

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

SPECIAL COMMISSION MEETING, MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2020

The Unified Government Commission of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, met in a Special Commission Meeting, Monday, August 10, 2020, with eleven members present on ZOOM or by phone. Bynum, Commissioner At-Large First District; Burroughs, Commissioner At-Large Second District; Townsend, Commissioner First District; McKiernan, Commissioner Second District; Ramirez, Commissioner Third District; Johnson, Commissioner Fourth District; Kane, Commissioner Fifth District; Markley, Commissioner Sixth District; Walters, Commissioner Seventh District; Philbrook, Commissioner Eighth District; and Alvey, Mayor/CEO, presiding. The following officials were also in attendance: Doug Bach, County Administrator; Ken Moore, Chief Legal Counsel; Bridgette Cobbins, Unified Government Clerk; Gordon Criswell, Emerick Cross, and Alan Howze, Assistant County Administrators. Persons attending from the CARES Act Team: Commissioner Bynum, Commissioner Philbrook, Crystal Sprague, and James Bain.

MAYOR ALVEY said before I call the meeting to order, I want to announce that due to COVID-19, commissioners, staff and the public are attending remotely via ZOOM or by phone. All participants joining by phone should mute their phones when not speaking to avoid background noise. During the meeting, please make sure that you announce yourself by name and title every time you speak so that the public that is observing knows who is speaking. This is critical given the number of remote participants in his current guidance from the Kansas Attorney General.

MAYOR ALVEY called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL: Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Johnson, Kane, Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Bynum, Alvey.

NOTICE OF SPECIAL COMMISSION MEETING of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, to be held Monday, August 10, 2020, at 7:00 p.m., regarding CARES

Act funding. Due to COVID-19, the public will be able to observe or listen to the meeting live on YouTube or UGTV; or through ZOOM.

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

Mayor Alvey asked are there any revisions to tonight's Special Meeting. **Bridgette Cobbins, County Clerk**, said yes Mayor. A blue sheet was distributed on Friday and in that blue sheet it provided additional information regarding the CARES Act funding, the submissions for the Municipalities resolution, Educational resolution, and a Non-Profit resolution. Also, Mayor, a clarification was sent out today and that clarification was in regard to the Non-Profit resolution, exhibit 1 and the change is limited to adjusting project descriptions to align them with the project name and does not adjust the allocations to any of the listed agencies.

Mayor Alvey said the only item tonight is the CARES Act funding. I would ask Commissioner Markley, Chair of the CARES Act subcommittee to make some opening remarks and to introduce staff.

Commissioner Markley said I want to say first thank you to the committee members and staff members who have worked on this. It has really been a marathon and a marathon where the course that we're running seem to change daily. This committee met almost daily for several weeks and several hours in each of those meetings. In addition, they did hours and hours of homework as every committee member reviewed every application afforded on a scoring metric. It was certainly a lot of work and everyone has been very dedicated. We had a great committee and I appreciate their work very much.

For some of us on the committee our work is nearly done, but I will recognize it for staff, the fun is just beginning as they will continue to track and monitor the allocations that we approve tonight. They will report back to my standing committee because this committee was formed out of that standing committee with additional members and they will be reporting to that standing

August 10, 2020

committee regularly. So, for commissioners and the public, if you're interested in seeing future updates on the CARES Act allocation tracking, those will come to the Administration & Human Services Standing Committee in the future and our committee members that are not members of that standing committee will get the packets for review.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to staff to do a presentation about our resolutions tonight.

Crystal Sprague, CARES Act Team Lead, said I'm going to share my screen with you so you will be able to see our presentation tonight.



First I want to say thank you so much to the committee and to staff who have just worked around the clock it seems like on massive amounts of information as I'm sure that you felt when you received your packets on Friday night.

Planning Committee Funding Priorities



2

We have had a tremendous amount of information that's been given to us and that we have been able to turn around and get out the door, but with that tremendous amount of information and in our haste to get them out to you Friday night for review, I would like to echo what the Clerk mentioned. We did have an adjustment to Exhibit 1 under the resolution for proposed funding for the allocations for the 501c3's. That amendment was to program descriptions as they did not align well with the program names. No discrepancies were found in the applicants scores, proposed allocations, or original funding request amounts. Late this afternoon we did send you an additional revised Exhibit 1B under the resolution for proposed funding allocations for Municipalities and Health Department.

Today we were able to isolate that we had three missing entry's from which the Planning Committee considered and made allocations for and those applications included Turner Vibrant Health, KVC Hospital, and an application for KU. Those were absent from the first round of documentation that you received on Friday. In addition, we would revise the recommendation for three applicants that were listed incorrectly on Exhibit 1B and not as the Planning Committee had adopted on Friday morning. That would be application 178, application 44, and application 68. There were some adjustments made during the meeting and adopted on Friday by the Planning Committee that were not reflected in your documentation that you received on Friday.

The record of the meeting was reviewed thoroughly to confirm that the Planning Committee actions on these exhibits were adjusted accordingly and any adjustments are notated on the revised exhibits. With that, I will get right to our presentation for today.

August 10, 2020

Just a reminder, that we did follow the Planning Committee's funding priorities which aligned with the State's SPARK Committee and Recovery Office Committee and those are listed here.

Funding Formula – Adopted 7.30.2020

CARES Funding Allocation Recommendation

	Amount	Health	CARES Team	Cities	County	Educational	501c3	Business	Total
Per resident x population	\$226	\$76.0	\$2.8	\$100.0	\$9.0	\$16.2	\$22.0	\$0.0	\$226.0
Total Phase I Allocation	\$37,330,934	33.6%	1.2%	44.2%	4.0%	7.2%	9.7%		100.0%
Subtotal		\$ 12,572,604	\$ 453,521	\$16,525,600	\$ 1,479,181	\$ 2,670,270	\$ 3,629,758		\$ 37,330,934

Jurisdiction	Population	Amount
Bonner Springs	7,804	\$ 780,400
Edwardsville	4,494	\$ 449,400
Kansas City Kansas	152,958	\$ 15,295,800
Wyandotte County	165,429	\$ 1,479,181

3

On July 30th we brought to you a funding allocation recommendation which you see before you and that funding allocation was adopted by the full Commission on July 30, 2020. If you can believe it, that's only been 10 days ago. Since that time, the municipalities, Government and Health Department have been frantically working at realigning their request to match this allotment as well as the Planning Committee, as Commissioner Markley said, has met several times. They scored more than 80 applications in a series of days and we're ready to present that information to you today.

