EDGERTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA CITY HALL, 404 EAST NELSON STREET January 27, 2022 7:00 P.M.

Call to Order

- 1. Roll Call _____ Roberts _____ Longanecker _____ Lewis _____ Brown
 - _____ Beem _____ Stambaugh
- 2. Welcome
- 3. Pledge of Allegiance

<u>Consent Agenda</u> (Consent Agenda items will be acted upon by one motion unless a Council member requests an item be removed for discussion and separate action)

4. Approve Minutes from January 13, 2022 Regular City Council Meeting

Motion: ______ Second: _____ Vote: _____

Regular Agenda

- 5. **Declaration.** At this time Council members may declare any conflict or communication they have had that might influence their ability to impartially consider today's issues.
- 6. Public Comments. Persons who wish to address the City Council regarding items on the agenda may do so when called upon by the Mayor. Comments on items not on the agenda, personnel matters or matters pending before court/other outside tribunals are not permitted. Please notify the City Clerk if you wish to speak by signing in at the meeting. Speakers must provide their name and address for the record and are limited to three (3) minutes. Any presentation is for informational purposes only. No action will be taken.
- 7. **Report.** American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Final Rule.

Business Requiring Action

- 8. Report by the City Administrator
 - 502 E 2nd St. Update

9. Report by the Mayor

10. Future Meeting Reminders:

- February 8th: Planning Commission 7:00PM
- February 10th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- February 24th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- March 8th: Planning Commission 7:00PM
- March 10th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- March 24th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- 11. **Adjourn** Motion: ______ Second: _____ Vote: _____

City of Edgerton, Kansas Minutes of City Council Regular Session January 13, 2022

A Regular Session of the City Council (the Council) was held in the Edgerton City Hall, 404 E. Nelson, Edgerton, Kansas on January 13, 2022. The meeting convened at 7:00 PM with Mayor Roberts presiding.

1. ROLL CALL

Clay Longanecker	present
Josh Lewis	present
Josh Beem	present
Jody Brown	present
Josie Stambaugh	present

With a quorum present, the meeting commenced.

Staff in attendance:	City Administrator Beth Linn
	City Attorney Lee Hendricks
	City Clerk Alexandria Clower
	Marketing & Communications Manager Kara Banks

Staff via videoconference:	Finance Director Karen Kindle
	Development Services Director Katy Crow
	Public Works Director Dan Merkh
	CIP Manager Brian Stanley

2. WELCOME

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

<u>Consent Agenda</u> (Consent Agenda items will be acted upon by one motion unless a Council member requests an item be removed for discussion and separate action)

- 4. Approve Minutes from December 9, 2021 Regular City Council Meeting
- 5. Approve Application FP2021-03, Final Plat for Logistics Park Kansas City (LPKC) Fifth Plat Generally Located North of 187th Street Between Kill Creek Road and Waverly Road, Edgerton, Kansas

Councilmember Beem asked that item 5 be removed for further discussion.

Mayor Roberts requested motion on Consent Agenda Item 4, approval of the minutes from December 9, 2021 City Council meeting.

Councilmember Brown made motion to approve consent agenda item 4, seconded by Councilmember Longanecker. The minutes were approved, 5-0.

Consent Agenda Item 5 -

Councilmember Beem stated the reason he wanted to remove this item was because it had been brought to his attention that concerns were raised about him possibly having a conflict of interest with Hillsdale Land and Cattle. He stated he has spoken with the City Attorney and does not believe he has a conflict of interest that would prevent him from voting on items but wanted to bring this to the Council and public's attention.

City Attorney Lee Hendricks stated he was the one who contacted Councilmember Beem because of claims that there might be a conflict of interest. He stated he does not think there is one but would like to discuss this matter in open session in front of the councilmember who raised the alleged conflict and the public who is entitled to understand his review of the matter.

He stated he received Councilmember Stambaugh's email yesterday (January 12, 2022) from Mayor Roberts that raised questions/concerns regarding a possible conflict involving Councilmember Beem. He read the email from Councilmember Stambaugh. A copy of that email is attached as **Exhibit A**.

