

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education, Unified School District No. 466, 704 S. College Street, Scott City, Kansas, Tuesday, October 25, 2022, 7:00 PM.

=====

The Board of Education of Unified School District No. 466 met in special meeting on Tuesday, October 25, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. in the Scott County Courthouse, 303 Court Street, Scott City, KS, with the following members present:

Scott Noll, Lynnette Robinson, Andrew Trout, Steve Kucharik, Jon Berning, Yanet Contreras and Julia Cheney.

Others present were members of the Scott City Council, Scott County Commissioners, Scott County Development Commission, Scott City Clerk, Scott County Clerk, Scott County Appraiser, School Board Clerk, Suzanne Hess, and Rod Haxton.

Katie Eisenhour called the meeting to order at 6:57 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Marie Allen, Scott County Clerk, took roll call for the Scott County Commissioners.

Ruth Becker, Scott City Clerk, took roll call for the Scott City Council.

Suzanne Hess, Scott City School Board Clerk, took roll call for the Scott City Board of Education. All School Board members were present.

Presentation

Katie Eisenhour shared the intent of the meeting is to come together for consensus the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) for drafting the NRP. A proposal was passed out to all Boards and included information on every incentive available in the state of Kansas. Each Clerk tracked information for their respective Board, Council and Commissioners. After this meeting, public notices begin immediately. Board of Education will hold public hearing on 11/14/22 at 7p.m., Scott County Commission will hold public hearing on 11/15/22 at 8 a.m., and Scott City Council will hold public hearing on 11/21/22 at 7:30 p.m.

Katie Eisenhour discussed the following information and requested each Board to vote if they were in agreement:

1. Does the Board support the NRP continuing in the future 2023 - 2033? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
2. Does the Board support the NRP is available for new construction and rehab construction? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
3. Does the Board support adding the restriction the NRP is not available to single family homes converting to multi-family homes? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.


4. Does the Board support the application period begin at onset of project or within 180 days of breaking ground? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
5. Does the Board support lowering the minimum \$40,000 to appraised value to \$15,000 of expenditures cost? All 7 member of the Board of Education agreed.
6. Does the Board support a 10 year term for revised NRP and must honor the 10 years even if NRP changes in 2027? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
7. Does the Board support include garages which are attached or detached, new or rehabbed? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
8. Does the Board support the current delineation the current categories of residential, commercial, industrial and agriculture and have all 4 included? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
9. Does the Board support nearly countywide as listed in packet today? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
10. Does the Board support residential at 95% on first 5 years then step down to 75% on remaining 5 years for residential and 75% across for agriculture, commercial and industrial? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
11. Does the Board support allowing 12 homes currently under-construction or done without a buyer in MIH area to qualify for the NRP? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.
12. Does the Board support transferability for entire term of NRP? All 7 members of the Board of Education agreed.

Each Clerk tracked information for their respective Board, Council and Commissioners and will post their specific information in their minutes.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.


Board President


Board Clerk