

Speaker 1 ([05:47](#)):

City Commission meeting. I'm going to pass

Speaker 2 ([05:49](#)):

It over to Sherry.

Speaker 3 ([05:52](#)):

Thank you and good evening everyone. Please remember to silence your cell phones to minimize distractions During the meeting when the mayor calls for public comment, please approach the podium to indicate you wish to speak. Virtual participants should use the raise hand function to indicate they wish to speak. When prompted, please select join as panelists. There will be a brief delay as your role changes. Excuse me. Once your name is called, please unmute and turn on your camera. To provide your comments, please state your name and zip code. Before speaking. The city reserves the right to turn videos off or mute participants. All comments will be limited to three minutes. The primary format for accessing or participating in this meeting is in person at City Hall. Virtual access to view or participate in the meeting cannot be guaranteed. The chat function will not be monitored. If you have any trouble, the meeting can be viewed on the city's YouTube channel and cable channel 25. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker 2 ([06:56](#)):

Thank you Sherry. Appreciate it. Okay. The first item is item A. To approve the agenda, city commission reserves the right to amend, supplement, or reorder the agenda during the meeting. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

Speaker 4 ([07:08](#)):

Move to approve the agenda. Second.

Speaker 2 ([07:11](#)):

Motion to approve the agenda by Finkel Dye. Second by Larson. All in favor say aye. Aye. Motion passes. Five zero. Next item on the agenda is the consent agenda and the items on the consent agenda are considered under one motion and approve by one motion. Members of the governing body may remove items for separate discussion if desired. Members of the public may remove items identified as quasi-judicial. For separate discussion if desired, members of the public will be limited to three minutes. For comments. I have one item to remove, which is item B eight B. Is there any other items to be removed from the consent? The consent agenda item commissioners?

Speaker 4 ([07:55](#)):

I don't. Samuel Carter had asked for B five. I don't see him here. Is he online? Let's see. I don't think so. I

Speaker 2 ([08:05](#)):

Can't see that.

Speaker 4 ([08:08](#)):

Okay. I am fine then. He didn't say why, he

Speaker 5 ([08:11](#)):

Didn't say why. No, I don't know.

Speaker 4 ([08:13](#)):

Yeah. Okay. I'm fine then.

Speaker 5 ([08:16](#)):

No, I reached out to him so I don't know if he plans on just doing general public comment.

Speaker 4 ([08:21](#)):

Okay. Okay.

Speaker 5 ([08:22](#)):

So I did follow up on his email. Okay. I'm not sure if he wants to pull or not. Okay.

Speaker 3 ([08:29](#)):

And you said B eight B though?

Speaker 2 ([08:31](#)):

That's correct.

Speaker 3 ([08:32](#)):

Okay. Just want to make sure I have that right. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([08:34](#)):

B eight B for me. And do we need to remove B five then or no?

Speaker 4 ([08:38](#)):

Nope.

Speaker 2 ([08:38](#)):

Okay. Alright then are there any other items that are required for removal? Do I have a motion with the omission of B eight B to approve the consent agenda?

Speaker 4 ([08:53](#)):

Move to approve the consent with the exception of B eight B second.

Speaker 2 ([08:59](#)):

Motion by fin dye, second by Larson. All in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 5 ([09:03](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 2 ([09:05](#)):

Motion passes. Five zero. Okay, so I just wanted to remove item B eight B just to make sure we highlighted the discussion related to the diminishing funds related to our supplemental agreement with LCS for this year, as well as the desire for fundraising to be a source of income in the future and to try to

focus the attention of LCS on outside fundraising because as time goes by, this money is going to go away and I want to make sure that we as a commission are acknowledging that this money is going to be diminished and that we want to make sure that we're trying to help move the process along where if there is the need for additional funding for this temporary shelter that we have the money available from a source that's more reliable than the city is currently. That's all.

Speaker 5 ([10:08](#)):

Mayor, in your comments, you said temporary shelter, are you talking about funding as relates to temporary sheltering that we have going on with pallet shelter or are you speaking in general to emergency sheltering, which is what LCS provides, which is a resource in our community?