As a reminder, anything that we submit to the Recovery Office has the final approval of the Governor's SPARK Task Force and Recovery Office. So, even if you see allocations or programs set forth today, we believe that we are putting forward our best belief that these would qualify for funding under the CARES Act, but the state holds the final decision.

August 10, 2020

By Direct Aid Application Category	Dept Request	Final Allocation
Adaptability, Variance, and Print postage/printing/digital advertising	\$555,000.00	\$555,000.00
Communications		
Recruiting Connectors and clients (print, mass media, social media, etc.)	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00
Community Organization and Advisory Committee stipends		
\$20,000 per host site organization + stipends for Community Advisory Board members	\$515,000.00	\$250,000.00
Contact Tracing		
Supplies and incentives for complying with isolation and quarantine	\$72,000.00	\$72,000.00
Contracted Staff		
90 Connectors, 10 Supervisors, 5 Project Managers, 1 Project Lead	\$4,970,000.00	\$2,712,888.00
Equipment & Technology		
Equipment for live streaming	\$11,362.00	\$11,362.00
Lab Processing		
Laboratory supplies and equipment	\$1,416,081.00	\$1,392,082.00
Mask Campaign		
Media and professional services	\$683,000.00	\$368,000.00
Media Broadcasting Room		
Design (Equipment & Consulting)	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00
Operating		
Shared by United Way of Greater Kansas City and Community Health Council of Wyandotte County	\$861,943.00	\$252,943.00
Personnel		
FT Social Media Outreach	\$425,000.00	\$77,084.00
Program Evaluation		
External evaluation conducted via an RFP process	\$200,000.00	\$0.00
Public Health Response Grants		
Safety net clinic	\$0.00	\$2,258,114.00
Staff		
Contractual Coordinators	\$1,406,100.00	\$1,382,100.00
Contractual staff (July-December)	\$581,508.00	\$484,590.00
Technology		
Laptops, surface pros, cell phones, Apricot software, etc.	\$351,840.00	\$252,840.00
Computer/Internet/Software	\$90,000.00	\$90,000.00
Testing		
Testing supplies and equipment	\$871,100.00	\$871,100.00
Testing Campaign		
Media and professional services	\$713,000.00	\$713,000.00
Testing materials		
Robust training for all Connectors and host sites	\$80,000.00	\$40,000.00
Travel		
Mileage for staff	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00
Vaccination Prep		
Flu Shot Vaccine and supplies	\$290,000.00	\$290,000.00
Grand Total	\$14,583,099.00	\$12,368,265.00

Wyandotte County Health Department Exhibit 1

Strengthen the Ability for Robust Public Health Responses

- Public Health Response Grants \$2,191,888
- Scaling of WYCO Connects Strategy based on timeline
- Focus on lab fees and testing capacity
- Balance for additional reimbursements for the end of July 2020

4

We'll get right into the first resolution and, commissioners, we will be going in resolution order today and exhibit order, so if you would like to follow along, this is the resolution adopting the funding for Municipalities and Health Departments.

You see before you an adjusted department request from the Health Department. This is a request that aligns with the allotment that they were given on July 30th. The Public Health Response Grants that were previously under 501c3's have been adjusted to fit underneath the Health Department in the amount of \$2.1M. We believe that scaling the WYCO Connects supported by the Health Department Administration, scaling the WYCO Connect Program to align with the required incurred by the December 30th deadline for the State Recovery Office allowed these additional public response grants to fit under the Health Department. We believe that's the best strategy based on the timeline and it will allow us to monitor those health interventions in a more realistic way. The Health Department requests for direct aid moving forward from August 1 to December 30th has a strong focus on lab fees and testing capacity.

August 10, 2020

Wyandotte County Health Department – Exhibit 1b



Strengthen the Ability for Robust Public Health Responses

- Applications fit best under the Public Health Goals
- Applications were scored by the Planning Committee
- Better ability to measure impacts under this goal
- Able to better spot areas of collaboration

App #	REQUESTING ORGANIZATION	SCORE	AWARD	REQUEST
186	Sharon Lee Family Health CARE	50	\$245,784	\$245,784
204	Children's Mercy West Cordell Meeks Clinic	49	\$22,650	\$22,650
54	Turner House Clinic Inc. (d/b/a: Vibrant Health)**	47.5	\$500,000	\$500,000
201	Wyandot Behavioral Health Network, Inc.	47	\$176,576	\$235,434
66	Swope Health Services - Wyandotte	45	\$134,247	\$200,474
90	Cornerstones of Care	45	\$46,663	\$62,217
163	Mid-America Regional Council Community Services Corporation	45	\$250,000	\$250,000
178	Community Health Council of Wyandotte County (CHC)*	42.5	\$215,956	\$330,998
44	Mercy and Truth Medical Missions*	39	\$267,357	\$580,115
67	KVC Hospitals, Inc.**	39	\$67,789	\$90,385
68	KVC Kansas*	38	\$112,950	\$150,600
170	Latino Health For All Coalition	37	\$131,916	\$131,916
99	KC Digital Drive	35	\$20,000	\$45,000
205	Thrive (Together Helping Reduce Youth Violence for Equity), Center for Community Health and Development, University of Kansas Center for Research	32.5	\$0	\$100,588
46	CleanAirNow	26	\$0	\$157,787
157	University of Kansas Hospital Authority **	Not scored	\$0	\$1,400,000

5

In Exhibit 1B you will those public health response organizations listed by application number and name. The application fits best under Public Health Goals. The committee believed this was the best place for them to be scored and the applications were all scored by the Planning Committee. This gives us a better ability to measure the impact under this goal and we're better able to spot areas of potential collaboration or overlap in services.

We'll go a little further and deeper when we get to Education and 501c3. What this score here means on the top right corner of your page, but this is a composite score from each one of the raters who rated these applications. You'll see the award amount or the allocation amount and the original request amount.

