

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

SPECIAL SESSION, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022

The Unified Government Commission of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, met in Special Session, Thursday, October 27, 2022, with ten members present: Bynum, Commissioner At-Large First District; Burroughs, Commissioner At-Large Second District; Townsend, Commissioner First District; McKiernan, Commissioner Second District; Ramirez, Commissioner Third District; Kane, Commissioner Fifth District; Markley, Commissioner Sixth District; Stites, Commissioner Seventh District; Davis, Commissioner Eighth District; and Garner, Mayor/CEO, presiding. Johnson, Commissioner Fourth District; was absent. The following officials were also in attendance: Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Interim County Administrator; Misty Brown, Chief Legal Counsel; Brett Deichler, Interim County Administrator; Daniel Soptic, Sheriff; Monica L. Sparks, Acting Unified Government Clerk; and Reginald Lindsey, Budget Director.

Mayor Garner said before I call this meeting to order, I want to announce that we have individuals attending remotely as well as on-site. All participants joining by phone should mute their phones when not speaking to avoid background noise. During the meeting, please make sure that you announce yourself by name and title every time you speak so the public that is participating knows who is speaking. This is critical given the number of remote participants and is current guidance from the Kansas Attorney General.

MAYOR GARNER called the meeting to order.

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

NOTICE OF SPECIAL SESSION of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, to be conducted in a hybrid format on Thursday, October 27, 2022. An Executive Session to be conducted in person for consultation with Legal Counsel regarding litigation will be

at 5:00 p.m. in the 5th floor conference room, followed at 6:00 p.m. by a Special Session for a presentation regarding the Sheriff's Office salary funding.

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

Mayor Garner said at this time the Commission will go into Executive Session for consultation with Legal Counsel regarding litigation.

Commissioner McKiernan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Markley, for the Commission to go into Executive Session until 6:00 p.m. in the fifth floor conference room to consult with our attorneys to discuss confidential matters related to pending claims and litigation, as permitted under the Kansas Open Meetings Act; and that staff designated by the County Administrator be present to participate in the discussion, and that we reconvene in open session at 6:00 p.m. here in the 5th floor conference room. Roll call was taken on the motion and there were nine "Ayes," Markley, Stites, Davis, Bynum, Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Kane.

Present for the Executive Session relating to pending claims and litigation: Bynum, Commissioner At-Large First District; Burroughs, Commissioner At-Large Second District; Townsend, Commissioner First District; McKiernan, Commissioner Second District; Ramirez, Commissioner Third District; Kane, Commissioner Fifth District; Markley, Commissioner Sixth District; Stites, Commissioner Seventh District; Davis, Commissioner Eighth District; and Garner, Mayor/CEO presiding. **Staff present:** Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Interim County Administrator; Misty Brown, Chief Legal Counsel; Ryan Denk, Outside Counsel for Labor Negotiations; Sheriff Soptic (entering at 5:20 p.m.) and Joni Cole, Sheriff Legal Advisor (entering at 5:20 p.m.).

Commissioner Ramirez made a motion to adjourn from the Executive Session at 6:00 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Kane. Roll call was taken and there were nine “Ayes,” Markley, Stites, Davis, Bynum, Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Kane.

Special Session – 6:02 p.m.

Mayor Garner reconvened the Special Session at 6:02 p.m. for a presentation regarding the Sheriff’s Office salary funding.

Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Interim County Administrator, said Finance staff has been working with the Sheriff as a follow-up to some of the comments that were made during the budget session. The Sheriff will be presenting, his team will be presenting, what they anticipate are their ask for additional funding to be closer to what we have with our other law enforcement staff and then we will talk to you about some options for funding that.

Daniel Soptic, Sheriff, said I will just read some prepared remarks and then we can kind of go from there. I would like to thank the Mayor and the Commission for this opportunity to come back in front of this group. I would also like to thank the Commission for their continued support of the Sheriff’s Office. Finally, I would like to thank all of the staff that worked hard to put all this information together and to include Legal, Finance, and the County Administrator’s Office.