Mr. Hendricks stated there is nothing in the City Code that has any regulation over, or penalty for, a conflict of interest. There is nothing written that says, in the event of 'x', the Governing Body has to do 'y'. He stated Councilmember Stambaugh is concerned there is a conflict of interest because Councilmember Beem rents from NorthPoint, specifically Hillsdale Land and Cattle which is a subsidiary of NorthPoint, and he therefore should not vote on anything involving NorthPoint. Mr. Hendricks stated he asked Councilmember Beem if he pays rent monthly and if he received any benefits with this agreement. Councilmember Beem stated he has not received benefits of any kind and has paid timely rent each month.

Mr. Hendricks stated he began pulling documents from the Kansas Statutes related to this topic because of the statute referenced in Councilmember Stambaugh's email. He handed out five documents **(see Exhibit B)** to the Governing Body related to the current Kansas Statutes. He stated there is a form councilmembers are required to file with the County which contains certain criteria listed that determines if an elected official has a "substantial interest" in a company or other entity.

He referenced Document 1 and read the highlighted portion, which reflects the five items that fall under the term "substantial interest."

He stated there is no claim that Councilmember Beem has any interest in Hillsdale Land and Cattle; therefore, item 1 would not apply.

He stated regarding item 2, there is no claim that Councilmember Beem has received any income from any business or combination of businesses that the City has dealt with. Councilmember Beem confirmed he has not received any income from those sources.

Mr. Hendricks stated he will come back to item 3.

He stated regarding item 4, Councilmember Beem does not hold position of office in any business.

He stated regarding item 5, Councilmember Beem stated he does not have a conflict, nor has he received any sort of compensation paid to him.

He returned to item 3. Mr. Hendricks stated Councilmember Beem is not benefiting in any way from the agreement he has; Hillsdale Land and Cattle provides a residence, Councilmember Beem provides payment to reside there. He asked Councilmember Beem if this was the agreement. Councilmember Beem stated yes, it is a normal lease. He asked Councilmember Beem if he has received or paid anything beyond rent for the residence. Councilmember Beem answered no.

Mr. Hendricks stated he then began asking himself if there was any possible way there could be a claim under item 3. He stated the only thing he came up with was if Councilmember Beem has the lease and decides to transfer the interest of that lease to another party and asks for money for that lease. He stated this cannot happen because the lease agreement signed has a non-assignment clause.

Mr. Hendricks then referenced document 2 and read the highlighted portion.

He stated based on his review of the situation, he does not believe there is substantial interest in this matter.

Mr. Hendricks then referenced document 3 and read the highlighted portion.

He stated the reason he included documents 2 and 3, has to do with document 4 which specifies the penalties for violations. He stated the penalty for violation of this substantial interest doctrine is a Class B Misdemeanor.

He stated if Councilmember Beem makes disclosure of this situation, which he has done now, there is no substantial interest. Mr. Hendricks stated his recommendation to Council is to follow the guidelines set forth in KSA 75-4303a and asked Council to reference Document 5.

He stated this is Councilmember Beem's call if he decides to vote. Mr. Hendricks stated it is his opinion to Council that the Councilman does not have substantial interest but he recommends the Council seek an advisory opinion from the state's Ethics Commission as allowed by Kansas Statute. He asked Councilmember Beem if he had any objection to getting that report. Councilmember Beem stated he did not have any objection.

Mr. Hendricks asked for a motion to allow him to request that advisory opinion.

Councilmember Stambaugh stated before proceeding, she had some questions and comments. She stated she spoke directly with the attorney at the ethics committee, and he stated this report will have to go to the Johnson County District Attorney himself. She questioned why Councilman Beem is allowed to live in a home that is not zoned for residential dwelling.

Mr. Hendricks said he intended to address the zoning question and would come back to this question.