Initial Request: \$3,494,730.60
Adopted Request: \$780,400.00



City of Bonner Springs
KANSAS



Project	Original Request	Revised Request	Difference Dollars	Percent	Remaining Funds
Reimbursements – Public Safety Payroll COVID-19 Leave ¹	\$675,273.09	\$780,400.00	+\$105,126.91	155.68%	\$0
Reimbursements – PPE & Modifications	\$75,203.49	\$0	(\$75,203.49)	0%	\$0
Direct Aid	\$2,744,254.02	\$0	(\$2,744,254.02)	0%	\$0
Total	\$3,494,730.60	\$780,400.00			

Exhibit 2



Reimburse UG / Bonner Springs / Edwardsville for Allowable Expenses

Next we have an Exhibit 2. Exhibit 2 is the city of Bonner Springs. We have the initial request listed from the city of Bonner Springs and the adopted request on July 30th and the adjustments that the city of Bonner Springs has made in order to fit that revised adoption amount.

August 10, 2020

Initial Request	\$ 926,678
Adopted Request	\$ 449,400

Project	Original Request	Revised Request	Difference Dollars	Percent	Remaining Funds
Reimbursements	\$ 163,788	\$ 163,788	\$ -	100%	\$ (163,788)
Remote access	30,000	30,000	-	100%	(193,788)
City Council A/V Improvements	41,440	41,440	-	100%	(235,228)
Broadband Initiative	25,000	-	(25,000)	0%	(235,228)
Learning Lab	34,100	-	(34,100)	0%	(235,228)
MC Health/Safety Upgrades	21,350	21,350	-	100%	(256,578)
Outdoor Public Space	300,000	-	(300,000)	0%	(256,578)
Public Messaging	98,000	59,800	(38,200)	61%	(316,378)
PD Booking Room Modifications	100,000	60,022	(39,978)	60%	(376,400)
PD Lobby Modifications	40,000	-	(40,000)	0%	(376,400)
UV Sterilizer	73,000	73,000	-	100%	(449,400)
	\$ 926,678	\$ 449,400			



The city of
EDWARDSVILLE
Kansas

Exhibit 3



Reimburse UG / Bonner Springs / Edwardsville for Allowable Expenses

Exhibit 3 is the same from Edwardsville with the initial request and the adopted request as allocated by the funding formula at \$449,400 and the additions or reductions that Edwardsville has elected to make. I will note with Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3, both Edwardsville and Bonner, will be presenting these to their City Council and adopting a resolution similar to the resolution that this governing body adopted for Wyandotte County. That is expected to happen, I believe, tonight. I think they're in meeting tonight and they plan to adopt or hope to adopt this type of funding application along with the resolution.

Unified Government – Exhibit 4



KCK / COUNTY



CARES TEAM



REIMBURSEMENT



Reimburse UG / Bonner Springs / Edwardsville for Allowable Expenses

Lastly, we have an Exhibit 4. Exhibit 4 covers Kansas City, Kansas and the county of the CARES Act Team and reimbursements.

August 10, 2020

KCK – WYCO Reimbursement

Personnel	\$ 3,832,311.47
Contractual & Commodity	\$ 1,093,225.17
Total Projection	\$ 4,925,536.64*

	March	April	April	May	May	June	June		
By COVID Code	By Pay Period	7	8	9	10	11	12	13 Grand Total	
11 COVID 19 REGULAR		\$99,000.82	\$285,710.45	\$223,345.51	\$201,318.76	\$191,399.34	\$128,079.49	\$95,955.09	\$1,234,809.46
All Other		\$21,997.58	\$97,488.98	\$77,280.57	\$53,159.86	\$50,482.43	\$43,875.45	\$61,113.04	\$375,597.91
Health Department			\$24,917.33	\$52,713.03	\$34,090.76	\$42,458.07	\$37,742.25	\$29,602.37	\$203,571.79
Public Safety		\$77,680.24	\$184,294.14	\$113,465.19	\$114,088.14	\$98,510.84	\$46,462.79	\$34,189.88	\$647,629.76
11 COVID 19 OVERTIME		\$73,587.15	\$14,417.98	\$10,027.18	\$1,361.33	\$7,607.46	\$12,255.24	\$1,744.95	\$120,891.27
All Other		\$15.38	\$4,082.76	\$7.20	\$92.32	\$784.04			\$4,911.90
Health Department									\$0.00
Public Safety		\$73,571.77	\$12,429.42	\$10,019.96	\$1,068.81	\$6,823.42	\$12,255.24	\$1,744.95	\$115,979.37
11 COVID 19 SICK		\$13,576.58	\$59,804.29	\$3,153.48					\$76,534.35
All Other									\$0.00
Health Department									\$0.00
Public Safety		\$13,576.58	\$59,804.29	\$3,153.48					\$76,534.35
11 COVID 19 STANDBY		\$4,701.28	\$12,298.85	\$395,265.28	\$384,967.51	\$288,424.04	\$161,992.36	\$78,699.30	\$1,520,908.42
All Other		\$2,292.49	\$10,189.89	\$12,575.42	\$124,044.18	\$110,351.16	\$86,043.70	\$48,521.79	\$614,423.63
Health Department									\$0.00
Public Safety		\$2,292.49	\$10,189.89	\$12,575.42	\$124,044.18	\$110,351.16	\$86,043.70	\$48,521.79	\$614,423.63
Grand Total		\$190,815.83	\$572,231.57	\$625,684.47	\$587,547.60	\$487,480.84	\$301,927.09	\$171,399.34	\$2,996,796.54

For Kansas City, Kansas and Wyandotte County the reimbursements are projected as such. Personnel at \$3.8M and this would be for the reimbursable period of March 1 through July 31. We project Contractual and Commodity at \$1.0M with a total projection of \$4.9M for reimbursement. You've seen this slide before as well as the slide listed below, or the graphic listed below, which lists out pay codes for the individual groupings. The Unified Government began to track COVID needs and COVID overtime immediately upon the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic to give us a really good understanding of how much time staff was expending on COVID related activities.

I will mention here that although we see Personnel at \$3.8M projected between March 1 and July 31, we do anticipate there will be some elements of these need codes that are not applicable or will not be approved through the Recovery Office at the State of Kansas. That is mainly due to the adjustment in the definition for what can be reimbursable under Personnel payroll and the burden that we must meet that says that the person must be substantially dedicated. It was an early on decision to track individual hours by employees so if we have an employee who worked, for example, three or four hours of a week on COVID related activities, they likely will not qualify to be reimbursed under Personnel here. So, we do expect some slight adjustment to that Personnel column.

We are going, although our projections have been pretty spot on, to monitor Contractual & Commodity as we closeout the month of July and we do expect this to vary just slightly, but that would be our projected number. If it varied, we would be decreasing, not increasing.