We came before the Commission twice during the budget process in an attempt to implement a plan to achieve pay parity between the sworn of the Sheriff’s Office and the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department. During those presentations I felt that you all were fairly receptive to the proposal in some form or fashion. However, due to many different procedural issues, there was never any action taken and, therefore, the adjustment was not made in the budget.

I’m back before you today to insist that a resolution to the salary disparity between the Sheriff’s Office and the Police Department please be resolved tonight. I understand that the budget process was a very labor intensive process for the Commission and tough decisions had to be made and I can appreciate the work that you guys put into that.

The staffing at the Sheriff’s Office continues to be a problem. As of today the Sheriff’s Office has a vacancy rate of over 30% between my Deputy and Correctional Specialists. If we think money will completely fix our staffing issue, that is unreasonable. It does; however, put the

Sheriff's Office in more of a position to compete with surrounding agencies. With agencies like the Johnson County Office offering huge salary increases, not making this adjustment puts us that much further behind. You have to remember, we don't always fight the recruiting of applicants, we also fight the retention of our current employees that could go elsewhere.

I refuse to lower the standards that I have for this job and we must pay our current employees what they are worth and recognize that by being competitive with their salaries. When you lower the hiring standards, you play a dangerous game and that's not something I'm willing to do and I think we all know that all too well.

When I was sworn in as Sheriff here in Wyandotte County I accepted the responsibility to uphold the statutes of the State of Kansas and specifically the three that outline the responsibilities that I have and, obviously, it takes staff to make this happen. I have faith that this Commission will make a decision tonight that will not only show your commitment to the men and women of the Sheriff's Office, but it will also show your willingness to accurately fund the Sheriff's Office in a way that gives me the tools to best position the Sheriff's Office to serve the citizens of Wyandotte County. My ultimate goal is to attract, hire, and retain quality applicants, quality deputies, and I think that we all know all too well what happens when I can't do that.

That is my prepared remarks. I don't want to go too far out of my lane, but I guess I can at least kind of explain my ask.

So, when I originally came to you I was asking for 100% parity between us and the KCKPD. After it didn't get put in, you know I'm a numbers guy, as you guys have had to be through this whole budget season, so I went back and looked at just what it looked like. I knew what 100% looked like and I talked to my recruiting staff and I talked to others. My proposal here tonight is a 95% parity and let me explain why I've changed that.

I recognize the difficulties that the Unified Government is having. I recognize the difficulties in getting the budget put together and passed. I also recognize that there are things that we offer at the Sheriff's Office that the Police Department does and I'm willing to put some of that burden back on my recruiting staff to make up that 5%. After rerunning the numbers at 95%, it did make a significant difference impact wise on what that required. I also hope that shows this Commission my willingness to work with and be a part of everything that we have going on in the Unified Government.

October 27, 2022

You know, the statutes that govern what I do are pretty clear about what I have to do and that's what I'm here to try to accomplish, but at the same time, I want a relationship that my predecessor fostered with this governing body, the ones that were here and the new ones that have come in. I want to continue with that and I will do everything in my power to make that happen. I hope that this shows my willingness to do that. So, that's the first ask.

The second ask is more out of necessity because of the first one. So, what the first ask will cause is an already compressed pay between myself and my Undersheriff and down the line. My pay is set by statute—sorry, ordinance/resolution and so when we adjust my staff, it's going to put everything else way out of whack and make the staff below me, and in some cases, make more than me. So, the second ask is a resolution/ordinance also correcting my pay and the Undersheriff's pay to, again, mirror that 95% number. That is my ask of the Commission.

I'll let Misty or whoever from Finance kind of carry the rest of the discussion forward. I guess my final ask would be, as it relates to those two, is that those two items, the two resolutions be taken forward and added to your 7:00 meeting for, hopefully, approval. I'm here for any questions.

Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Interim County Administrator, said if there are no questions, we do have Mr. Lindsey here from Finance if you would like for us to move maybe to the finance component.