Speaker 2 ([10:25](#)):

Yeah. Well, I'm talking about the LCSS mission currently that we're hiring them to conduct in the future, which is this 12 month agreement. And so we need to agree that we're diminishing the funds. So this highlights the fact that we're cutting their funds in the future and that we as leaders need to admit that if this is the amount of money that's necessary to carry out these missions, there needs to be an alternate source of funding

Speaker 5 ([10:51](#)):

As it relates to their general operating funds as an emergency shelter.

Speaker 2 ([10:54](#)):

Correct.

Speaker 5 ([10:54](#)):

Not to their temporary sheltering needs. No. Gotcha. Just wanted to make sure that was clarified.  
Emergency

Speaker 2 ([10:59](#)):

Shelter.

Speaker 5 ([11:00](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 2 ([11:08](#)):

Okay. So no general comment from the commission. Any public comment on this item?

Speaker 5 ([11:18](#)):

Did we not have staff here? Was there anything from staff, not to interrupt for public comment, was there anything from staff that you needed?

Speaker 2 ([11:25](#)):

No, I let the city manager know I was going to pull this for just to discuss it between us and we have a comment or an opportunity to make sure that we highlight the need for other sources of income as we reduce our contributions to the emergency sheltering.

Speaker 5 ([11:41](#)):

So do we have staff here or anyone from LCS online to speak to the agreement? We do. Okay. Had to

Speaker 6 ([11:53](#)):

Staff. I could maybe speak on this a little bit.

Speaker 5 ([11:58](#)):

Let's have current staff first, but I do like to hear,

Speaker 2 ([12:02](#)):

Yeah, I would like to get public comment on this. I don't think I need any insight from staff at this moment. I just want to make sure that we as a commission acknowledge the fact that we're cutting funding in the future from a sustainability standpoint, that we acknowledge that publicly and that we talk about how we would supplement that income in the future.

Speaker 5 ([12:22](#)):

Okay. And that's part of the agreement? Excuse me? That's part of the agreement.

Speaker 2 ([12:25](#)):

That's right.

Speaker 5 ([12:25](#)):

Correct. That's

Speaker 2 ([12:25](#)):

Why I wanted to make sure we talked about it

Speaker 5 ([12:27](#)):

And I don't have any disagreement as far as the agreement. I think as normal protocol is when we have things on the agenda, we have comments, we have questions from the commission if there's staff or anyone to speak on it, to speak on it. Then we have public comment. So I just want to make sure there's anyone from LCS or staff wanted to speak on the agreement since the motion is to approve the funding agreement and you're bringing up the question as it relates to ensuring that there's recognition and understanding that that funding agreement will be diminished year by year. So I would like to hear from either staff or if there's someone from LCS that would like to comment in regards to this.

Speaker 2 ([13:13](#)):

Thank you. Appreciate that. So is there anybody from LCS or from the city would like to comment on this?

Speaker 5 ([13:20](#)):

I was told that Mr. Chisholm, the executive director is on

Speaker 7 ([13:28](#)):

Mayor. This is Brandon McGuire, assistant city manager. I can provide a few summary comments of the contract and James Chisholm, the executive director of LCS, is also on to provide any comments and answer any questions. So the contract before you is the next year's contract about three and a half million dollars, which is a slight increase from the expiring contract, which in total is \$3.43 million. The funding sources and the allocation to the different funding sources are explained in the memo, but generally speaking, this contract is funded with special alcohol tax, the recently voter approved affordable housing and homeless solution sales tax as well as general fund dollars. This is the first year that we are funding the agreement without the assistance of federal funding with the covid relief funds. So we are very grateful to the community for supporting this initiative and this contract by imposing a sales tax increase on themselves.

(14:49):

The contract, I think the contracts attached the scope of work is very comprehensive. I do just want to point out that with this year's contract, I think we're gaining quite a bit of cost efficiency, not just in LCS agreeing to do fundraising and reduce their dependency on city funds, but also through the addition of what we're calling the Pallet 24 project. So we are currently working on installing 24 pallet cabins at LCS, which will provide on a regular night, I think 24 non congregate units for folks who are going to be harder to serve and maybe this is their first step towards sheltering and seeking services. It can also help with capacity expansion during winter weather operations where we can potentially double up in those cabins. So asking LCS to do that and they're committing to doing that as well as a number of other service level increases related to case management and winter sheltering and other aspects pointed out in the scope of work attached to the agreement. So I'd be happy to answer any other questions commissioners might have and it just reminds you James is on also.