She continued by saying Hillsdale Land and Cattle is a part of NorthPoint. Mr. Henricks stated yes, they are a subsidiary, which he had stated before. She stated when she spoke with the attorney, he said if there is any thought of a possible conflict, a person can get in more trouble if deemed in conflict. She stated her opinion would be for Councilmember Beem to recuse himself until there is an answer.

Mr. Hendricks stated he would disagree on the District Attorney portion. He stated he must follow what the City Code and state statutes say to do. He stated the DA must work within the bounds of the Kansas Statutes. He stated the role of the council does not involve judgement, regulation or penalty on this item. The state statute clearly states that these questions should be sent to the Ethics Committee and that is his recommendation.

He stated Councilmember Stambaugh mentioned Councilmember Beem living in a NorthPoint owned home that is not zoned for residential dwelling. He stated the property was rezoned from RUR to L-P, but the City has seen multiple situations with property owners that remained in residential dwellings post-rezoning. He stated the use occurring prior to rezoning is allowed as a non-conforming prior use, so long as it is continuous for a year. He stated this is how the City's UDC is specifically listed and this is also allowed until buildings start being built and the land begins to change for the new zoned use.

He stated this is not a violation as it is clearly stated in the City's UDC. He added however, were it a violation, it would be a violation against the property owner, not against the resident who is leasing. He stated this has no bearing on the question of Councilmember Beem being able to vote or tonight's agenda item.

Councilmember Stambaugh asked if Mr. Hendricks could circle back around to timeframe of dwelling.

Mayor Roberts stated the clock starts from the point of rezoning.

Mr. Hendricks said Councilmember Beem's residential zoning has no bearing on the issue at hand or if Councilmember Beem should be allowed to vote on this item or any item.

Councilmember Stambaugh stated when she saw this happen, she was confused and concerned because of the conflict. She asked Councilmember Beem how he came into a lease agreement with them. She stated he must know someone with NorthPoint, which she believes would be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Hendricks stated this meeting should not be a deposition on Councilmember Beem. He stated in a city the size of Edgerton, there are connections all over the City. He stated if there is an ethical conflict, it needs to be dealt with. He stated rather than saying it is Councilmember

Beem's call and moving on, the Council can ask for an official opinion using a tried-and-true method from the Kansas Statute to get that answer.

Mayor Roberts stated the Kansas Ethics Commission is obligated to give an opinion.

Mr. Hendricks stated it is rare that the statutes are this clear, but Document 5 clearly states the process for filing for an opinion. He stated once the City receives that opinion, the City is legally protected. He stated again that Councilmember Beem can vote how he so chooses or recuse himself, but tonight is about a request for motion to send the letter to the Ethics Commission and get an answer on this matter.

With no further questions or comments, Mayor Roberts requested a motion to direct the City Attorney to obtain an opinion from the Kansas Ethics Committee.

Councilmember Longanecker moved to approve the above-mentioned motion, seconded by Councilmember Lewis. The motion was approved, 5-0.

Mayor Roberts stated he is not sure how long this process will take but does know the Ethics Commission posts everything on their website and their opinion will be there once it is complete.

Mayor Roberts asked Councilmember Beem what he would like to do related to voting or abstaining on Consent Agenda Item 5.

Councilmember Beem stated with all the information presented tonight, he believes he does not have a conflict in this matter. He stated he will vote.

With no further questions or comments Mayor Roberts requested a motion to approve Consent Agenda Item 5, approval of Application FP2021-03.

Councilmember Longanecker made motion to approve consent agenda item 5, seconded by Councilmember Brown. The item was approved, 4-1 with Councilmember Stambaugh voting no.

Regular Agenda

6. **Declaration.** There were no declarations made by the Governing Body.

- 7. Public Comments. There were no public comments.
- 8. Announcement. Holiday Home Decorating Contest Winners.

Ms. Kara Banks addressed the Council. She showed photos of the winning homes from the 2021 Holiday Home Decorating Contest.

She said the first-place winner is in the audience tonight, Mr. Randy Clements. She invited him up to the dais to accept a certificate and a gift card for his participation.

Mayor Roberts thanked Mr. Clements for putting lights up each year and added this is great for the community and everyone loves getting out to look at the lights.