**County General Fund Forecast
2022-2027
Including Sheriff's Office Compensation Realignment**

County General Fund	2022 Amended Budget	2023 Approved Budget	2024 Forecast	2025 Forecast	2026 Forecast	2027 Forecast
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 76,691,702	\$ 77,827,782	\$ 80,835,292	\$ 84,776,332	\$ 88,763,131	\$ 92,936,109
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 78,204,310	\$ 81,556,050	\$ 84,654,407	\$ 87,829,889	\$ 91,269,471	\$ 94,822,772
51a: Sheriff's Office Compensation Realignment		\$ 1,292,581	\$ 1,344,284	\$ 1,398,055	\$ 1,544,851	\$ 1,606,645
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ (1,512,608)	\$ (3,728,268)	\$ (3,819,115)	\$ (3,053,557)	\$ (2,506,340)	\$ (1,886,663)
Cash Basis Ending Fund Balance	\$ 12,399,230	\$ 8,670,963	\$ 4,851,848	\$ 1,798,290	\$ (708,049)	\$ (2,594,713)
ACFR Ending Fund Balance	\$ 15,440,254	\$ 11,711,687	\$ 7,892,872	\$ 4,839,314	\$ 2,332,975	\$ 446,311
Reserve % of Expenditures	19.74%	14.36%	9.32%	5.51%	2.56%	0.47%
Fund Balance 17% Target	\$ 13,294,733	\$ 13,864,528	\$ 14,391,249	\$ 14,931,081	\$ 15,515,810	\$ 16,119,871

Reginald Lindsey, Budget Director, said the current financial summary on the screen includes the Sheriff's Office compensation realignment and basically what we have is the 2022 Amended Budget, the 2023 Budget that we approved, and then we have forecasts going from 2024 to 2027. We have in the middle of the page the Sheriff's Office Compensation Realignment. As Sheriff Soptick said, he would shoulder the cost in the 2022 Amended Budget, so there's no cost there for the Sheriff's realignment in 2022, but in 2023 we do have a \$1.3M number that does have an impact on the 2023 Budget that we approved, so it does push the number up to \$81.5M. The number that we did approve back on September 15th was \$80M—\$80.2M, so when we approved that budget we did have a 16% fund balance. Our target is a 17% fund balance, so with adding this additional \$1.3M, our fund balance is now 14% and we are at \$11M for our fund balance for actual-wise.

Then what we approved, just to give you an idea, we had a \$13M fund balance and so as we go out to 2024, we do see the impact. There is a little over \$1.3M for 2024, and then out to 2025 the Sheriff's compensation does go up to almost \$1.4M. In 2026, it is \$1.5M and in 2027, it is \$1.6M. Just some of the things that I'll point out is, when we get to the 2026 forecast, the cash basis ending fund balance does go into the negative. We would definitely have to balance this budget out at that time and then some of the other things that I will point out, in 2024 and 2025 we are—we're already below the 17% fund balance, but the fund balance did drop from where we originally forecast when we approved the budget on September 15th. So in 2024 we are at a 9% fund balance which we were at a 12% and then in 2025 we were at 10% fund balance and we have dropped to almost 6%.

Those are some of the key things about the financial statement and the impact of Sheriff Soptic's proposal.

Commissioner Stites said so the difference in 95% and 100% was what amount? **Chief Soptic** said 100% was about 2.2. **Commissioner Stites** said 2.2 starting in '23. What would be the impact—like we have this 1.3 starting in 2023 if it was funded at 100%, and I'm going into why I'm asking 100% in a second, but what would those numbers look like if it was at 100% and do we have that and now I'll go into why I'm asking that.

I appreciate you taking the step to make this easier to swallow, but I don't know why we would tell Sheriff's sworn deputies that you're going to earn less than the counterpart at the Police

Department. If we're closing the gap, then let's close the gap 100%, not 95%, not 96, not 98, we're equal and I think that's how we've got to view it. Yeah, it has an impact, but we're still saying in a sense, you're less than the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department is being paid, you're doing the same job. So, Reggie, if you have that or if you don't, I would like to have it later on. That's all I have right now.

