it needs to be under the right category. We don't usually have grant funds that I'm aware of that the Unified Government can grant to other organizations or to other entities, but if we're paying personnel costs for the District Attorney's office—**Chairman Walker** said no, this is our Municipal Court. The District Attorney has a similar position that they get funding through the state for. **Commissioner Murguia** said it's just like in our budget where we say if Public Works comes to us and they're going to fund a road in our budget, if we get \$100,000 from the federal government and we're spending \$100,000 of our own money, you can tell that in the budget when it comes in and it's all under Infrastructure Improvement Projects.

Commissioner McKiernan said the first place I looked is just under our listing of grants so our grant inventory clearly delineates this through the Violence Against Women Act, it delineates the description of this funding with the amount that's anticipated in grant funding. What it doesn't show here on this line that I'm looking at is the local match that they're requiring but there are about 12 different positions that appear to be receiving at least some portion from grant funding. **Commissioner Murguia** said again I need to see all those details but just for tonight's purpose I mean I guess I would say if we're going to have ongoing funding to pay a salaried or a contract position, I just think it should fall under Personnel unless there is a grant fund that I'm unaware of that the Unified Government has because I'm only aware of two. One is through CDBG and the other is through a Casino Fund unless there is another one I'm missing. **Commissioner McKiernan** said this is where we get an external grant to supplement our own

internal money. **Commissioner Murguia** said but we don't have a grant set-aside of grant funds to give away to match other grants. Just like when Police wanted—it's not worth the discussion. We can have a special session or whatever. I'm just saying it's confusing when we tell the public we're grant funding a Domestic Violence position when we don't have grant funds available because there could be other people out there that provide domestic violence programming that may want to make an application for funding and that's not the case. We have some pass-through money from the state is what I hear her saying and we match it with some General Fund money which we for some reason are calling grant money.

Chairman Walker said obviously there are areas for clarification here at some future point for discussion and, Mr. Connor, you might note that for your internal office issues so that this can be addressed.

Action: **Commissioner McKiernan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Walters, to approve as presented.** Roll call was taken and there were five "Ayes," Walters, Murguia, Townsend, McKiernan, Walker.

Item No. 3 – 15270...COMMUNICATION: LAND BANK APPLICATIONS

Synopsis: Request approval of the following applications, submitted by Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager. The Land Bank Board of Trustees has recommended approval

Land Bank Applications

*407 Cleveland Ave. - Trinity AME, development

*415 Greeley Ave. - Trinity AME, development

*419 Greeley Ave. - Trinity AME, development

*416 Quindaro Blvd. - Trinity AME, development

*428 Quindaro Blvd. - Trinity AME, development

2113 Pacific Ave. - Dean Zagorts, development

2029 Homer Ave. - Dean Zagorts, development

December 7, 2015

2211 Homer Ave. - Dean Zagorts, development

2024 Quindaro Blvd. - Ronald Smith, yard extension

2102 N. 30th St. - Mustaffa Muhammad, property maintenance

3120 N. 23rd St. - Vance Reynolds, future development

1621 S. Early Dr. - Tyler Curry, future development

* Brought back from September 14, 2015 NCD Standing Committee

Transfers to Land Bank

2113 Pacific Ave. from Board of County Commissioners

2211 Homer Ave. from Board of County Commissioners

(Part of land assemblage for Dean Zagorts.)

Commissioner McKiernan said could I ask Mr. Slaughter a question before he presents these? **Chairman Walker** said certainly. **Commissioner McKiernan** said the reason I preempt is that I see that a lot of the majority of the uses here proposed for these property tonight are development and this is a topic that Commissioner Walker has brought up now for the past couple meetings about us transferring Land Bank properties for some as yet future or unspecified development. Commissioner Walker's comments have really prompted me to think a lot about this and I just wanted to see if I could start a general discussion here that may or may not get resolved tonight, but about whether or not we should chose to transfer properties by sale from our Land Bank to an individual or an entity for a development that is as yet undescribed, potentially unfunded, has not made clear to us. I know that Commissioner Walker had suggested that maybe we should provide a timeframe in which someone who purchases above X number of properties and labels it as for future development would come back to us and articulate what that development is going to be or that we get a set timeframe and if we don't have a picture of the development within that set timeframe, then we revert those properties back to the Land Bank.