Speaker 5 (16:13):

Just quickly, Brandon, do we know as of right now how federal dollars as it relates to ESG and continuum of care, is there any indication that those funds could potentially be dissolved on the federal level?

Speaker 7 (16:31):

Well, the funding freeze, the federal funding freeze by executive order a couple of weeks ago was extremely alarming and that potentially could have shut down all funding federal funding to all COCs, not just Kansas but nationally. And of course co CS serve as a pass through funder of those federal funds for virtually all the nonprofits working in this space. So it is greatly concerning, but at this point we don't have any specific indication that programs like ESG will be defunded.

Speaker 5 (17:16):

Thank you Brandon.

Speaker 2 (17:21):

So Brandon, you mentioned that James was online. Is that correct?

Speaker 7 (17:28):

Yes, sir.

Speaker 2 (17:29):

Great. Okay. Well maybe James can comment on my desire to discuss external fundraising as a source of income for future operations and making sure that we use this time to ramp up to the period where we might not have federal funds available for some of these services as well as the ability for us to continue

to operate and serve these people in the best ability that we can using all the great tools and resources that we've created.

Speaker 8 ([18:05](#)):

Hello Mayors Anders kind of spot you can, I want to, the thing that putting forward have agreed to next year develop a produce our dependence on the city's funding by 10%, which is in the contract and by next year we'll reduce it another 15%. In order to do that, we have started restructuring our organization and one of the things we've done is hire or contract with a director of strategic development and public relations. And specifically part of those duties are to create a development team and to identify and secure grants sponsorships and donations and to assist in the cultivation of relationships with funders and donors to support the organization's programs and initiatives in planning and executing fundraising events and campaigns. And we plan to have a comprehensive plan put forward to the Homeless Solutions Division sometime in April with that plan. The person we contracted with is Barry Ker and we've been working since the beginning of the year to start that development team, so we are well aware of wanting to,

Speaker 9 ([19:35](#)):

They decided they didn't need to because they got our tax money. I thought it was offensive that after LCS got our tax money, they stopped budgeting money for fundraising. They used to, I have the reports if anybody from the newspaper cares to actually report on that stuff, but you guys spin a story that we're going to start to do this to reduce the need. The reality is is LCS needs to be more self-sustaining if they're going to do anything the way they're doing right now. You guys are going to contract with Barry Fiker. I've talked to some experts in the Northeast Kansas area and one of the common quotes that I get is that Barry's mentality is more of warehousing rather than housing. He's less about affordable housing and getting people structurally housed permanently than he is in just temporarily solving the problem. Which leads us back to one of the first things James mentioned here just now.

([20:34](#)):

One of the first things they're going to do is hire somebody to do pr. I don't know if you realize that, but part of the scope of that guy's work was to improve relations with the community. When are you guys going to understand when you want to improve relations with the community? Start treating the community with some fucking respect. \$2,200 in donations through GoFundMe, \$3,500 through Venmo, another 580 in individual donations, and all of that was matched dollar for dollar by Pinnacle propane. Nobody died this year from propane, but your city, people like to put out that press statement in the Lawrence Journal, urinal, swirl, whatever we're going to call it, that propane kills and they wouldn't support that. That's your homeless resource team reaching out to the community and building relationships. Nobody died this year from the cold, did they? You're welcome. And my viewers say you're welcome because it's offensive that we got shoved aside and maligned in the media when we were all about saving lives in some deathly cold temperatures that we had this year offensive. The shelter was kicking people out when it was 50 below, refusing to let 'em in 50 below the normal. So we were at temperatures 10 15 below zero. I was out there for just a few minutes and my fingers went numb. Can you imagine living out there on the street 24 7? I know Amber can't.

Speaker 10 ([22:22](#)):

Good evening. Okay, I am trying to get this thing to go down, but I don't, oh, here we go. Okay, thank you. Thank you. I have sent several emails to city commissioners and I've sent emails to the director of the Lawrence Community Shelter and I apologize I had the wrong email address on some of those, but on one I think I got through. I have not heard anything from the director. However, I can document the case to which Michael referred of two individuals and their dog who were told that LCS was full when it was very, very cold. And I found out on this through Facebook and I did in fact take them to Motel six where

the desk clerk was very happy to help and we got them housed. They had set up a blanket behind a dumpster on ninth of Massachusetts Street. This is not helping and I do want to alert you to some possible alternatives.