Mr. Clements thanked Council for the prize and stated he enjoys setting up the lights each year.

Business Requiring Action

9. CONSIDER A CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AND SCOPE OF WORK WITH ETC INSTITUTE FOR THE 2022 CITIZEN SURVEY

Ms. Kara Banks addressed the Council. She stated in 2012, 2015, 2018, and 2020 the City contracted with ETC Institute perform a citizen survey. She stated the results of those surveys have been used to assist the Governing Body in prioritizing funding and resources during the preparation of the annual budget. She stated staff would recommend contracting again with ETC Institute to perform the 2022 citizen survey.

She stated the draft contract includes the responsibilities for both ETC and the City. She stated new this year, ETC is including a question on the survey asking residents to opt in for a chance to win a \$500 Visa gift card funded by ETC.

Mayor Roberts asked if staff could give a brief description of who ETC is for those that are new to Council.

City Administrator Beth Linn stated ETC is headquartered in Olathe, and they are one of the nation's most well-known municipal survey companies. She stated one thing that is different for Edgerton than most other cities is that every household in Edgerton receives a survey. In Olathe for example, only a certain percentage of households receive a survey. She stated for ETC to say the City will receive 200 surveys back is a large amount for about 650 households.

Mayor Roberts stated the survey has been a useful tool to determine those overall community desires. He stated he is very supportive of this.

Councilmember Longanecker asked if 200 surveys are the rough estimate of what they think they will get back.

Ms. Linn stated it is the requirement. She stated usually in the first push of surveys out, they get about half that back, they'll then send emails, phone calls, etc. to pull data and get people participating to make sure they get the 200 surveys back.

With no further questions or comments, Mayor Roberts requested motion to approve the 2022 Citizen Survey with ETC Institute.

Councilmember Lewis moved to approve the contract with ETC Institute for the 2022 citizen survey, seconded by Councilmember Brown. The contract was approved, 5-0.

10. CONSIDER ON-CALL MASTER SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF EDGERTON AND BURNS & MCDONNELL INC. FOR ON-CALL WATER & WASTEWATER ENGINEERING SERVICES

Public Works Director Dan Merkh addressed the Council. He stated during the 2021 Wastewater Master Plan work session, staff presented the need for additional services to maintain the model, run development scenarios, analyze existing infrastructure for capacity, as well as many other services. He stated these services are best acquired through a Master Services Agreement (MSA) which defines a scope of services for Engineering Services for the Water and Wastewater disciplines for the City to select and utilize.

He stated this MSA is an on-call contract, which means whenever a need arises, staff will solicit the contract holder and create a task order. That order will identify the scope of work, set a budget and set a schedule to complete. He stated the task order is project specific and the only method of payment is to the MSA contract holder. He stated the City will only pay for hours worked.

He stated one thing to note is that the funding source could change depending on the task order issued.

He asked Cliff Cate, representative for Burns and McDonnell, to give a brief background for the company.

Mr. Cate stated he appreciates being able to work with the City for 20+ years. He stated much of the work the company does is in the KC Metro area. He stated they are excited to continue working with the City and provide these services for the community.

Mayor Roberts stated having this system in place allows for the City to be more proactive than reactive to calls concerning the Water and Wastewater systems. He then requested a motion to approve the On Call Master Services Agreement with Burns and McDonnell.

Councilmember Longanecker moved to approve the agreement, seconded by Councilmember Beem. The agreement was approved, 5-0.

11. CONSIDER A MONTH-TO-MONTH CONTRACT EXTENSION WITH CLEMENTS CLEANING SERVICE TO PROVIDE JANITORIAL SERVICES FOR THE EDGERTON CITY HALL AND AUXILIARY OFFICE SPACE UNTIL MARCH 31, 2022

Ms. Linn addressed the Council. She stated in November 2021, the Governing Body approved a one-year contract extension with Clements Cleaning Service, the City's janitorial services vendor since 2012. She stated following that meeting, staff further discussed with Clements regarding the increase in costs of cleaning supplies, etc. and based on those discussion, staff issued a Request for Bid for Janitorial Services for 2022.