December 7, 2015

One of the things that Commissioner Walker got me to thinking about is we could potentially have a large number of properties, and there is almost no way for me—I don't want to cast dispersions on anybody who is here tonight, because I'm not saying that this could or would happen with any of our current applicants, but the number of properties here has just gotten me to think about this. What happens if in a couple of years there has been no movement and the development is still not funded and it's still not planned, what happens if that person who purchased all these lots decides that it's not really worth it to mess with them anymore and they are just going to walk away? Aren't we ultimately going to end up taking those properties back and we will have to expend time and resources to recover those properties back into the Land Bank? One of the things I was thinking about was right now we have holed areas that we have developed within the Unified Government where we will hold Land Bank properties for a particular person or organization in anticipation of some future development. Would it make sense for us just to when someone comes forward with a proposed development to create another hold area and maybe put in place the same sorts of stipulations that we have on our other areas which is if somebody else comes along with a funded and well-articulated plan, the original holder gets the right of first refusal. They get a chance to do something with it. We don't take it out from under them without giving them an opportunity, but we also don't lock up that land forever, a bird in a hand and two in the bush here, when we might have a better development come along. Those are just some of the thoughts and bless your heart, Mr. Slaughter, you have tried for the five years that I've been here to start this conversation about not waiting for someone from the community to come look at our Land Bank inventory and go gosh I see some development there, but for us to turn that on its head and instead through your efforts and our Economic Development office and our Planning office that we look at our assets currently in our Land Bank and we drive what sort of development might occur on those assets and we engage a developer rather than waiting for someone to walk in and go I have a great idea. I just wanted to throw that out for my fellow members of the committee. It just seems to me that we should think about these proposed future developments in the same way we've already thought about our current hold areas which are mostly for residential development down the road and now we might be talking commercial development. It seems it would be smarter for us just to maintain control of those properties, hold them for a specific person, company or purpose; but still have them in the event that whatever was planned did not ultimately go through.

December 7, 2015

I wanted to throw that out because I would see that we might ask Mr. Slaughter to take these rambling ideas that I just laid out there and maybe go back and graft something in terms of policy for the Land Bank that he could bring back to us.

Chairman Walker said I would echo that I have concerns that you know I've heard the statement made that well when people acquire these properties at least they're paying taxes on them. I haven't had that verified that they continue to pay taxes. I'm giving everyone the benefit of the doubt that they pay the taxes, but it would not be the first time in Wyandotte County history where land is acquired at a tax sale and held for whatever the bid price was and no taxes were ever paid on it and it was just—I could identify several people from long ago that it was nothing more than speculation in the hopes that someone would need a piece of property for a right-of-way or a road improvement or perhaps even a new economic development incentive. Every three, five or seven years they would lose the land in the tax sale. We've done some things to stop that in terms of being able to bid back on the property that's in foreclosure but when you add up most of the properties that we're selling and that are being acquired for future development the tax difference we're getting on those properties is virtually not even a drop in the bucket. It's certainly not making our budget for us by selling these unwanted or unloved properties. I think we have to examine at some point you know you can only have so many side yards or gardens and we've had people who have used that I don't know how many times. I only have four sides to my house so I could only acquire four pieces of property. I think there is merit in a critical examination of—I'm all for it if you've got a real economic development plan and you're going to do something with these properties, I will do everything I can to help anybody get the property they need to make it happen because that's what we want. At the same time I don't want to give up control of property that would prohibit me from bringing in an economic development project to an area knowing I've got to acquire 70 pieces of property that I have already owned and disposed of. I think there has to be a point of which you put your cards on the table and say this is what I'm doing with this property and we've got a half dozen, maybe ten of those, that I've noticed over my short tenure here that are acquiring property and I'm all for them but I want to see your cards here one of these days.