(23:28):

I'll be very clear. I do not think you should give more money to the Lawrence Community Shelter. I think before any kind of fundraising initiatives are done, you need to get some regulatory oversight from outside the town, from outside the individuals running it to make sure that what happens in there is in compliance and is not just safe, but is also caring and compassionate and competent. I think that you have put too much money into this. I also think that the Homeless Solutions Division is failing. We know this from their wildly inaccurate point in time. Count of 43 unhoused, unsheltered individuals. All you have to do is drive down Massachusetts Street or Vermont and you will see otherwise. I want to call your attention to permanent supportive housing, which is not, by the way, housing first or treatment first. I sent you all a video.

(24:29):

This video was sent to me by someone who is not a member of the advocacy group but a business owner. This is a very viable solution. I also will send you information about Eden Village in Kansas City. This is permanent supportive housing. They're tiny homes. These individuals have support from mental health workers, healthcare workers. They're taken to food pantries, they're allowed to keep their pets. If you want to end homelessness in Lawrence, if that is actually your end game, this is a more promising solution than putting more money into warehousing temporary shelters. If you simply want to remove the unhoused from the downtown area, camp sweeps, as we know, will not do it. We have had evidence of this for quite some time, so for three years plus, I've been calling attention the attention of this commission to the problems that have occurred with the unhoused. You can do a pivot as one of your members mentioned in an email to me and turn this around, surround

Speaker 4 (25:39):

Nancy.

Speaker 11 (25:54):

Hello, I'm Joe. I'm with Justice Matters. I just want to thank the commissioners for your support of a Place for Everyone plan and this critical part of it. The Lawrence Community Shelter as previous speakers have said, this is a hard problem and it's not the kind of thing that things are going to go perfectly. I think there's going to be a lot of stopping and starting with things, but we're committed to this course of action and I appreciate the city committing to this course of action. To the degree that the community shelter is funded through the place for Everyone Plan, we fully support it. And regarding Mayor Deaver's concern about the funding being diminishing each year and needing to be supported by alternatives, I think I would personally want to help with that. If there's a way to do that. I think there's a lot of people in the community that would support that and want to keep that going. Not to say that as the previous speaker mentioned, there might've been things that happened that could be done differently. Of course, those conversations have to go on as they always do in any organization. We want that to continue. But I think supporting this plan, keeping going with what we're doing and really trying to turn the tide on the homeless problem in Lawrence is the right thing for this commission to be doing. We fully support it. Thank you.

Speaker 6 (27:47):

I have been working in industries that deal with homelessness in our community for a long time now. I would say approximately five years, and I remember the last time that we cut funding to the shelter. The impact ended up having to be, we had the camp outside of Johnny's and then the pallet village. And I

think that right now we're talking about funding streams, getting funding streams down the line when we can't even guarantee what our economy's going to be like in the next five months. We know that there's going to be tacks on effects that may impact our ability to get donations. We know that they're trying to gut federal funding and I understand folks are talking about the shelter's focus being warehousing people. Yes, of course that's what the shelter is supposed to do. It's not there to be permanent housing. It's there to be for an emergency for people who for whatever reason need some place to stay temporarily.

(28:51):

Rarely. The answer is always going to be you have to house people and that's not going to be cheap, but it's going to be cheaper than the alternatives and it's not immediately going to show up on it as a budget line on a sheet. So I understand that finances are going to be what they are, but I encourage you all to identify that what you're recommending right now is based on sets of conditions that are not going to be present six months from now. So just I honestly would pause it. Let's see what the impacts of Trump's regime is going to be because we've got tariffs, we've got all these other things, we're going to have sticker shock that we haven't felt yet and people's wallets are going to close up real quick. So that's all on this one. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 12 (29:55):

Alright, you ready? Eric Hyde, 6, 6 0 4 4. I live in the Polar Lofts. I'm running for City Commission. So you're interested in pulling this item, which I agree with and I'll tell you my reasons why I think it lacks transparency. And I wrote a comment that I had posted the agenda, but I don't really want to focus on that. I just want to focus on the fact that it lacks transparency because a lot of the homeless problems in Lawrence funnel to Bur Nash or they're directed there for services there, case management and stuff like that, whether that's direct or indirect, it does happen. We know this and I think there's a little bit of a conflict of interest here. I hate saying that just because someone on the city commission has a relationship with somebody who works at Burt Nash and this stuff really isn't divulged in the agenda item report. And so yeah, lacks transparency.