She stated in the meantime, staff would recommend a month-to-month contract extension with Clements for January 1, 2022 to March 31, 2022. Before the end date of the contract, staff will present the bid results for consideration by the City Council. The City Attorney also added a requirement that Clements provide written thirty-day notice of desire to terminate the contract, but the City may terminate at any time. She stated all other elements of the contract remain the same as was approved in November 2021.

Councilmember Longanecker asked if the budget of \$19,000 is the yearly amount.

Ms. Linn stated yes, that is the annual amount budgeted. She stated the governing body approved the annual contract, this one for consideration tonight is for a month-to-month until bids are brought to the Governing Body for consideration and approval.

With no further questions or comments, Mayor Roberts requested a motion to approve the month-to-month contract for janitorial services with Clements Cleaning Service.

Councilmember Lewis moved to approve the contract with Clements Cleaning Service, seconded by Councilmember Brown. The contract was approved, 5-0.

12. Report by the City Administrator

• Marketing and Communications Update:

Ms. Banks addressed the Council. She stated since August, the City's Facebook page has grown to more than 1,100 followers with an average post reach of 6,500 in the last 30 days. She stated the audience continues to be mainly women, with the City's website reaching more men. She stated Twitter has nearly 160 followers. She stated as far as media coverage, the top 3 stories were related to the Edgerton Crossing development and the Wichita State study.

• Miscellaneous Updates:

Ms. Linn stated the final code enforcement report is at the Council's dais for 2021. She stated there will be a new community development format coming in April for 2022.

She stated the newest Governing Body handbook from the League of Kansas Municipalities is at each Councilmember's seat. She stated staff is working on additional training as we move forward.

She stated she also put at the dais the current COVID-19 mitigation measures that are in place for City staff. She stated this includes measures such as all staff being required to wear masks inside City facilities. Staff must also work in place, which means staff does not travel to and from other facilities unless necessary. All staff meetings are conducted via Teams if possible, and if an in-person meeting is required, social distancing and masks are required of staff. She stated changes have been made to court to allow for more social distancing and fewer people within the space.

She stated Mayor Roberts signed two executive orders that declare a local declaration of emergency which postpone or cancel events within the City through the end of January. She stated for example, the annual town hall meeting with the Sheriff's Office has been postponed.

She stated senior lunch, dominoes and a few other recreation programs had to be either cancelled or postponed as well.

Mayor Roberts stated reports are saying the new COVID-19 strain is more contagious than prior strains. He stated many businesses are having issues opening due to lack of staff. He stated City Hall was pretty lean this week with only two people working, so the measures are temporary until the City can get through this season.

Ms. Linn stated she would like to have Council save the date for a new community event approved by the Governing Body. This event, called Meat Inferno, will take place October 7th & 8th, and will be Edgerton's first Kansas City Barbeque Society-sanctioned competition in downtown. She stated more details are to come, but right now they are looking at trying to do a backyard competition and a kid's barbeque competition.

13. Report by the Mayor. Mayor Roberts had no report to give.

14. Future Meeting Reminders:

- January 27th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- February 8th: Planning Commission 7:00PM
- February 10th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- February 24th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- March 8th: Planning Commission 7:00PM
- March 10th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM
- March 24th: City Council Meeting 7:00PM

15. Adjourn

Councilmember Beem moved to adjourn, seconded by Councilmember Longanecker. All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 PM.

Submitted by Alexandria Clower, City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

Lee W. Hendricks STUMBO HANSON, LLP. 2887 SW MacVicar Ave. Topeka, KS 66611 (785) 267-3410 phone (785) 267-9516 fax



IMPORTANT: DO NOT read, copy or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail communication contains confidential and/or personal information intended only for the addressee. If you have received this communication in error, please call us (collect) immediately at (785) 267-3410 and ask to speak to the sender of this communication. Also, please e-mail the sender and notify the sender immediately that you have received the communication in error. Thank you.