KCK – WYCO Direct Aid

Economic Development	\$1,375,000.00	\$825,000.00	Appraiser's Office	\$6,294.00	\$6,294.00
Finance Department	\$3,205,252.00	\$1,518,609.00	Community Corrections	\$13,699.00	\$10,229.00
Finance Department-Budget	\$51,517.00	\$50,942.00	Court Trustee	\$20,748.00	\$19,710.00
Finance Department-Payroll	\$6,094.30	\$5,789.58	District Attorney	\$41,277.00	\$39,213.15
Human Resources	\$27,690.00	\$27,904.00	District Court	\$107,844.00	\$102,451.80
Knowledge 311	\$18,000.00	\$0.00	Emergency Management	\$3,410,335.00	\$3,396,135.00
Knowledge DOT5	\$670,212.00	\$639,831.40	Finance-Treasury Office	\$17,600.00	\$17,600.00
Knowledge GIS	\$502,000.00	\$297,000.00	General Services-SOAR	\$84,000.00	\$0.00
Knowledge P&I	\$2,302,650.00	\$446,861.95	Parks and Recreation	\$2,866,000.00	\$2,866,000.00
Legal Department	\$36,333.00	\$36,333.00	Public Health Department	\$14,583,099.00	\$12,589,265.00
Municipal Court	\$61,311.00	\$61,311.00	Sheriff Department	\$46,630.00	\$44,605.25
Parking Control	\$3,657.00	\$3,657.00	UG Clerk-Mailroom	\$1,523.00	\$1,523.00
Police Department	\$517,132.00	\$46,433.00	UG Clerk-Record Management	\$177,518.00	\$28,973.10
Procurement & Compliance	\$7,334.00	\$0.00	Wyandotte County Museum	\$4,397.00	\$4,397.00
Public Works- Admin	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00			
Public Works- Building & Logistics	\$1,171,850.00	\$1,171,850.00			
Public Works- WPC	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00			
Public Works-Admin	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00			
Public Works-Fleet	\$2,590.00	\$2,590.00			
Public Works-Streets	\$81,000.00	\$0.00			
Fire Department	\$1,473,744.00	\$925,482.00			
BPU	\$1,354,777.71	\$250,000.00			

County Investment w/o Health Department = \$ 6,537,129

CARES Act Response Team \$488,108.00 \$453,521.00

City Investment = \$ 6,339,474

10

The Kansas City, Kansas/Wyandotte County Direct Aid; this would be for the period. We are asking for programming or assistance to help recovery and response through Kansas City, Kansas or Wyandotte County throughout the period of time August 1 through December 30. I give you a really, really high level advantage point in your exhibit. It's spelled out a little bit more clearly what each one of these programs are. I will note they are divided by City and County Investment. You will see some departments that are a split, a 60/40 split, a 70/30 split. We've done our best to stay with the major function of that department but realize that we might have some overlap.

The other thing I would draw your attention to, we do have Public Health Department listed here although they are encapsulated in Exhibit 1. We have them listed here so that we can truly track the County Investment, but without the Health Department, you'll see that the County Investment or the County response would need to be about \$6.5M.

The CARES Team is listed here below. The initial request was \$488K. That's been reduced and like many of these asks have been reduced, one of our attempts is to gather all the technology pieces from inside each one of these asks so that we might be able to get a better purchase price on those technology pieces that are put into place or requested so that staff can work remotely, if necessary. That is the same case here in the CARES Act Response Team, we're hoping to be able to at least get a 5-10% savings on those technology items by ordering them in bulk.

Alan Howze, Assistant County Administrator, said just a quick note on that previous slide, the first column there is what the original request was from the department and the second column is the recommended allocation. So, again, that's true for both the City side and the County side. **Ms. Sprague** said, Alan, thanks for pointing that out. Yes, I do see that there are not strong

August 10, 2020

column headings here. This first column here, as Mr. Howze said, is the request from the department and the second column is the actual allocation or the adjustment. Just as you saw in Bonner Springs or Edwardsville as there was an attempt to reduce where we could find overlap in services and maybe see if something was actually a reimbursement, so this is the actual allocation amount underneath the funding guidelines that were previously adapted.

3.) Based on the applicants response I believe the request meets the CARES ACT "eligible" requirements. (Select 1 option)

- ☐ 1 - It does not seem to contain any eligible expenses
- ☐ 2 - I can not be sure, it is unclear
- ☐ 3 - This request seems to meet the requirements, but needs more justification
- ☐ 4 - This request fits nicely but some areas need more justification
- ☐ 5 - The request clearly meets the requirements for eligible expenses

Sample of Scoring Questions & Method

6.) I believe the applicant can accomplish their goals or make the purchases within the required timeframe. (Select 1 option)

- ☐ 1 This project is clearly outside the timeframe
- ☐ 2 I am not confident this can be accomplished
- ☐ 3 This will be tough and progress will need to be monitored
- ☐ 4 I believe this is a good timeline and planned out for success
- ☐ 5 I am very confident this proposal will meet all the required deadlines

10.) I would recommend funding the proposal in the following way: (Select 1 option)

- ☐ 25% or less - There is a small part of the application we should fund in Round 1
- ☐ Between 25% and 50% - There are several parts of the application we should fund, but not all
- ☐ Between 50% and 75% - Most of this application should be funded, there are a few pieces that
- ☐ Between 75% and 100% - There is one element I am concerned about
- ☐ 100% All parts of this application should be funded

- 83 Applications
- 8 voting members
- Access to all the submitted documents & application
- Composite score is
- Last question used to determine recommended funding level as a group
- Scores used as a decision guide

11

We'll take a little break and talk a little bit about how we scored applications as a group and I give you a little bit of a sampling here. Each applicant or subrecipient filled out an application. That application was then in turn replicated in the ability to rate the strength and maybe areas of improvement where the Planning Team thought independently there could be some improvement on the application or maybe the application didn't quite meet the eligibility requirements. I've given you three out of the ten questions here just as an example. Question 3; Based on the applicants response I believe the request meets the CARES Act Eligibility requirements as we know them today. Each rater or each Planning Committee Team member was able to rate each individual application one through five with one receiving the lowest score, five receiving the highest.

Number 6 is another example. I believe the applicant can accomplish their goals or make the purchases within the required timeframe. This is a really important question when it comes to the State Recovery Office eligibility, but these funds or projects have to be completed no later than December 30th. This was something that your Planning Committee was really digging through applications to see if we could get a good understanding if the plan was to complete that item or expend that money on goods or services before December 30th.