Commissioner Markley said I don't disagree with getting to the mark 100%. I do recognize there's a budget reality that we may need to ease from the 95 to 100% over a couple of years instead of the first year. I will suggest, and this is a little more complicated suggestion, because some of us in the room are more familiar with the situation than others, but I suggest we consider funding a portion of the 2023 amount using the \$3.1M in ARPA dollars that we left unallocated. Obviously, not all \$3.1M, but a portion of this \$1.2M could come from that. I say that because we set that aside for housing related projects, but I don't think that we have a housing related project that is shovel ready enough for us to expend the money within the federal deadline. So, this is a project that I did discuss with Erica. It would be fundable through that source and we would obviously be able to spend it within the deadline if we used it for this purpose. That doesn't save us from having to deal with the budget implications in the outyears because that's a one-time expenditure, but it pushes out the date when we reach the bad numbers for the fund balance. So, I think that's a possibility that we should consider for the 2023 amount.

Commissioner Bynum said sorry, are you suggesting that we fund the entire \$1.29M?

Commissioner Markley said I think we could or any derivative of that. **Commissioner Bynum** said just asking in general. Part of me wonders if we could fund a portion of '23 and a portion of '24 and stretch that money a little longer. **Commissioner Markley** said but then do we meet the deadline problem. **Commissioner Bynum** said I don't remember the deadline, but I thought it was like '25, '26, but I could be way wrong on that.

Commissioner Townsend said let me say, Sheriff, I appreciate your position and coming forward to grapple with this parity issue. What I am concerned about and would not be prepared to do just seeing these numbers right now is to vote on something tonight. I don't know if this is going to be blue sheeted or if that was the intention, but I for one would need more time to look this over.

I would not be in favor of using ARPA dollars right now as we sit here for this. We did extensive community engagement and paying public servants out of this money was never anticipated or talked about, not that you all are not deserving, but I for one could not support that right now.

My other concern is not just the short run, but the long-term ability to pay and if part of what the Sheriff is asking is 95% or parity of whatever our police officers are getting, I'm not sure that we've actually come to terms of what that's going to be yet. So my concern is that these numbers would not be the same until there's a determination of final determination about that.

Sheriff, I appreciate your situation, want to continue to try to look it out, but I'm certainly one not prepared to take any kind of action on it tonight if that's what we're proposing be done.

The other question I have, Sheriff, you had also come to us about a program that was a lot less. Is that still on the table, is that still your ask? **Sheriff Soptic** said that program starts up—we're finalizing the details for that and that'll be up in January. **Commissioner Townsend** asked, has that already been included in the budget. Was that already part of our—**Sheriff Soptic** said it's already in my budget and one thing I should have been a little more clear to, the resolution that relates to this tonight, is only a resolution of support to meet that 95% and so I think how that gets done is probably a discussion to be had, but it's a resolution to support to get us there. That's my ask tonight.

Commissioner Townsend said I appreciate that clarification. I still have the same reservations though tonight.

Commissioner Kane asked, didn't the Sheriff in Johnson County sue the Commission? The Commission finally woke up and said we're going to go ahead and give this much money, correct? **Sheriff Soptic** said I don't want to speak out of turn. From what I understand of the situation, he just reminded them of his statutory obligation and authority. **Commissioner Kane** said and that's my point. We have an obligation. There are things written in there that we have to supply the Sheriff with the appropriate amount of whatever it is and I don't—he won't go that route, but I don't want him to think he would have to go that route and then public safety is a priority to our residents. If we can't keep people here or we train them up and get them going and then they go to Johnson County and make a hell of a lot more money, so I would support the modification and maybe we don't have to vote on it tonight, but I think we need to give him what he needs to perform his job and the rest of his crew.