From: Donald Roberts <mayor@edgertonks.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 12:01 PM
To: Lee Hendricks; Beth Linn
Subject: FW: NP/Joshua Beem

Good afternoon Lee,

I am forwarding this email to for a response. Can you please respond and copy me on that response?

Sincerely, Donald Roberts

From: Josie Stambaugh <jstambaugh@edgertonks.org>Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 11:52 AMTo: Donald Roberts <mayor@edgertonks.org>

Subject: NP/Joshua Beem

Mayor Roberts,

I am sending this email in hopes for clarity and resolution. As you are aware, Joshua Beem is currently living in a Northpoint owned home, which was not zoned for residential dwelling. I have contacted several people, including the attorney for the ethics committee and was instructed to also contact the Johnson county DA, as this is a conflict of interest. I have been asked by several residents why this would be allowed and I am bringing this issue to you, prior to contacting the DA and city attorney. Is or has Joshua Beem filed a recusal for himself where Northpoint is concerned? I believe this would be the legal way to prevent a conflict of interest case. I was given reference numbers according to recuse of a councilmen and why this would be relevant in this case. 754303 requires him to file a report of interest.

An individual listed as a local official or an appointed official who has taken a part of a contract with someone who has substantial interest would be someone who would have an obligation to recuse themself.

A question asked by the attorney was, has there been a public bid or motion in this case? Joshua, to my knowledge should have filed disclosure statements of substantial interest regarding him leasing property from a developer in which he votes on.

This email is my suggestion on having him file an emergency recusal regarding Northpoint. I hope I hear from from you prior to the meeting, although I am willing to openly discuss this, as it is a public concern.

Thank you, Josie Stambaugh

Get Outlook for iOS

EXHIBIT B

75-4301a. Governmental ethics applicable to local governmental subdivisions; definitions. As used in K.S.A. 75-4302a, 75-4303a, 75-4304, 75-4305 and 75-4306, and amendments thereto:

(a) "Substantial interest" means any of the following: (1) If an individual or an individual's spouse, either individually or collectively, has owned within the preceding 12 months a legal or equitable interest exceeding \$5,000 or 5% of any business, whichever is less, the individual has a substantial interest in that business.

(2) If an individual or an individual's spouse, either individually or collectively, has received during the preceding calendar year compensation which is or will be required to be included as taxable income on federal income tax returns of the individual and spouse in an aggregate amount of \$2,000 from any business or combination of businesses, the individual has a substantial interest in that business or combination of businesses.

(3) If an individual or an individual's spouse, either individually or collectively, has received in the preceding 12 months, without reasonable and valuable consideration, goods or services having an aggregate value of \$500 or more from a business or combination of businesses, the individual has a substantial interest in that business or combination of businesses.

(4) If an individual or an individual's spouse holds the position of officer, director, associate, partner or proprietor of any business, other than an organization exempt from federal taxation of corporations under section 501(c)(3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (10) or (19) of chapter 26 of the United States code, the individual has a substantial interest in that business, irrespective of the amount of compensation received by the individual or individual's spouse.

(5) If an individual or an individual's spouse receives compensation which is a portion or percentage of each separate fee or commission paid to a business or combination of businesses, the individual has a substantial interest in any client or customer who pays fees or commissions to the business or combination of businesses from which fees or commissions the individual or the individual's spouse, either individually or collectively, received an aggregate of \$2,000 or more in the preceding calendar year.

As used in this subsection, "client or customer" means a business or combination of businesses.

(b) "Business" means any corporation, association, partnership, proprietorship, trust, joint venture, and every other business interest, including ownership or use of land for income.

(c) "Local governmental employee" means any employee of any governmental subdivision or any of its agencies.

(d) "Local governmental officer" means any elected or appointed officer of any governmental subdivision or any of its agencies.

(e) "Candidate for local office" means any candidate for nomination or election to any elective office of a governmental subdivision.

(f) "Governmental subdivision" means any city, county, township, school district, drainage district or other governmental subdivision of the state having authority to receive or hold public moneys or funds.