Commissioner Townsend said I agree with what you said earlier, Commissioner Walker, a couple meetings ago about individuals who may have acquired I think we just said an arbitrary number and once you hit that sixth piece of property to explain either in more detail the applications or come before us. I know that since I've been on this Commission it appears this group has expressed an interest of getting properties out of the Land Bank into willing buyers and people in the neighborhood who will take care of it and make it look better and sometimes it's no more simple than that. I agree that after a certain point if we want to extend an invitation before moving on the application for people to come in if they have not already made it clear in their application what their intentions are. I see benefit in that.

I'm not sure I follow Commissioner McKiernan's idea about the hold though and waiting on somebody else. I don't know. I would have to hear that one again.

Commissioner McKiernan said, for example, somebody came forward and said I have a vision and it's going to require some land in this particular geographic area and let's say that a lot of that land, maybe a majority of that land is currently in the Land Bank owned by us and controlled by us, we would say to the potential developer we appreciate your vision and in anticipation of your potential development we will mark these properties in the Land Bank as held for X, Y, Z development. When you come back with the proposal to make that development move forward we can make an agreement with you to release those properties at whatever the price would be for those properties to you to facilitate making that development go forward. If you never come back, you say I've got a great idea and we hold these 70 properties for you and you never come back and you never flush out your idea, you never get your funding, you never have a plan; then we don't have to go and get back those 70 properties that we sold to you because we never sold them. We simply mark them as designated for you for somewhere in the future and before you come back with your plan if somebody else comes in and says I not only have the plan I have the financing and I have everything else, then we will come to you and say we have someone else who has a plan for this and you have X amount of time to come up with a counter proposal of whatever it might be.

I just think that we run the risk and, Commissioner Walker again, has articulated this two meetings in a roll; we run the risk of giving up control of large tracks of land for developments

that have yet to be specified and that may never happen and that we may ultimately go and have to get back all of those properties.

Chairman Walker said add to that the problem that we used to be able if we had a development like the Legend's which would be an extreme kind of example, but we could acquire the property by condemnation. Now we can only acquire it for a true public purpose, schools, bridges, roads, sewer, etc. It would require us to go to the legislature and get an act, a bill, passed and signed by the governor that gave us public condemnation authority for taking property from one person for a business to be developed. A factory, say for example, or a big commercial center or whatever office building, whatever it might be; I don't know that anyone has tried that in Topeka since that bill was passed and given my sense about the general feeling of condemnation of ones land for the purpose of giving it to somebody else to make money by the current legislature, I think that's not going to be an easy process. I could be wrong. If it was a big enough deal and the state had a piece of it, it would probably be a lot easier but I'm just simply—we've asked the question and we're really not going to decide that here tonight, but it is something that needs to be addressed in the near term.

I think as a committee at least we, Brian and I, think there is merit in looking at is this a good thing we're doing and if it is, keep doing it. If it's not, maybe we need to modify how we do this to make sure on the backside that if we have an opportunity that we're not hamstrung from moving on that by landowners having acquired property from us and now we've got to pay them an enormous profit to get the land.

Commissioner McKiernan said I guess my question, would it be acceptable to the committee that we would ask Mr. Slaughter to get together with at least Mr. Brajkovic and Mr. Richardson and assess whether or not this idea of a hold area that I've put out has any merit to see if there are inherit flaws in that strategy and basically to come up with their recommendations from a Land Bank, from an Economic Development, and from a City Planning perspective as to the best to move forward and turn our current Land Bank properties into future taxpaying development.