Commissioner Davis said, Sheriff, thank you so much and when we met we had really good discussions and I'm glad to see that the recommendation that I made is up for discussion. I agree with Commissioner Townsend. I'll explain this to some of my colleagues. As far as the ARPA money, it's one-time money. It's money that's going to be gone. I would rather see that money, because it's a one-time, go to make a long-term impact. I think there's an argument that could be made that if we were to use ARPA to pay for one year and then not necessarily solve this issue long term, are we really saying that there's parity or that you're as valuable because we've not made that long-term commitment.

My thinking is if we're going to go this route, let's go this route; however, I do have a question. Is there a reason why we didn't send this to standing committee and kind of go through this process? Is there a time limit on this? **Sheriff Soptic** said not as much a time limit as, you know, we continue to lose staff and every day that I can't—you know you mentioned Johnson County, Commissioner, you do get that—I'm going to use the word, wow factor, I guess, you're able to show those that hey, this is what we now offer. This is what we can now do. It's a competitive world. Everybody, I think, knows that. Anybody that owns a business, goes to a business, you know, we're no different and so it's just every day we wait, that's another applicant that I've possibly lost, an employee that I'm possibly losing and so for me it is timely. I can't say that there's an expiration date, but that's why I tried to do this during the budget process and even in that time, we've lost employees.

Commissioner Davis said I'm sorry, I've had a hard time hearing you talking over here. **Sheriff Soptic** said if I could add something, I apologize, our staffing numbers are—you know, it's not like we've just gotten a little short. I mean we're definitely at some extremely dangerous levels and so there is some fire behind me to get it done, so it's definitely timely.

Commissioner Davis said what I would like to see, because I do think Commissioner Townsend brings up a good point, what we may want to do is find a way that is sustainable. My worry with this and I guess, Mayor, I'll just ask you. What commitment can we get to get the Sheriff back on the agenda to kind of figure this out in a way that's a little bit more methodical, not necessarily putting in red tape. I mean sitting on Economic Development & Finance—I mean we could see this next month and maybe get some recommendations on budget adjustments from other county departments and maybe see if we have some cost savings and things that we said that

we were going to spend money on that we're not so that we can make the adjustment and so that we can ease that burden, but give Sheriff Soptic the assurance that this is going to go through.

I do agree with Commissioner Townsend and I actually want to apologize to you, Sheriff, because the way that we did our budget should not have been standard practice and I've met with other commissioners. We're going to start talking about the 2024 Budget next month because you should have—we should have had you come to us earlier so that we can weigh your priorities and your needs with everything else and make a methodical decision. Mayor, can we get that commitment from you to kind of see this through for Sheriff. Okay, thank you.

Sheriff Soptic said if I could just add two things, some of this stuff is popping back in my head. The money that relates to the adjustment of my pay, the majority of it has already been budgeted. It was already put there. The change just couldn't be made because it takes this process, so that is far less impact. I think to your question, and I don't want to speak out of turn, so please, Misty, or somebody, stop me if I'm wrong, but by adopting that resolution of support tonight, that's essentially what you are doing is saying yes, we'll get you to the 95. We don't know how, but we'll get you there.

Mayor Garner said just a point of order. We've got two more commissioners that have questions and for staff to be able to transition us to full session, we'll need to wrap this up within the next five minutes.

Commissioner Burroughs said I think it is fundable. I think with the reduction in farmouts, with reduction in farming out our prisoners, and with the reduction of overtime if you go to full staffing with a more competitive wage, and I do also believe that these numbers are—the numbers that are presented here tonight, is that at 100% staffing level? **Sheriff Soptic** said no. **Commissioner Burroughs** said it's not. It's just at what present staffing level is it Reggie? **Mr. Lindsey** said 80%. **Commissioner Burroughs** said 80% staffing level. **Mr. Lindsey** said currently Sheriff Soptic is at 70%. **Commissioner Burroughs** said so you're not even—that won't even be at 100% staffing level and by that time we should have some turnover and within a three to five year budget, which will come in at lower salaries and less benefits, I think it's doable and I respect the fact that you're asking your employees to be treated fair and responsibly. I've got no problem with the 95%. I've got no problem with the 100% because I believe public safety is an important issue and

we need to send a message to our law enforcement community and to our public servants that we as commissioners support you.

