

## **MINUTES OF THE MISSION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

January 8, 2020

The Mission Community Development Committee met at Mission City Hall, Wednesday, January 8, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. The following committee members were present: Trent Boultinghouse, Hillary Thomas, Arcie Rothrock, Nick Schlossmacher, Kristin Inman, Debbie Kring, Sollie Flora and Ken Davis. Mayor Appletoft was also present. Councilmember Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Also present were City Administrator Laura Smith, Assistant City Administrator Brian Scott, City Clerk Martha Sumrall, Assistant to the City Administrator Emily Randel, Public Works Director Celia Duran, Parks & Recreation Director Penn Almoney, Chief Ben Hadley, Capt. Kevin Self, and Capt. Kirk Lane.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

### **Presentation on SMAC Establishment of Watershed Organizations**

Ms. Duran provided background information on the Johnson County Stormwater Management Program, particularly current geographical constraints to the program. She introduced Brian Pietig, Lee Kellenberger, and Madison Crowell with Johnson County SMAC.

Mr. Kellenberger presented the following information regarding the Johnson County Stormwater Management Program Strategic Plan Implementation. He stated this information is being shared with all cities in Johnson County (Mission is the 13th out of 14 cities to have the presentation.)

- Stormwater Management Program (SMP) history - the program was established in 1990, the current policies and procedures adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2002, strategic plan focused on watershed-based improvements adopted by the BOCC in 2016, and implementation of the strategic plan via five subcommittees began in 2017. He noted that there has been approximately \$400 million in investment through this program over the past 30 years.
- Consideration of changing how the program functions began in 2013-2014 due to dwindling participation.
- Information on members of the Strategic Plan Steering Committee, including Ms. Duran who is a member, and their work to determine what they like and don't like about the program, as well as benchmarking against other programs.
- The implementation timeline over the past 3.5 years. He stated this has not been easy and noted changes to include funding new project elements and types of projects.

- Stakeholder engagement has included 40 meetings in cities through Johnson County. This has been a grassroots effort.
- Program is taking a new direction and will now be made up of six Watershed Organizations that cross city boundaries. This approach will work better as upstream improvements contribute to issues downstream, and cities downstream must now contribute to the process. The Watershed Organizations follow the natural system of waterflow. Mission will be in Watershed Organization No. 1.
- Organizational framework will have six watershed organizations reporting to the Watershed Advisory Committee, which reports to the Stormwater Management Advisory Council and then to the Board of County Commissioners. Johnson County will help facilitate all meetings. The Stormwater Advisory Committee will keep the same structure with a representative from each city. Municipalities are the only voting members, but other organizations can participate (i.e. Parks & Recreation District, school districts, etc.). He discussed how the cities will work together within the Watershed Organizations.
- Provided information on cities included in each Watershed Organization.
- The “Focus Ahead” for the program, including flooding, water quality, system management, and planning:
  - Flooding - Habitable buildings, streets, Home Buyout Program, and the Homeowners Technical Assistance Program
  - Water Quality - Restore impaired streams/lakes, protection of high quality areas, streambank stabilization, and retrofitting existing infrastructure.
  - System Management - Countywide inventory, condition assessments, replacing failing infrastructure, and natural and manmade flooding.
  - Planning - Watershed master plans, near term and long range improvement projects, and increased level of coordination.
- Programmatic changes include moving to a watershed scope, 5/10/15 year Capital Improvement Plan, 50% County funding for system replacement projects, 100% County funding for significant watershed projects and 50% County funding for local projects, and alternative funding incentivized.
- Next steps including the establishment of the six watershed organizations, watershed master planning, policy and procedure updates, and revised interlocal agreements.

Discussion by the committee continued on dissimilar geography and how funds will be allocated (large vs. small geography of a watershed organization), how projects are scored and funding allocated by their rank/scoring and those projects with the greatest risk reduction when completed, whether this watershed organization framework has worked in other areas (Mr. Kellenberger stated this is a relatively new approach), how the matching funds will be allocated (watershed vs. city) with Mr. Kellenberger stating city projects will still go through the watershed organization (courtesy check) for coordination, transparency and uniformity, and the completion of the Watershed Master Plan in 2020.