The last sample question that you will see here, and again, it was 1 through 10. They had a lot of applications to rate so we stopped at 10, but number 10 is a recommended funding or proposed funding amount based on the application giving each rater the opportunity to say what rate of funding they would recommend to the particular application received.

We had 83+ applications, 8 voting members, each one of the voting members had not only the scoring guide but access to all submitted documents and the applications submitted by the subrecipient. We used a composite score, meaning that we reviewed each individual question by each individual rater and elected a composite score that would give us a quick snapshot of where each one of those applications fell in relation to each other. We used the last question to determine recommended funding levels as a group and, just as a reminder, the score guide was used as a decision guide for discussion and gave us an opportunity to really see where those applications shook out in merit and eligibility.

Allocations Informed with Data									
Vote in Bucket		Use Rate		Use Rate		Use Rate		Use Rate	
		\$		\$		\$		\$	
		2,670,269		2,670,269		2,670,269		2,670,269	
Project #	Type of Organization	Funding 100%	Funding Recommended	Composite Score	% recommended	Funding Committee	Committee Funding	Request	
51	Educational Institution	\$ 2,670,269	\$ 2,670,269	48	88%	\$ 2,670,269	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,581	
35	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ 2,664,487	\$ 2,665,385	47.5	100%	\$ 2,665,385	\$ 26,340.00	\$ 26,340	
65	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ 2,590,427	\$ 2,591,125	47	100%	\$ 2,591,009	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000	
79	Educational Institution	\$ 2,401,033	\$ 2,440,979	47	75%	\$ 2,431,009	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000	
41	Educational Institution	\$ 2,200,573	\$ 2,200,754	46.5	75%	\$ 2,201,009	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000	
153	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ 2,100,182	\$ 2,101,503	46	100%	\$ 2,100,988	\$ 1,411.00	\$ 1,411	
189	Educational Institution	\$ 2,113,148	\$ 2,132,813	45	75%	\$ 2,143,598	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 16,000	
103	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ 2,000,827	\$ 2,010,591	44	100%	\$ 2,013,576	\$ 12,212.00	\$ 12,212	
151	Educational Institution	\$ 1,207,985	\$ 1,500,885	43.5	75%	\$ 1,651,376	\$ 580,000.00	\$ 891,943	
151	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ 1,178,825	\$ 1,520,025	41.5	75%	\$ 1,654,376	\$ 17,000.00	\$ 17,000	
174	Educational Institution	\$ 965,420	\$ 1,165,137	40	85%	\$ 1,254,576	\$ 880,000.00	\$ 880,000	
208	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ 555,142	\$ 1,143,988	39.5	50%	\$ 1,310,376	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 21,000	
25	Educational Institution	\$ (1,519,814)	\$ 120,248	39	25%	\$ 352,376	\$ 900,000.00	\$ 4,009,001	
177	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ (1,549,988)	\$ 115,128	37	50%	\$ 324,876	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500	
130	Educational Institution	\$ (1,495,801)	\$ 78,817	35.5	25%	\$ 274,876	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000	
99	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ (1,740,101)	\$ 67,617	35	25%	\$ 274,876	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000	
138	Educational Institution	\$ (1,493,241)	\$ 39,441	35	25%	\$ 274,876	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000	
140	Educational Institution	\$ (1,519,151)	\$ 34,441	34	25%	\$ 274,876	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 110,000	
107	Educational Institution	\$ (1,438,070)	\$ (107,063)	34	25%	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	
137	Educational Institution	\$ (1,493,241)	\$ 39,441	33	0%	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	
98	Educational Institution	\$ (1,008,911)	\$ 33	33	0%	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	
60	501(c)(3) Non-profit	\$ (1,771,801)	\$ 33	25%	0%	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	
148	Educational Institution	\$ (2,222,181)	\$ 33	23	0%	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	\$ 124,876	

This is a lot of information, but this is what your Planning Committee was reviewing as they were making their funding decisions and we like to call this Allocations Informed with Data. On the very first column here is the application number and this is an example or a sample with the total bucket for this particular sample being \$2.6M. You will see the type of organization listed here to the left and the attempt was to provide a couple of different mechanisms to use the composite score and rate the individuals on the composite score with a 100% funding and then if we incorporated the recommended funding on that Question 10. Then we gave the committee a space here to have discussion and make adjustments where necessary. What you see the green to yellow to red is the burn rate of that particular bucket, so your Planning Committee knew when they ran out of money

based on this type of methodology versus this type of taking the percent of recommended funding into question and then what it would look like if we made some slight adjustments based on individual input through discussion.

I know that's a lot to look at, but your Planning Team had one of these for every type of application that they received and were able to make those determinations and get to the best possible result for our community.

Education - Exhibit 1		REQUESTING ORGANIZATION	SCORE	AWARD	REQUEST
 Improve the Adaptability of Taxing Entities Initial Request \$9,381,724 Approved Allotment \$2,670,269		Kansas State Research & Extension	48	\$5,000	\$5,582
		Kansas City Kansas Foundation for Excellence	47.5	\$24,260	\$24,260
		PCs for People Kansas City (formerly Connecting For Good)	47	\$50,000	\$50,000
		Donnelly College	47	\$160,000	\$189,394
		USD 202 Turner	46.5	\$130,000	\$200,460
		Stony Point Christian Church Preschool	46	\$1,411	\$1,411
		USD 204 (Bonner Springs/Edwardsville School District)	45	\$56,000	\$86,014
		KidZone Learning Center of Wyandotte County, Inc.	44	\$12,222	\$12,222
		Kansas City Kansas Public Schools	43.5	\$580,000	\$892,942
		The Urban Scholastic Center	41.5	\$17,000	\$29,160
		Piper School District	40	\$380,000	\$585,405
		Groundwork Northeast Revitalization Group, Inc.	39.5	\$22,000	\$38,278
		Kansas City Kansas Community College	39	\$800,000	\$4,085,001
		Uncle Sam's Academy for Tots	37	\$7,500	\$10,039
		University of Kansas Medical Center	35.5	\$50,000	\$145,404
		University of Kansas Medical Center	35	\$0	\$152,743
		University of Kansas Medical Center	34	\$150,000	\$504,108
		University of Kansas Medical Center	34	\$0	\$41,917
		University of Kansas Medical Center	33	\$0	unknown
		University of Kansas Medical Center	32	\$0	\$909,791
		Future Leaders Outreach Network	29.5	\$0	\$362,014
		University of Kansas Medical Center	23	\$0	\$1,000,580

Using that type of methodology, we look at Education – Exhibit 1, the initial request for Education was \$9.3M and the approved allotment or allocation was \$2.6, and I go back to the approved allotment from July 30th. You'll see a similar slide here that you saw with the medical group listing all the applicants to the left, their composite score in the second column, their allocation amount based on vote from the Planning Committee and the original request amount. So, that's Exhibit 1 under the Education resolution.