Mayor Garner asked, can you repeat that Mr. Lindsay, the number? **Mr. Lindsey** said 80. The number that you asked about earlier, across the board, what we have it funded at now, it would be like \$200K more dollars. **Someone** said I'm in favor (inaudible).

Commissioner Bynum said I will try to be as brief as possible. I'm trying to wrap my head around how this plays into the current Lodge 40 contract and I'll just spit it all out and then you can answer. The contract that's negotiated speaks to increases in pay—**Sheriff Soptic** said by percentage. **Commissioner Bynum** said so this would increase the base pay. **Sheriff Soptic** said correct. **Commissioner Bynum** said the contract then speaks to the percentage increase—**Sheriff Soptic** said correct—**Commissioner Bynum** said year over year and so are both of those sets of increases reflected in the analysis? **Mr. Lindsey** said yes, they are.

Commissioner Bynum said I agree with Commissioner Burroughs because one thing I was thinking was if we can get to 80% or 100%, then possibly we can reduce overtime, but I don't know that yet. I would like to see it. So, I would like a sheet that gives me a little more information. I'm willing to support a resolution that states that I support getting you to 95% parity without committing us to the numbers because I don't think I have enough info yet.

Mr. Lindsey, I am just really—I've been trying to do this math as I sit here—are you laughing at me doing that—that is kind of funny. I'm going to need help with how this gets us to .47% of our reserve by 2027, so I'm just going to need help getting there with the math is all I'm saying. Again, I'm willing to support the resolution because you all remember that we've already added stuff to our budget that puts us in a pretty serious crisis. You know I don't mean like what's a couple million more, but I do kind of mean that, because we're faced with finding a serious correction is the point and I don't mean to be flippant. **Sheriff Soptic** said I understand. **Commissioner Bynum** said but we're already faced with making serious steps to correct this imbalance that we're in, so I'll stop.

Sheriff Soptic said I guess what I would ask of the group and the Commission and the Mayor is—I'm a little new to this, what we need to do to ensure that those two resolutions get added to your regular session coming up? **Mayor Garner** said I'll get to that Sheriff.

Commissioner Stites said I'm still not comfortable with the fact that we're saying hey Sheriff Department officers, we're going to still give you 5% less than what the patrol officers make. I'm in support of a—if we're going to get there, we're going to get there, and let's get there now. Not we're going to promise you and maybe this comes and you know maybe later and we get there. I don't know, whatever. It's 100%, in my opinion, and I support the resolution that we adopt the intent to get to 100%, not 95 or 65, it's equal across the board, 100%.

Commissioner Townsend said the Sheriff and I have talked and he knows that I am supportive of what he's trying to do here, but I am uncomfortable not knowing what the final numbers are going to be for the Police. We haven't approved a contract yet, so these numbers are all speculative to me. They may be close, but I don't know about that.

The other thing is we didn't have to wait to do something like this. I mean we could have had this a couple of weeks ago or present this now and do it at the next meeting. I don't want to put it off until infinity, but again, I'm concerned about if action is taken and some of the numbers we're talking about here, how are we going to meet those paydays for the Sheriff, Fire and Police.

What I would like to see is what is going to change maybe in other aspects of our budget. We used to get to that. If we give to A, we're reducing in B, C or D somehow and I'm not hearing that. That's not for the Sheriff to tell us, so that's why I am cautious and actually nervous. I'll share it with you because I would have to be accountable to constituents about why—hey, why aren't funds being paid for our Police, our Sheriff, or Fire; whatever those funds are, or why aren't we going forward with the other projects. So, this just makes me nervous the way this is being done. Sheriff, I support you. You're worth every dime, you and all your people, it's just how are we going to do that in a responsible ongoing way.

Mr. Lindsey said, Commissioner Townsend, I would like to advise you, the Police is a city function, so their dollars come from the city and Sheriff Soptic's funding comes from the county and right now we're only looking at the county. The contract with the city is from city funding.