Mr. Kellenberger also provided historical information on which areas have been of the greatest concern, (Indian Creek in 2017, Mission in 1998 for example). All cities will adopt the uniform scoring method and he stated that they can help walk the city through this process. He also discussed sinkholes, noting that this program focuses on issues such as a failed pipe, rather than the geology of a sinkhole. The type of pipe used for stormwater management is not dictated by the program unless SMAC funding is included in the project. The committee also discussed whether there is an option to participate in the watershed organization with Mr. Kellenberger stating the only way to participate in the SMAC program is now through the watershed organization. Mr. Kellenberger also provided information on the master planning process that will kick-off in mid-February and be facilitated by Johnson County. The committee also discussed previous issues with shifting of projects over the years and the impact on the project budgets of CIPs of smaller cities. Mr. Kellenberger stated that the County needs to move to a five-year CIP.

This item was informational only and no action was taken.

#### **Acceptance of the December 11, 2019 Community Development Committee Minutes**

Minutes of the December 11, 2019 Community Development Committee were provided to the committee. There being no objections or corrections, the minutes were accepted as presented.

#### **SMAC Agreement for the Establishment of Watershed Organization 1 in Johnson County, Kansas**

Ms. Duran reported that this agreement establishes Mission's participation in Watershed Organization 1 as presented by Mr. Kellenberger at the beginning of this meeting.

Councilmember Schlossmacher recommended the Agreement for the Establishment of Watershed Organization 1 in Johnson County, Kansas be forwarded to Council for approval. All on the committee agreed. This will be a consent agenda item.

Councilmember Thomas asked if participation in the watershed organization will require any additional staff time. Ms. Duran stated it will remain generally the same. Councilmember Davis noted that some of the signature pages on the agreement will need to be updated to reflect the names of newly elected mayors in some cities.

#### **Marketing / Branding Contract**

Ms. Smith stated that over the last several years, there have been ongoing conversations about the need for consistency and cohesiveness in the City's marketing and branding. This issue began with the Parks and Recreation Department, but it became clear during the interview process following the release of a Request for Qualifications for proposals for marketing and design (branding) services, that more clarity was needed on what would best serve the City

overall. She stated that staff contacted each of the three firms interviewed to request a proposal addendum to expand the scope of the project to include the entire organization. In December 2019, the interview panel was expanded to include additional staff and Councilmember Davis, and two local firms were invited back for second interviews. She stated that throughout the process they considered what we need and what we want. The recommendation of the interview committee is to contract with Crux for an annual contract that would provide 60 hours of dedicated staff time and resources from the Crux team each month. The services included in this contract are included in the packet. Ms. Smith discussed the depth and breadth of the Crux team and their ability to become an extension of our staff, functioning in a manner similar to our on-call engineers. The contract would be billed in equal monthly installments (subscription fee) for the 60 hours monthly and the services would include development of a brand and identity, data collection, staff development and training, and standardization of processes and procedures. She stated that they will drive this process (30-60-90 day action plans) to help keep us on track, and their services will help us to understand what we don't know. Ms. Smith also stated that the Comprehensive Plan Update and the ETC DirectionFinder Survey will be tied to this project, which will help to boost our messaging and communication with businesses and residents.

Ms. Smith introduced members of the Crux team present at the meeting - Melea McRae, Founder and CEO, Becky Schieber, Account Director/Senior Writer, and Ryan Hembree, VP, Creative. Ms. Schieber will be Mission's primary contact.

Discussion by the committee included what will happen after the one-year contract expires. Ms. Smith stated we will evaluate the process and bring to Council a recommendation to keep the process moving forward and how to sustain the investment made in this process. She also stated that finding one person to bring on staff with the skill set to accomplish all of this would be challenging.

Councilmember Kring asked how web development will work with our current website provider. Ms. McRea stated Crux will design, write, manage imagery and and work with a web developer, and they work with freelancers. Councilmember Davis stated that Kara Brooks with Crux is the social media manager and will be the fifth person on Mission's team.

Councilmember Schlossmacher requested information on the ability to track data and what can be tracked to show our return on investment (ROI) from Crux. Ms. McRea discussed the ability to track analytics in real time (Google analytics, email marketing and social analytics). Ms. Smith stated both firms were asked about this issue and were candid in stating there is no direct way to calculate the ROI. Ms. Smith stated we will benchmark and set goals as to what we want to achieve, and these will then be measured and tracked.

Councilmember Schlossmacher feels we are not a growing company so there is no need to "boost sales" and asked what the benefit of this project will be for Mission. He also expressed his concerns regarding what our ongoing expenses will be after the initial year of the contract.

Ms. Randel discussed the need to expand our reach for events, etc. and share what we as a City are offering (announcements, public service message, etc) potentially resulting in fewer phone calls, etc. Councilmember Davis stated other areas to promote include the upcoming sales tax renewals, the Comprehensive Plan Update, and dovetailing public relations efforts with current projects.