(31:31):

Let's see here. What else did I want to say? Oh, I saw Officer Collado out there. I like Officer Collado. We've had an experience before where I was standing up to some stuff and anyway, I like him. We talked about I am majoring at in philosophy. We talked about, he asked me who my favorite philosopher is and I said Emmanuel Kant, because he talked about the categorical imperative, which is live your life as if every act that you do becomes universal law. And so basically what I'm trying to get at is at the homeless shelter and giving them money. That's okay and I appreciate all the other stuff that was mentioned by the assistant city manager and all that stuff, but money's not the real answer here. The answer is the categorical imperative, just doing the right thing and they really need to turn to the Lord, which just simply means I am that I am. It's not really a Christian thing or anything like that. It's just God. And we need to understand more about that and I don't have much time to speak. We just need to do the right thing. Everybody, we just need to hear everybody out.

Speaker 2 (32:56):

Thanks Eric. Any other public comment in the room? See none. Anybody online would like to speak to this matter? Sherry I

Speaker 3 (33:15):

Noir.

Speaker 2 (33:17):

Okay, very good. Alright, if there's any other commissioner comments on the public comment or the item we discussed?

Speaker 5 (33:27):

Yeah, I have a couple of things since we pulled it. I do appreciate hearing the comments from everyone this evening. There are a couple of things that stuck out that I think will help us kind of understand. This is an ongoing commitment from the city as well as from the community under a place for everyone to address houselessness in our community and that an emergency shelter is essential to that and that for some reason we've kind of gotten into this and it's not just us, it's globally that an emergency shelter is not a community benefit. And I know that sounds funky, but it's the idea is that in the event that someone signs themselves without that there is a place for them to go and that there are options and opportunities for them to seek shelter when that may not be an option to double up or something of some sort.

(34:29):

And that's what an emergency shelter is. Some communities have more robust shelters than others, some have other ways of dealing with emergency sheltering. But yes, we do need to have some sort of infrastructure in place to address that because these are individuals who are either seeking work, are working, find themselves without, and we don't need to perpetuate that for them. So I think for me to say it's important for those to hear me say an emergency shelter is a community benefit because at any 0.1 of us may have to utilize it, may or may not, but I think we'd all rather have that safety net there than not have it there. I know there was conversation about housing first and earn a supportive housing and it's not an either or. I like to use the example that housing first is a playbook and permanent supportive housing is a play.

(35:33):

So it's a strategy. It's not permanent supportive housing versus housing first. So you don't have to use the housing first playbook. You can use another playbook. You can create your own playbook, but permanent supportive housing should be a part of your playbook in any of that. So I don't want us to create this narrative that we're doing something in lieu of something else and that's not the case. So a place for everyone speaks to housing first and utilizes the strategy of permanent supportive housing, which leads into the relationship that we have with the county in this. It is our charge to oversee emergency sheltering. It is through our partnership with the county that we seek five supporting housing solutions within our county. I mean emergency sheltering in the city, which is supported by some outside the city, but also those that permanent supportive housing is a part of the county's work and in partnership with us.

(36:33):

That's what a place for everyone speaks to. That's the work we're getting to. That's the work we're building on. It is funky, it is clunky, I get it, but we're moving there. We don't have a plan sitting on a shelf collecting dust. We're actually doing something with it where we may have some difficulties with some of our community partners in building that out. There's still opportunity to do that. We just have to be able to figure out and identify those gaps and not perpetuate the gaps, but figure out a way that we can fill those gaps collectively and not adversarially. So with the approval of this, just like anything that we approve as far as funding agreements, we have the ability to claw back. So if things are going great and LCS doesn't need the money, we can definitely either claw back or change the agreement. We can amend the agreement. If something happens on a federal level where it looks like many of our partners are going to be impacted by this work, we can again amend the agreement and change it. But this is what we're saying we're going to commit to as of right now, but as a commission, it is our authority to amend things. We can use that authority if we want to use it.