Commissioner Townsend said thank you, Mr. Lindsey. You are over the moon as you always are and just right on it, but I am looking at the entire Unified Government budget and so I know all of this has spillover effect, but I get where you're coming from. I appreciate that.

Mayor Garner said if I'm hearing the Commission correctly, I'm just going to lay it out in three options. I know that Commissioner Townsend wants more information. That's one option. I can direct the Administrator to get you more information and give you more time. The other option that Commissioner Davis brought forward is to make more of a commitment to the Sheriff's ask, which we could push this to standing committee. The information can still be got as Commissioner Townsend has requested, that debate can be had. Input could be, as we know standing committee, community intake has been taken from the public as well. The other option is to honor the Sheriff's request tonight and I think some commissioners expressed that—that resolution of 95% at a minimum. I think one question that's unclear to me, Chief Counsel, does that commitment commit in the resolution to the 95% moving forward or is it just a resolution that says we will get there as a Commission once—if it's acceptable to this Commission? **Misty Brown, Chief Counsel**, said the resolution of support that I drafted, Mayor, essentially recognizes the Sheriff's duties and supports increasing the base salary of the sworn Sheriff's Office employees to achieve up to 90% pay parity and then it directs the Administrator and yourself and other Unified Government staff to take other action, research and analysis. It's a resolution of support, but it's also being passed with an expectation that action is going to be taken that's going to effectuate this.

Mayor Garner said Commissioner Markley just gave me another option that's kind of out there. That last option is to take it to standing committee with the resolution which still commits, Sheriff, this Commission to trying to reach that threshold. I guess I'm still a little unclear, is this Commission and this Unified Government obligated to that 95% if that resolution moves forward tonight and is passed? **Ms. Brown** said no, Mayor. You wouldn't be obligated, but you would probably—the governing body would have some explaining to do to the Sheriff if he had an action that he wished to bring forward saying he couldn't do his statutory duties. **Someone** was inaudible. **Mayor Garner** said yes, Commissioner Stites, it has 100%.

Mayor Garner said as the Mayor, I would recommend that the resolution move forward tonight. I do support that if you're going to have a great Wyandotte County, you have to have a safe Wyandotte County. So, I just recommend that we support the resolution tonight and move it forward to full commission meeting for final approval by this Commission and then move it—that and everything that we've talked about to standing committee for further discussion. Is this Commission in line with that? Okay.

Ms. Brown said one question Mayor. Are you in support of moving forward a resolution with 95% or 100%? **Someone** said I think we need a thumbs up. **Mayor Garner** asked, do we want 100% or do we want 95%? **Someone** was inaudible. **Mayor Garner** said let me do it like this, 95%, if you just raise your hand, 100%. It looks like we got 100%. So you can make that adjustment Chief Counsel. So, it looks like the resolution will go forward tonight. We'll blue sheet that and further debate will be had and if it's approved, we will move that to standing committee for final discussion and it will come back around and that's a commitment to you, Sheriff, for a final disposition of where we're at as far as your ask.

Sheriff Soptic said the other Sheriff's pay, adjust resolution. **Mayor Garner** said that will go along with it as well and I believe that—just based on what we have tonight, everything will be 100%.

Mayor Garner said this concludes our Special Session and I have to apologize to the public that is watching. Due to us going somewhat over the time necessary, I'm allowing our staff and IT team to get our regular commission meeting up and running, we will need to reconvene the formal Unified Government Commission meeting at about 7:15 to 7:20, so please be patient, bear with us with these technical difficulties.

Commissioner Markley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kane, to adjourn. Roll call was taken and there were nine "Ayes," Markley, Stites, Davis, Bynum, Burroughs, Townsend, McKiernan, Ramirez, Kane.

MAYOR GARNER ADJOURNED

THE MEETING AT 7:00 p.m.

Monica L. Sparks
Acting Unified Government Clerk

dt

October 27, 2022