Councilmember Thomas asked how broad the rebranding would be for the City, and the general process - will decisions be staff driven or by committee. Ms. McRae stated much of this will be determined in the kick-off of the project once there is a full understanding of the stakeholders. She also provided information on a previous rebranding project with the Kansas City Chamber and how that worked (long standing brand and many stakeholders). Mr. Hembree provided information on the need for civic engagement. Mission's process will begin with interviewing the stakeholders, use of metrics and analytics, followed by the 30-60-90 process. It was noted that this strategy can pivot if necessary.

Councilmember Inman stated that one objective was to drive revenues at the Community Center and asked if self-sufficiency rates would be a part of the project. Ms. Smith stated that as Council sets goals, these tools can then be used to help us meet these goals and identify which groups to target. This process will not set cost recovery rates at the Community Center

Councilmember Schlossmacher stated he feels the proposal is good, but feels the scope of the project is too big for what the City needs at this time, especially with the cost. Councilmember Thomas stated that she shares some of these thoughts and expressed her concerns with what will happen in the following years and whether having a person on staff for this project would make more sense. She stated it seems like a lot of the discovery as to what Mission needs for this process was during discussions with Crux. She likes the cafeteria style of the proposal and feels trying it for a year makes sense. Ms. Smith stated we knew the need, but the opportunity to procure the services became clearer during the process. Ms. Smith noted that \$30,000 has been included in the budget for the last two years for this project. Ms. Randel stated that we did not know that what Crux offers even existed, as their model is unique. The Crux model is customized to us and offers opportunities to collaborate, educate our organization, and provide consistent messaging. Councilmember Inman noted the training and implementation included in the proposal. Councilmember Flora asked for confirmation from staff that they feel what makes Crux unique is their implementation process and then follow-through. Ms. Randel stated that is correct and Councilmember Davis stated he likes the breadth of expertise Crux offers (similar to a law firm) and how this will benefit Mission.

Councilmember Schlossmacher stated he does not fully understand what we are trying to get out of this process and used the analogy of feeling we may be buying a new BMW when we could get by with a two-year old Camry. He feels the proposal and presentation were great but he is unsure we need this level of market penetration. Councilmember Flora stated she would

push back on this a bit, and noted previous discussions to support, attract and retain business, and the benefits some of the data analytics could add to this initiative. Discussion continued on what the top priorities would be for this project, with Councilmember Schlossmacher noting that everyone could have different goals and again expressed his concerns with the cost. Councilmember Kring asked who is “the driver” of this program - the City or Crux. Ms. McCrea stated that Crux will be driving this process, but will be listening to stakeholders, doing extensive research, looking at the full family of brands for the City and the overarching message for the City, and will message each department separately. They will also develop communications strategies. There will be monthly check-ins and the establishment of a committee. Councilmember Kring stated she is unsure what we are selling, and feels the City should define what we want and then have Crux provide the “how.” Ms. McCrea stated it is the overarching message for the City and that ultimately we are “selling” economic development to attract residents, businesses, and a workforce. Discussion continued on economic development.

Councilmember Thomas stated with all the different thoughts, she would like to have additional information on potential plans for what will come after Crux, as well as the potential costs. Councilmember Schlossmacher stated he would like more concrete objectives. Councilmember Inman stated there are specific objectives included in the packet (committee process). Councilmember Boultinghouse stated that with a new decade it seems like a good time to move forward with this, as well as new leadership, buy-in from stakeholders, and with development projects bringing new residents to Mission. He feels we have an opportunity to do this the “right way” in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan Update. He stated it can be ambiguous in determining ROI, but if we are going to do it he advocates for doing it the right way and leans toward supporting this at this time. He would also like additional information and discussed the ability to control the narrative at an important time in Mission.

Councilmember Thomas asked where the committee would like to go with this. Councilmember Davis and Flora stated they support moving forward. Councilmember Schlossmacher stated it is not about the firm, but about the scope of the project, noting the cost. Ms. Smith stated that \$60,000 of the \$90,000 had been committed over the past two years, demonstrating our commitment to the project. We now have the opportunity to add \$30,000 to expand the scope of the project. Ms. McCrea discussed the higher cost during the first year, with a reduced rate in the following year. She stated their fee would be \$100/hr in following years (about \$72,000/year) but noted that Mission may not need the full 60 hours per month in the following years resulting in a lesser cost. Councilmember Davis stated that there is scalability to fit our needs in future years. Ms. McCrea stated this is two projects in one - branding and communications - and noted that once the branding is done, it is done.