Before we go into the 501c3's I might want to go back and stop since we are at a nice break to consider the first resolution with the exhibits from Municipalities and I would ask whether or not action would want to be taken on the first resolution we have presented before we move into Education. **Mayor Alvey** said I would ask the Commission, any comments or questions.

Commissioner Bynum said I would like to ask Crystal to go back to the beginning slide. This is slide where we—I need clarification on the County column in terms of the dollar amount that we've allocated specifically to Wyandotte County because it says to me \$1.479M, correct? **Ms. Sprague** said that's correct. **Commissioner Bynum** said if you move slides forward several I

thought I heard Alan say that the righthand column was the allocation, so these departments are not necessarily broken up by whether they are a City or a County department. For example, my specific question is with the Parks & Rec line. That must be on the City side, correct? **Ms. Sprague** said we have it listed here as a countywide agency, but it's one of those departments similar to say the Finance Office in which most of the funding is broken down by the percent of time that office works or that service is provided to City or County. Parks & Rec is listed here just for ease of listing them here, but I could absolutely see where, Commissioner, you would see that they fit better under the City side and we can definitely make some of those adjustments because it's not lost on us that the allocation for the County is \$1.4 and the County Investment without the Health Department here is listed at \$6.5. In the limited timeframe that we had, as you know, the Budget Office spends months and months and months dividing up different services to make that the appropriate budget is set-aside for City and County during the budgetary process. In this particular example with the speed at which we needed to put these documents together, this is where staff recommended that the Parks & Rec Department set at least for the visual of seeing the County Investment.

Commissioner Bynum said I really appreciate that. I'm asking more as a matter of being very, very clear for our public that, you know, for example, the Appraiser's Office is a County function, etc. and identifying whether the functions shown on this slide are in fact City or County functions. I appreciate what you're saying, at the same time I want to be crystal clear for our entire community, the County of Wyandotte's total allocation is \$1.4M countywide for the County side departments.

I had just one other comment that probably will be echoed repeatedly as we move our way through the rest of this presentation, but I really want to thank Juliann VanLiew with our Unified Government Public Health Department for taking the 501c3 related health requests away from the 501c3 bucket and taking them into the allocation that we had agreed on with Public Health because had she not done that, our task in allocating funds to the 501c3's would have been almost impossible. What you're seeing here is that these are non-profit organizations and they applied as 501c3's, but our Public Health Department encumbered these within the dollars that have been allocated to Public Health. That moved these requests out of our small, small bucket for the rest of the 501c3 organizations that we were trying to support and that's what allowed us to make allocations to everyone else. Again, thank you to Juliann VanLiew.

Mayor Alvey said at this time I would entertain a motion for the Municipalities resolution that includes Health Department, Bonner Springs, Edwardsville, Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas and the Board of Public Utilities.

Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-54-20, “A resolution adopting WYCO CARES Funding proposals. That the WYCO CARES funding requests for the Wyandotte County Health Department and health priorities and the municipalities of Bonner Springs, Edwardsville, and Kansas City/Wyandotte County, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, Exhibit 2, Exhibit 3, and Exhibit 4 are hereby adopted and recommended by the Board of Commissioners with the authority granted to the County Administrator to make adjustments as necessary.”

Commissioner Ramirez made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Markley, to adopt the resolution. Roll call was taken and there were ten “Ayes,” Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Johnson, Kane, Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Bynum.

Mayor Alvey said we now go to the Education resolution. Crystal again.

Ms. Sprague said just to recap, the Education – Exhibit 1 is listed here with a total approved allocation or allotment at \$2.6M. The Education dollars are listed here for the allotment and the request on the far right side. Mayor, that’s the totality of the second resolution.

Mayor Alvey said I will entertain any questions. I do have a question. Looking at the request from Kansas City Kansas Community College, the award was for \$900K. The request was for \$4.1M. Anything in general we need to know about the significant gap? **Ms. Sprague** said I would say that we were able to look at the—I say we; the Planning Committee was able to take into evaluation how many dollars of CARES Act funding each one of the organizations had previously received and then we went by the scores where each Planning Team member was able to score those applications. As you can see, the Kansas City Kansas Community College application scored at a 39 where many other applications scored at a higher percentage and perhaps one of the team members on the line would be able to elaborate a little bit more.

Commissioner Markley said I think the biggest explanation is we didn't give them \$4M, so that was just the reality. I do think there were parts of the application that were more closely aligned to our higher priorities as a committee and as, I think, a government at this stage. There are other things in the application that were wonderful ideas and that we would have loved to fund, but because not all parts of the application were sort of in that higher priority grouping, that's why we awarded not the entire amount or a lesser amount than what was requested. You'll also see KU Med made some significant requests. Same sort of circumstance. We didn't have enough money to allocate to everyone in this category, so we had to look at the application and how it was going to impact our residents here in this county and how closely it aligned to the goals of this committee which, you know, the highest priority was related specifically to protecting public health. That's really what this committee was looking at and how we were evaluating these applications as we went through the scoring process and then as we allocated dollars. **Mayor Alvey** said thank you. That's helpful.

Mayor Alvey said seeing no more questions, I would entertain a motion.

Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-55-20, "A resolution adopting WYCO CARES Funding proposals. That the WYCO CARES funding requests for Educational organizations, attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is hereby adopted and recommended by the Board of Commissioners with the authority granted to the County Administrator to make adjustments as necessary." **Commissioner Bynum made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Markley, to adopt the resolution.** Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Johnson, Kane, Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Bynum.

Mayor Alvey said that takes us to the Non-Profit resolution. Crystal again.