(37:49):

But I do want to reiterate that there, what Brandon stated, that there is some possibilities, and I don't want to harp on that, but we do, as we are moving forward with this agreement, we do need to be honest with ourselves about what it could look like if federal dollars were to disappear and how we would pivot and be innovative in that space to address that. So that is a charge for not only city staff, but it's importantly as a charge for these commission and these commissioners that sit on this day, but figure out policy-wise, what would that look like? So I'm in supportive of the agreement for now. If we need to make some adjustments and amendments, we will do that. The only thing I will speak to as it relates specifically in the agreement is under Exhibit A, part B, Roman Numer three number two key personnel and positions. So I'm speaking directly to LCS on this because there's been conversations in other circles about how do we, from a funding standpoint, from a wage standpoint and from a sustainability standpoint, we need to invest in personnel.

(39:08):

A long time ago had a family member who was a licensed mental health technician. You don't hear that phrase very much in this circle, but an LMHT has a lot more depth and opportunity than calling someone a case manager. So if we are not pouring in and developing individuals to be strong, supportive case managers, all we are doing is giving lip service to this work and we're going to continue to see just a revolving door of folks going in and out. We need to start investing in folks. So I hope that is something that can come of this funding an opportunity, whether it's with a partner here in the region or even a national partner, but we need to figure out a way to support case management staff so that they feel comfortable and competent and confident in doing their job and that they're not drinking from a fire hose every single day because this is difficult work.

(40:07):

Case management is probably some of the most toughest work out there because it's doing the work that a lot of folks wouldn't even dare think. It's helping people at their worst when they're at their worst, when they need someone to be not just sympathetic and empathetic to them, but an encouragement to them. So I would like to see LCS invest in that because I think that will help. I mean, anyone that's in behavioral health needs to invest in that, but as it stands, I'm in supportive of the funding agreement. If there's something that piques my curiosity and we need to bring this back to the commission to make some adjustments, we have that authority and ability to do it.

Speaker 2 (40:45):

Thank you. Anybody else want to comment?

Speaker 4 (40:50):

Well said.

Speaker 2 (40:51):

Okay. Very good.

Speaker 4 (40:52):

All said. Yeah.

Speaker 2 (40:54):

So is there a motion to approve item B eight?

Speaker 4 (40:57):

Move to authorize to city a manager to execute a funding agreement with Lawrence Community Shelter in the amount of 3,500,000 for the operation V Cs emergency shelter in the Village. Second

Speaker 2 ([41:08](#)):

Motion by Finkel Dice, seconded by sellers. All in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 1 ([41:12](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 2 ([41:13](#)):

Those opposed? Motion passes. Five zero. Okay, we'll move on to commission items. I just have one KU student Senate had reached out to me the opportunity to delegate a ex-officio person who would be elected by their body, who might show up to our meetings and monitor them and then report back to the students senate on what's happening here at our meetings. And then also maybe bring forth during public comment items that are occurring up at ku I feel like might be something we could consider. I had received some stuff in writing and I was going to share it with you all via email, but I just wanted to make sure it would be something we might consider to kind of get feedback from the student population and also for them to relate to what's going on at the city and some of the management responsibilities we have kind of highlight the city of Lawrence and not just the University of Kansas. So I feel like it might be a good opportunity. I know this may have come up in the past, but I just wanted to bring it up and see if anyone might be interested in pursuing that matter.

Speaker 4 ([42:25](#)):

Yeah, when I was mayor, just during Covid, they were trying to come up with a way to do that and they never executed it, so there was a lot of things going on at that point. So I mean, I'm not faulting it for them, but at the time what I read at the time I thought of course,

Speaker 2 ([42:45](#)):

Yes. So they did some documentation and hopefully we'll share it with all of you can look it over and see what you think that I want to talk about it and make sure that y'all thought it might be something that might, I know it had come up in the past and I know there's a great way to try to incorporate part of our population into the city and have them vested in some way that is official and then makes them more accountable, which is what we are all about here.