Councilmember Davis recommended that this be taken to Council. Mayor Appletoft stated he feels this should slow down as he is not sure the objectives are clear to everyone. He suggested staff be given a chance to answer some of the questions raised this evening with Crux and, once additional information is available, bring this back to the committee.

Councilmember Thomas asked that this item be moved to the February committee agenda, potentially taking action at that time. Ms. Smith stated additional information can be brought back to the committee at the February 5 meeting, and possible additional discussion at the City Council Retreat. No action was taken at this time.

### **Department Updates**

Mr. Scott stated Tidal Wave Car Wash has one contractor that is building all of the Tidal Wave Car Washes in Kansas City and is now working to complete a project in Blue Springs. They anticipate beginning work in Mission in mid-February beginning with site work and structure construction in early spring. Councilmember Flora stated that when approved, the company promised to improve the property quickly and this has not yet been done. Mr. Scott stated they completed the waterline work late last summer, and that although they are moving slow the project is moving forward.

Rockcreek Brewery, located at the old RunRite building, pulled a building permit late last summer. The building needed extensive work, but they anticipate a soft opening in March.

Mr. Scott stated Cinergy at the Gateway has seen lots of activity. Final design of the garage is being completed and the footings are going in. They anticipate the parking garage “going up” at the end of February. Ms. Smith stated we will make available to the public the visual of the project that identifies all of the buildings, allowing people to put the Cinergy building in context. She noted the stone veneer going up at the Mission Trails garage which changes the look of the building.

Mr. Scott reported the WCA transition has gone smoothly. He stated there are some issues still with condos who have a bin/corral and determining who is responsible for these. WCA will put carts and bins in those locations at no additional cost to them (as they are already paying through their property taxes.) Waste Management has collected all their old carts and they are staged at the Mission Bowl site. This has been a slow process with some still having trash in them. Staff has been working with them to speed up this process and get it completed as soon as possible. Councilmember Inman asked when WCA will have their new automated trash trucks. Mr. Scott stated they are using a mix of trucks, but there is a long lead time for them to get the trucks they have ordered for our contract.

The planner position has been posted and we hope to have someone hired by the end of February.

Mr. Scott stated he and Ms. Smith will meet with Confluence on the Comprehensive Plan Update process next week.

Councilmember Davis asked for an update on the Mission Bowl. Mr. Scott discussed the owner of the building vs. the owner of the land. The owner of the land now has control of the building

and is cleaning up the site. He has long-term plans for the site. The City will not incur any demolition costs if the property owner moves forward.

Councilmember Kring noted a line issue with Spectrum, and the work that a subcontractor did for Spectrum (ruts in the backyard of a resident). Ms. Duran provided information on how easements work and the rights of the utility, and stated she will reach out to the property owner. She stated it is typical for the company to come back in the spring to correct the problem.

Ms. Duran provided an update on the Broadmoor Project, specifically delays with the traffic signal at Broadmoor and Johnson Drive. There was a manufacturer defect on one pole, but it is in route to Mission and will be installed as soon as possible based on the weather. One mast arm of another installed signal pole has an incorrect bolt pattern (from the manufacturer) and this will need to be corrected. This is causing a delay on the sidewalk completion. Pavement will be completed in the spring due to the weather.

Ms. Duran provided an update on the project at 50th and Dearborn stating that the fiber and gas lines were not located on the plans causing a delay. She stated they are discussing internally how to avoid this in the future.

Ms. Duran stated final plans for the Lamar project should be available in the next few weeks. She stated that the bike lanes (due to the Safe Routes to Schools grant) are being bid by KDOT. Mission will bid the whole project and put in temporary pavement markings while KDOT bids the bike lanes (2 sets of plans).

Ms. Duran stated we have all the necessary easements for the Rock Creek project with the exception of one resident that has not yet been able to meet with staff (she does not anticipate a problem with this) and there is one business that has not yet signed the easement documents. We are working with Mr. Heaven to resolve this issue with the business. She stated we hope to bid this project in January, construction beginning in March or April with construction complete by the end of the year. Councilmember Flora asked for an update on the bid alternates discussed at a previous committee meeting. Ms. Duran stated once we have the bids back, those items will be bid alternates to be decided on by Council with real dollars available. Councilmember Flora asked if one of the "hold outs" is a beneficiary of one of the bid alternates. Ms. Smith stated we can not redesign the project and may need to proceed to condemn an easement. This would come back to Council for approval.

#### **Other**

No other business was discussed.



**Meeting Close**

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting of the Community Development Committee adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Sumrall  
City Clerk