501c3 - Exhibit 1



Grow Requisite Health & Human Services



Build in Community Resiliency

Initial Request

\$11,808,296

Approved Allotment

\$3,754,634

1 of 3

App #	REQUESTING ORGANIZATION	SCORE	AWARD	REQUEST
30	Community Housing of Wyandotte County (CHWC)	49	\$100,000	\$100,000
172	United Way of Greater Kansas City	48.5	\$1,245,000	\$3,761,120
62	Kansas City Kansas West Kiwanis Foundation	48	\$5,778	\$5,778
181	St. Paul's Episcopal Church (St. Paul's Neighborhood Pentry & Breakfast at St. Paul's)	48	\$18,863	\$18,863
176	Young Women on the Move	47.5	\$20,000	\$20,000
55	Youthfront	47	\$50,000	\$50,000
71	KC Healthy Kids	47	\$36,750	\$36,750
53	Bethel Neighborhood Center	46.5	\$50,000	\$50,000
8	Choices Health Services Inc.	46	\$35,000	\$35,000
69	LA FAMILIA DEAN LOZOYA FOUNDATION INC	46	\$25,000	\$25,000
190	Argentine Neighborhood Development Association	46	\$45,289	\$45,289
218	Avenue of Life	46	\$660,014	\$931,000
29	Mt. Carmel Redevelopment Corporation	45.5	\$38,000	\$101,700
28	Fellowship Christian Church (DOC)	45	\$18,000	\$30,000
120	Harvesters - The Community Food Network	45	\$300,000	\$450,000
130	Cross-Lines Community Outreach	45	\$45,000	\$75,000

14

14

Ms. Sprague said I would say this was the most challenging funding as we had the most amount of applications, the largest requests, and the most valuable, innovative ideas presented as well as just like we talked about on July 30th, just some really pragmatic ways to help our community. I know that this was the most difficult, the most thought provoking conversation that we had and some of it was just scaled, the just sheer number of applications that we had.

The initial request minus the medical requests that were moved to the Health Department or the medical allocation, the initial request in this group \$11.8M. The approved allotment was \$3.7. It was actually a little under \$3.7, but there were a few dollars left in the Educational allotment that the group decided and voted to move to the 501c3 allotment making it \$3.754M and we have several slides here. Three of which contain the information that was presented in your Exhibit 1.

They are in score order, so you'll see the first application receiving a 49 out of the 50 on the score and you'll see several applications here that the committee elected to fund or recommended funding at 100%. Just to give you some ideas about what some of these applications are, application #62 was a very pragmatic approach to helping folks out with food baskets. If we look down a little further to Avenue of Life, application #218, really focused at wraparound services for many, many members in their community and this was a very innovative approach to—or what the committee found an innovative to wraparound services with many different organizations involved.

501c3 - Exhibit 1		App #	REQUESTING ORGANIZATION	SCORE	AWARD	REQUEST
 Grow Requisite Health & Human Services	Initial Request	179	Keeler Women's Center	45	\$4,001	\$4,001
	Approved Allotment	97	Giving the Basics, Inc.	44.5	\$48,000	\$70,000
 Build In Community Resiliency		202	Dotte Local Grocer, Inc. (fiscally sponsored by Groundwork NRG, a 501c3 non-profit).	44.5	\$40,000	\$56,727
		206	Mt. Carmel Church of God in Christ	44.5	\$8,000	\$9,653
		39	Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Kansas City	44	\$33,000	\$58,000
		119	Wyandotte Economic Development Council	44	\$350,000	\$350,000
		122	The Family Conservancy	44	\$275,000	\$2,487,810
		38	Guiding Star Missionary Baptist Church	43.5	\$4,439	\$4,439
		52	Catholic Charities of Northeast Kansas	43	\$10,000	\$16,150
		81	Urban Scholastic Center	43	\$20,000	\$69,300
		224	NBC Community Development Corporation	42.5	\$18,000	\$23,400
		116	Hillcrest Ministries of MidAmerica, Inc., dba Hillcrest Transitional Housing	42	\$60,000	\$152,450
		96	The Farm School at Gibbs Road Inc.	41	\$20,000	\$44,165
		194	Young Women on the Move	41	\$10,000	\$75,000
		203	Police Athletic League of Kansas City, Kansas	41	\$13,000	\$27,450

15

Slide 2 of 3, and you can tell how tight some of these scores were, lists applications as varied from our religious community to The Farm School at Gibbs Road.

501c3 - Exhibit 1		App #	REQUESTING ORGANIZATION	SCORE	AWARD	REQUEST
 Grow Requisite Health & Human Services	Initial Request	187	Kansas City Dream Center Co	40.5	\$30,000	\$60,000
	Approved Allotment	225	Moneytalk Financial Foundations, Inc	40.5	\$0	\$50,000
 Build In Community Resiliency		134	KCK Alcohol Safety Action Project	39	\$10,000	\$25,000
		165	Board of Public Utilities	39	\$0	\$1,100,000
		192	Argentine Neighborhood Development Association	39	\$0	\$570,000
		193	Argentine Neighborhood Development Association	35	\$0	\$394,250
		211	Kansas City Kansas Chamber of Commerce	34.5	\$16,000	\$25,000
		126	Humane Society of Greater Kansas City	34	\$90,000	\$223,653
		188	Made Men Inc.	34	\$0	\$60,939
		199	Due West Therapeutic Riding Center	30	\$2,500	\$48,000
		45	KC Roller Warriors Inc	29	\$0	\$42,500
		109	Civic Leadership Training Council Inc. DBA Leadership 2000	29	\$0	\$13,337
		112	Allegro Choirs of Kansas City	27.5	\$0	\$11,572
		12	American Fallen Warrior Memorial Foundation	20	\$0	Unable to determine

16

Slide 3 of 3, I'll give you a second to look at that. Again, some of these applications were not funded based on recommendations from the Planning Committee and of scoring noticing timeframe, noticing things for eligibility, what would be considered eligible based on the Treasury response.



With the conclusion of the 501c3 applications, Mayor, I will mention, Commission, I will mention that with those three areas of funding the taxable entities are Educational, the Health & Human Services and Building Resiliency in the Community. The group was able to set-aside \$9M of the CARES Act funding to go into those three funding priorities and go straight into our community. Mayor, that's all I have on that resolution, resolution #3 presented tonight.

Commissioner Townsend said I would also like to thank the committee for what I know had to be an overwhelming task in such a short time, but nevertheless, they rose to it clearly. So, thank you. I have some questions and I think the Clerk has already referred to this and maybe Ms. Sprague, but I'm looking at the original for this application and I notice that with respect to a couple of individual organization there was apparently a mix-up with names and the detail provided. I just want to make sure if you could put those exhibits up again, Ms. Sprague, how this looks. I will tell you I'm looking particularly for 176, Young Women on the Move. I verified with their director that they did request \$20K. The description on what we were initially given did not coincide with what they told me they were about or what they had asked for with regard to rent and something else, utility assistance, so maybe that's been corrected.