Speaker 4 ([43:09](#)):

Absolutely. Thank you

Speaker 13 ([43:11](#)):

Mayor. If I may, I have a couple. Sure. So my first one is, if possible, if you guys agree with it, had the opportunity to go visit last week and attend the meeting that Haskell organized regarding their university and the effects of what has happened. And if you guys all agree with it, if we could come together and figure out any sort of letter or any sort of support that under their direction and they would be driving what exactly they would need. If we could go ahead and find a way to support them, I'd really

Speaker 2 ([43:52](#)):

Appreciate

Speaker 13 ([43:53](#)):

It. I know that the Chamber is thinking doing something similar as well, so if we could have staff maybe coordinate something in that regard, I'd really appreciate it. Definitely,

Speaker 4 ([44:04](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 13 ([44:07](#)):

Second one is, I know that from our previous meeting I canceled, unfortunately the proclamation from Mr. Kevin Wilmot was not given and I don't have that in front of me. I couldn't find it, but I just wanted to make sure to give him his kudos on his retirement and his dedication and work in film and all of his achievements and his contributions to the University of Kansas and all the work he's done for Lawrence. So he thought he just needed to be made a note of and held high for all that work he's done. So thanks for mentioning that.

Speaker 3 ([44:43](#)):

We are going to have that on the March four wedding. Okay,

Speaker 13 ([44:46](#)):

Good. Good.

Speaker 5 ([44:50](#)):

Okay, mayor, I have a couple. Yes, just one quick Kansas ledge update. There are a couple of bills that passed the house. We're not at death con nine or anything like that, but there were just a couple of bills that passed the house that are in the Senate right now in committee that for us to keep an eye on. There's one in particular that the legislature wants to dissolve the Kansas low-income housing tax credit that was recently implemented a couple of sessions ago, so we know that that was state matching dollars, the federal iTech dollars, which is another piece we need to keep an eye on that there hasn't been a lot of movement as far as HUD reallocating reauthorizing, not reallocating reauthorizing funds and some of those projects. So just keep eye on that. There was another one in regards to guarantee income that we surely need to keep an eye on, and there's a couple of more, but just that Litech one has, we've had several developers who have received affordable housing tax dollars allocated dollars from us, from Ahab that have utilized those dollars to create access to affordable housing in our community.

([46:06](#)):

So just want us to be vigilant of that. I'm glad you brought up the ex-officio member for ku. I did receive an email from a couple of students that had concerns. They understand jurisdiction, but they did have some concerns in regards to kus housing policy, a gender inclusive housing policy. And so I think it's a little bit of a CYA situation where housing may be offered for gender inclusivity. There was some reference to IBC code and the email that I'll forward through to everyone so that everyone in the commission has, I'll send that through staff so that it can be submitted to anyone that's interested in knowing more about it. But as we talk about housing as it relates to campus housing and off-campus housing for students, I think it's something for us to just keep an eye on and if there's any impact to housing policies as it relates to executive orders that could impact our housing stock. That's something we need to be aware of. And then I know last year I requested this, I don't have a timeline on it. It'd be nice to have it maybe before May, but if we could just get a reprise of the housing inspection report that I requested last year just to see where we're at with inspections as far as those top code violations

([47:36](#)):

And things of that nature so that we can just see how we're progressing in that. And those are all my requests. Okay,

Speaker 2 ([47:42](#)):

So you got that housing?

Speaker 4 ([47:44](#)):

Yeah, I'd be obviously interested in that. I would say it did remind me that one of the things the legislature passed the house, again, not gone through as relating to land development is a building a 60 day,

Speaker 5 ([47:58](#)):

60 day permit,

Speaker 4 ([47:59](#)):

60 day building permit and land disturbance approval that if a city doesn't approve it within 60 days, it's automatically approved. That's not zoning, but it's building permit. And so anyway, just watch to see how that goes through. Talking to Craig and Jeff, I don't know that it's a, I mean we process most of those within 60 days, so it's not a, I mean, and if it passes, we'll do what it says, but clearly it's something to watch. And if they change that to zoning or something else, it would be a whole nother level. But so far it's just building permits and land disturbance.

Speaker 2 ([48:36](#)):

Okay. Anything else? Commission item wise? I, okay. Let's move on to the future agenda items then said March 4th, the next meeting. Any questions or concerns about the next upcoming meetings?

Speaker 1 ([49:00](#)):

No.

Speaker 2 ([49:00](#)):

Okay. All right. Commission calendar, nothing there for me. Anybody have any comments on that? No. Now let's go ahead and move on with the end of our live broadcast this evening, and we will give anyone time to break away so we can move forward to item G, which is the open public comment section of the meeting.

Speaker 10 ([49:48](#)):

Good evening.