(g) "Contracts" means agreements including but not limited to sales and conveyances of real and personal property and agreements for the performance of services.

(h) "Acts" means the exercise of power or authority or performance of any duty incident to public office or employment.

(i) "Compensation" means any money, thing of value or economic benefit conferred on, or received by, any person in return for services rendered, or to be rendered, by that person or another, but shall not mean nor include reimbursement of reasonable expenses if the reimbursement does not exceed the amount actually expended for the expenses and it is substantiated by an itemization of expenses.

(j) "Preceding calendar year" has its usual meaning, except that in the case of candidates and individuals newly appointed to office or employment, it means the 12

months immediately preceding a required filing date. History: L. 1990, ch. 306, § 14; L. 1991, ch. 150, § 45; July 1.

75-4304. Same; making or participating in certain contracts prohibited; exceptions; abstaining from action. (a) No local governmental officer or employee shall, in the capacity of such an officer or employee, make or participate in the making of a contract with any person or business by which the officer or employee is employed or in whose business the officer or employee has a substantial interest.

(b) No person or business shall enter into any contract where any local governmental officer or employee, acting in that capacity, is a signatory to or a participant in the making of the contract and is employed by or has a substantial interest in the person or business.

(c) A local governmental officer or employee does not make or participate in the making of a contract if the officer or employee abstains from any action in regard to the contract.

(d) This section shall not apply to the following:

(1) Contracts let after competitive bidding has been advertised for by published notice; and

(2) contracts for property or services for which the price or rate is fixed by law.(e) Any local governmental officer or employee who is convicted of violating this section shall forfeit the office or employment.

History: L. 1970, ch. 366, § 4; L. 1974, ch. 397, § 1; L. 1990, ch. 306, § 17; May 31.

75-4305. Same; filing of report of interest if statement of substantial interest not filed; abstaining from action. (a) Any local governmental officer or employee who has not filed a disclosure of substantial interests shall, before acting upon any matter which will affect any business in which the officer or employee has a substantial interest, file a written report of the nature of the interest with the county election officer of the county in which is located all or the largest geographical part of the officer's or employee's governmental subdivision.

(b) A local governmental officer or employee does not pass or act upon any matter if the officer or employee abstains from any action in regard to the matter.
History: L. 1970, ch. 366, § 5; L. 1974, ch. 397, § 2; L. 1990, ch. 306, § 18; May 31.

75-4306. Penalties for violations; severability. (a) Violation of K.S.A. 75-4304 or 75-4305, and amendments thereto, or failure to make any disclosure of substantial interests required by K.S.A. 75-4302a is a class B misdemeanor.
(b) If any clause, paragraph, subsection or section of this act is held invalid or

(b) If any clause, paragraph, subsection or section of this act is held invalid or unconstitutional it shall be conclusively presumed that the legislature would have enacted the remainder of this act without the invalid or unconstitutional clause, paragraph, subsection or section.

History: L. 1970, ch. 366, § 6; L. 1990, ch. 306, § 19; May 31.

75-4303a. Same; advisory opinions on interpretation or application of act; presumption of compliance with act; filing of opinions; administration of act, rules and regulations. (a) The governmental ethics commission shall render advisory opinions on the interpretation or application of K.S.A. 75-4301a, 75-4302a, 75-4303a, 75-4304, 75-4305 and 75-4306, and amendments thereto. The opinions shall be rendered after receipt of a written request therefor by a local governmental officer or employee or by any person who has filed as a candidate for local office. Any person who requests and receives an advisory opinion and who acts in accordance with its provisions shall be presumed to have complied with the provisions of the general conflict of interests law. A copy of any advisory opinion rendered by the commission shall be filed by the commission in the office of the secretary of state, and any opinion so filed shall be open to public inspection. All requests for advisory opinions shall be directed to the secretary of state who shall notify the commission thereof.

(b) The governmental ethics commission shall administer K.S.A. 75-4301a, 75-4302a, 75-4303a, 75-4304, 75-4305 and 75-4306, and amendments thereto, and may adopt rules and regulations therefor.