Ms. Sprague said we did absolutely have a sorting error on our exhibit before we sent it out on Friday in our haste to get it out to you as quickly as we possibly could after the committee's final recommendation. We had not aligned the description appropriately with the individual application number. That did not impact the composite score, the recommended award, or the original request for any of the 501c3 organizations, but it did miss a line, the description. That was published this morning, I believe, about 12:30 and we certainly wish we could have had

a little bit more time to doublecheck and apologize for that inconvenience, not only for our commissioners, but also for our citizens and applicants who were reviewing that, as I would have been reviewing that, after it was posted on Friday. **Commissioner Townsend** said well good. I was not able to see that with some other things, so I just wanted to make sure having talked to some of the persons involved with the organization.

Youthfront, application #55, is that really—the description they gave, I’m confused about what Youthfront is, so what is Youthfront because I talked to Pastor David Lee at Guiding Light Baptist Church and they were the ones who sought tablets for seniors and that was the amount they requested, but it was under the name of Guiding Light Baptist Church, not Youthfront. **Ms. Sprague** said just a second and I will pull up the description for that application. You said it was application 55? **Commissioner Townsend** said it’s showing here as 55, but on the original edition of this exhibit the award was \$50K and the request was \$50K and the detail had to do with request for 50 tablets for seniors. What I’m questioning here is Youthfront. The description and the amount coincides with the application from Guiding Star Missionary Baptist Church which I see later as application 38 and it’s significantly less for \$4,439 and the description talks about a variety of things including veterinary service. I can assure you Guiding Star Baptist Church has nothing to do with veterinary services. In this case I’m really making sure that we got money going to the right requestor for the right program. **Ms. Sprague** said the aligned or corrected exhibit reads application 55, Youthfront, received a 47. It was a \$50K award for \$50K ask and the description of the project or the Direct Aid request was Youthfront was requesting \$50K to package 150,000 non-perishable meals to distribute in Wyandotte County through our Something to Eat Meal Packing Program.

Commissioner Townsend said okay and then Guiding Star is showing now and asking and receiving how much money and for what purpose? **Ms. Sprague** said Guiding Star Missionary Baptist Church is application #38 and I’ll bring it up on the screen for you. Application 38 receiving a 43.5 composite score, requesting \$4,439, receiving \$4,439. Requesting funds to provide 50 seniors with tablets and I believe, if I’m getting the summation right, the tablets were to assist with medical appointments and contacts with their physicians as well as some technical assistance to help them navigate setting up those tablets. **Commissioner Townsend** said and you’re saying the requested amount was what? **Ms. Sprague** said \$4,439, application #38. Commissioner, if you would like, as we proceed I would be happy to actually pull that application

up so the Commission members can see it. **Commissioner Townsend** said okay, that would be great. Their application was not for \$50K. **Ms. Sprague** said that's correct. Their original request as listed here as \$4,439 and that was to provide 50 tablets for seniors within the community. **Commissioner Townsend** said okay. That seems consistent then with what they wanted, what they had identified. The amount was off a bit but alright, thank you for that clarification.

Commissioner Burroughs said I had one question. I see where the Harvesters had requested \$450K and were awarded \$300K and then I look down and I see the Wyandotte Economic Development Council requested some additional dollars, \$350K for Harvesters, which gives them a total of \$650K. Is there a reason why we just didn't meet Harvesters initial request and cut WYEDC. I'm just curious as to why the decision to fund it through two different sources. **Ms. Sprague** said, Commissioner Burroughs, I think that's a really great question. Wyandotte Economic Council or WYEDC had initially asked for over a million dollars in a request that they pared down pretty significantly on Friday morning adjusting their requested amount to the amount that you see here. They did flash a lot of elements of their program that they thought either could not be met and I don't want to speak directly for the agency. I'm reading basically what is off the adjusted amount request that was submitted on Friday, but they significantly cut some services that would be overlap services as well as cut services because of fear they would not be able to get them completed by the December 30th date. They had an initial request when they first submitted their application of over a million dollars and then Friday morning pared that down significantly to the amount that you see.

As far as the funding goes, based on again the score, the requested funding in the scoring mechanism and then the discussion amongst the team members on Friday morning, that's how we reached the dollar amount that you see here today.

Commissioner Markley said I will also jump in and just say I know it's difficult when you're seeing the applications in this format where it's just the entity name listed, but it's important to note that there is a score. We're not necessarily awarding money to the entity although we are, but we're awarding for that application and in fact we have some entities as you saw in some of the previous slides like for Education, we had some where multiple applications came from a single entity. We were scoring the application, not the entity and so it could be that the information in

one application that involved an entity with different kind of service or a different type of set-up than with a different application. So that's sort of clear as mud, but I guess I would just say, keep in mind we were evaluating the esthetics of the application, not necessarily the entity as we were going through that scoring process and the application and what that specific application provided for that entity to do with the money is what was graded and scored.

Commissioner Burroughs said it came to my attention that the request for Harvesters wasn't granted, the full request, but yet others recognized how significant and important Harvesters is at this particular time in our community. I'm in full support of Harvesters. I was just curious as to why Wyandotte County Economic Development would choose to ask for the additional dollars for Harvesters and ensure that they got it. I'm pleased to see Harvesters get the money. I'm just curious why were using two different funding mechanisms to provide the dollars. That's my comment.

Mayor Alvey said seeing no more questions, I would entertain a motion.

Action: RESOLUTION NO. R-56-20, "A resolution adopting WYCO CARES Funding proposals. That the WYCO CARES funding requests for Non-Profit organizations, attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is hereby adopted and recommended by the Board of Commissioners with the authority granted to the County Administrator to make adjustments as necessary." **Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Townsend, to adopt the resolution.** Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Johnson, Kane, Markley, Walters, Philbrook, Bynum.

Mayor Alvey said once again on behalf of the Commission and on behalf of our residents, I want to thank you for all the hard work that the committee has put forward on this. I think it served the community well. That concludes our meeting for the evening.

**MAYOR ALVEYADJOURNED
THE MEETING AT 7:47 p.m.**

Bridgette Cobbins
Unified Government Clerk

dt

August 10, 2020