Commissioner Townsend said I don't have any objection to that being looked at. The question I have was how many times have we had the situation that you talked about where someone bought property and did not go forward with the development and then for some reason we got it

back or tried to get it back. Have we really had that situation come up on any big scale? **Chairman Walker** asked in what length of time. I happen to know an individual who is now deceased and bought hundreds of pieces of property and never paid a dime of tax on any of them except his own personal residence and never maintained them, never cut the grass and evidentially in addition to fighting code he eventually had them take them back away from him and it was just pure speculation. The speculator is the one that I am not—**Commissioner Murguia** said sorry, not to interrupt, but I think at least the way I interrupt the question is how many times has that gotten in the way of a development? **Chairman Walker** said sometimes you would be proactive to prevent it from doing that. I'm not saying that it's a major problem; I'm just simply saying we need to look at it. **Commissioner Townsend** said I don't have any objection to having it looked at. I guess that would be the process of having it looked at we could look at all of these issues. I just hope it won't be a deterrent to individuals or organizations that do have a legitimate desire, the funds and the wherewithal to move forward to do it, but I don't have any objection. **Chairman Walker** said those organizations I'll work with them 100%. **Commissioner McKiernan** said in this proposal of mine for old areas doesn't stand in the way at all. You come forward with the money and the plan and we make it happen. Mr. Slaughter, if you could from your perspective with at least Mr. Brajkovic and Mr. Richardson—**Commissioner Murguia** said I was just going to say if you're going to look at, I'm totally fine with you looking at it. I do agree with Commissioner Townsend. I've never seen somebody swoop up and take some land and even if they're tax delinquent and we want them to pay it, I've never seen a preventive development from moving forward.

This is what I would say. I would like to see the policy include one very specific thing. There is an advantage to a developer that pays property taxes whether that is for-profit or not-for-profit to have the Unified Government hold it for them because if we're holding it, then that potential developer doesn't have to pay property taxes. Do you see what I'm saying? That even goes for not-for-profits. I think the only people that don't pay property taxes are churches unless you have a special exemption. There is a benefit to that entity while they're planning we're reserving that land for them. They have first right of refusal, as Brian is saying, and they don't have any cost associated with that so I would like to see you add a piece that in order to make sure that they have, as I would say, skin in the game that they're required and they sign a maintenance agreement with you where they are going to mow the grass and keep it looking nice

in the meantime; it's the least they can do. **Commissioner McKiernan** said I love that idea. **Commissioner Murguia** said I would just add that little tiny piece.

Chairman Walker said, Mr. Slaughter, you have in front of us a list of properties, applications and Commissioner Townsend you contacted me. **Commissioner Townsend** said the first five, the applications from Trinity; they and one of the neighborhood groups, Oak Grove, are still in the process of meeting and so they would like that deferred until sometime in the new year. **Chairman Walker** said so you would like those five properties pulled. **Commissioner Townsend** said yes. **Chairman Walker** asked is there any objection from any of the commissioners. (There were none) **Chairman Walker** said those properties will be pulled and why don't we set that for the February meeting and at that point if there is no agreement, we will decide. Fair enough? **Commissioner Townsend** said I think so.

Chairman Walker said we have a list of properties I think that totals seven remaining. **Chris Slaughter, Land Bank Manager**, said I do want to add in talking to Mr. Zagorts today we are going to ask that 2211 Homer Ave. also be removed. That may come up in the future, but for this round we don't need to include it. **Chairman Walker** said we're now down to six. Does anybody have any questions regarding any of these properties or their applications?

Action: **Commissioner Murguia made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McKiernan, to approve the six remaining.** Roll call was taken and there were five "Ayes," Walters, Murguia, Townsend, McKiernan, Walker.

Mr. Slaughter said we have a transfer. We had two but since we're taking 2211 Homer Ave. out, we will just have the request for 2113 Pacific go from the Board of County Commissioners to the Land Bank.

Action: **Commissioner Walters made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Murguia, to approve.** Roll call was taken and there were five "Ayes," Walters, Murguia, Townsend, McKiernan, Walker.

Adjourn

Chairman Walker adjourned the meeting at 5:53 p.m.

dt

December 7, 2015