History: L. 1974, ch. 396, § 1; L. 1981, ch. 171, § 47; L. 1990, ch. 306, § 16; L. 1991, ch. 150, § 42; L. 1998, ch. 117, § 26; July 1.

EDGERTON global routes. local roots. 404 East Nelson Edgerton, KS 66021 P: 913.893.6231 EDGERTONKS.ORG

MEMORANDUM

Date:January 27, 2022To:City of Edgerton Governing BodyFrom:Katy Crow, Development Services DirectorRe:Status Update - 502 E. 2nd Street, Edgerton, Kansas

On October 22, 2020 the Edgerton City Council passed Resolution 10-22-20A which set July 22, 2021 as the deadline which required the owners of 502 E. 2nd Street, Edgerton, Kansas to resolve the dangerous and unfit structure which exists on said property. While progress was made towards resolution of the unfit structure, the Governing Body deemed that additional time was needed for the owner to continue making progress towards correcting the dilapidated condition of the structure. On July 22, 2021 the Edgerton City Council passed Resolution 07-22-21A which continued action taken in Resolution 10-22-20A. As part of the adoption of Resolution 07-22-21A, the Governing Body requested staff provide bimonthly updates on the progress being made at the site. Updates have been provided every two months since July 2021.

On January 19, 2022, City staff was informed by the owner of the property, Juan Abundiz, that no work had occurred on the property since the last status update on November 12, 2021. Mr. Abundiz has been busy with his regular employment and is expecting a new baby and he has been unable to perform any work on the project.

Resolution 07-22-21A requires that the dangerous and unfit structure be resolved by February 24, 2022.

When the initial resolution action was taken on October 22, 2020, the condition of the property was far different than it is today. The property had been in a constant state of violation, with piles of yard waste, miscellaneous debris, and automotive tires strewn about. There was also a camper trailer on site that had not moved in several years that was covered with mold, and it had areas along windows and air vents which indicated that it was not weather/rodent tight. A tall weeds and grass violation also existed.

Having not been occupied for several years, the structure itself was also in a state of disrepair. Several windows were broken and the front door was not secure. There was also some roof damage from large tree limbs falling on the structure.

The current owner has resolved all of the exterior concerns which brought about the initial resolution in October 2020. All of the trash and debris have been removed from the site including the camping trailer. At this time, the structure appear to be airtight with all doors and windows intact.

At this time the owner has been notified that the stack of building materials being kept onsite may not stay there if work is not occurring. Additionally, there has not been a formal building inspection by Edgerton's contracted building inspector (GBA) since July 16, 2021. Pursuant to City of Edgerton Code of Regulations For Buildings and Construction (Article 2, Section 5 (d)(2), an issued building permit becomes null and void if the building or work authorized by said permit has not progressed to the point of the next required inspection within 180 days of either the issuance of the permit, or from the date of the last inspection. When this occurs, the following step must be taken before any work can resume on the property:

 Before such work can be recommenced, a new permit shall be first obtained to do so, and the fee therefore shall be one half the amount required for a new permit for such work, provided no changes have been made or will be made in the original plans and specifications for such work; and provided further that the untimely progress has not exceeded one year. In order to renew action on a permit that has expired for a period exceeding one year, the permittee shall pay a new full permit fee.

This information has been provided to Mr. Abundiz and he has been made aware that no further work may occur without obtaining a new permit. If he obtains the permit prior to the new one year deadline of July 16, 2022 (date of last timely progress) the permit fee would be one half the original permit fee amount. If he does not obtain a new permit before that date, he would need to pay the entire permit fee amount.

City staff has conferred with the City Attorney regarding resolution of this item and it is recommended that if the City Council agrees that the property has reached a satisfactory condition, confirmation of this action be done via a staff memo placed on the February 10, 2022 Consent Agenda.

City staff would continue to monitor the property for routine code violations and would ensure that an active building permit is secured prior to any future activity occurring onsite.



Photos from Last Walkthrough: November 12, 2021



