

CITY OF CANEY
CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
December 1, 2025

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Elliott called the regular City Council meeting to order at 6:30 pm Monday, December 1, 2025 in the Council Chambers at City Hall located at 100 W 4th Street.

B. ROLL CALL

Present:	Josh Elliot	Mayor
	Jeff Culver	Council, Ward 1
	Mike Holman	Council, Ward 1
	Kenith Butts	Council, Ward 2
	Lori Patterson	Council, Ward 3
	Elizabeth Burch	Council, Ward 3
	Becky Dye	Council, Ward 4

Staff:	Andrea Sibley	City Administrator
	Ike Dye	Police Chief
	Adam Lanter	City Clerk
	Tyler Goza	Deputy City Clerk
	Jalissa Jones	Utilities Clerk
	Nigel Flenar	Code Enforcement Officer

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND INVOCATION

Attendees recited the pledge of allegiance and Mayor Elliott led the invocation.

D. CITIZEN PRESENTATION/VISITOR COMMENTS

Resident Justin Lyons addressed the Governing Body about the lack of a fence ordinance. Mr. Lyons stated that he replaced the fence at his property with an updated fence. He stated that Code Enforcement Officer, Nigel Flenar, stopped by and spoke to his wife about having a permit for the fence. He stated that he was unaware that one was needed but found that it was. He went on to state that Caney's fence permit and guidelines were hard to find and understand when compared to Independence and Coffeyville, where the process is laid out more thoroughly. He stated that his wife ended up finding it and when he came up to City Hall to

submit it, he spoke with the Utility Clerk. He stated that he paid for the permit on the spot and that he was under the impression that she had approved the permit. A few days later an Officer Simmons stopped by and spoke to them about the fence. He went on to state that when the fence got put up, it was the best opportunity for the project, as the weather had now turned. He stated that the City's code is confusing to maneuver. He stated that when he had issues maneuvering the City's code, he attempted to follow state and other municipality guidelines. He asked how long until he heard whether the permit was approved or not. Mayor Elliott stated that if it is approved and the construction follows the code as determined by the Planning and Zoning Board, approval would be swift. If it was rejected, he would be made aware of that and the reasoning for why.

E. REMOVAL OF ITEMS FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items removed from the consent agenda.

F. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

F.1 CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 17, 2025, MEETING.

F.2. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF PERSONNEL EXPENSES:

November 20, 2025	\$46,692.80
-------------------	-------------

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COUNCIL MEMBER PATTERSON, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER HOLMAN, TO APPROVE ITEM F.1. AND F.2. AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

G. OLD BUSINESS

G.1. DISCUSS AND CONSIDER THE DEMOLITION OF THE STRUCTURE AT 203 N STATE.

Staff stated that this item had initially been brought before Council at the November 3, 2025 regular City Council meeting and they had requested that it be brought back on the December 1, 2025, meeting. Staff stated that they had brought multiple options to the Council regarding the property at this time. Staff stated that option was accepting the estimate from G&G Dozer in an amount not to exceed twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000)

and execute resolution 2025-21. Staff went on to state that option 2 was that the property fell within the extended target area for the CDBG Housing Revitalization grant and that the demolition could be completed by the grant. In order to extend the target area, the City will have to pay an additional six hundred and fifty dollars (\$650) to one thousand two hundred and fifty dollar (\$1,250) for this expansion. However, whether the property's demolition was included in the CDBG grant or not, the City would be facing those costs due to the applications that had been received back. It was reiterated that should the property be included in the CDBG grant, it would not be able to be built upon for a period of five (5) years, and the City would not be able to turn around and sell the property either should it be donated to the landbank during that time. Mayor Elliott stated that the City had received twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) for the sale of the old nursing home in town and that those funds could be used to cover the G&G Dozer estimate and then the City would have the option to attempt to sell the land to recoup some of the cost for demolition. He went on to state that he does not love the idea of using the CDBG grant for this because it would lock down the property for five (5) years. City staff clarified that the City would not own the lot after the demolition, it would still be the private citizen's lot, the dangerous structure would just be removed. If they came in and paid their property taxes on it and built a new house on it, they could. Council Member Patterson requested clarification on whether there would still be a lien on the property if the City accepted the estimate. Staff clarified that there would be, however, the property was due to be placed in a tax sale, likely in August 2026, and any liens or fines against the property would be wiped out. Council Member Patterson requested additional information on what would happen if they attempted this under the state's abandoned property statutes. Staff stated that a nonprofit would have to file a petition and provide proper advanced notice to the owners. It was reiterated that despite multiple efforts to contact the property owners, no success had been had to that effect. Council Member Patterson asked if the City pursued the property through the Abandoned Property Act, if it could the City could then take possession of the property. Staff were unsure, but it was clarified that the property fit the bill described by the Abandoned Property Act. Staff did clarify that the Abandoned Property Act would allow the City to take possession of the property, although not immediately there was a process laid in the act that allowed for it. Staff did note that taking possession of the property through the act would have to follow a specific procedure. Council Member Burch requested clarification if the City could file the petition or if it had to be a non-profit. Staff clarified that the filer should be a non-profit, housing developer, or community development group and that the Betterment Group could qualify. Council Member Patterson asked what fees would be involved in that process. Council Member Dye stated that the only court fee associated would be the fee for filing the petition which was one hundred and ninety-five dollars (\$195). Staff offered to seek additional information on the Abandoned Property Act and Mayor Elliott requested that the item be brought back to Council in the last meeting in February.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COUNCIL MEMBER CULVER, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER BURCH TO TABLE THE ITEM UNTIL THE SECOND MEETING IN FEBRUARY.

MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

H. NEW BUSINESS

H.1. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON SRF FUNDING FOR THE CITY OF COFFEYVILLE SUPPLY LINE.

Midwest Engineering Representative, Ben Coltrane, presented to Council on this item. Mr. Coltrane stated that he has been in touch with City staff. He stated that the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (“KDHE”) had extended an offer of SRF loans to the City for the Coffeyville supply line project. The offer includes two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000) in loan forgiveness. In addition to this, CDBG provided an additional one million dollars (\$1,000,000) towards this project. He stated that he is now getting calls inquiring where the City is at with the project since these awards were awarded a year ago. Mr. Coltrane stated that he has three options for the SRF loan for the City. He stated that option 1 is set up as interim financing for the project. This would allow for the project to get started and finish the project. He noted that payments would start one (1) year after the construction was completed and the engineers had signed off on completion. He noted that the component causing the most issues for City staff was that this was written as a twenty (20) year note. He noted that since this was a water project it was possible to have it written as a thirty (30) or forty (40) year note, the terms of the note were malleable. Mr. Coltrane summarized these options with what annual payments would like versus the life of the loan with interest. He stated that the twenty (20) year note had an interest rate of 3.14% and the forty (40) year changes to a 4.19%. That one (1) percent changes the total payments by about three million dollars (\$3,000,000) from six million dollars (\$6,000,000) to nine million dollars (\$9,000,000) for a loan amount of four million three hundred thousand dollars (\$4,300,000). Mr. Coltrane stated that the comfort level from staff that the City could afford for an annual payment was between one hundred and sixty thousand (\$160,000) to one hundred and eighty thousand (\$180,000). He stated that the amounts on the amortization schedule are not in that range but since payments do not begin until one (1) year after the construction is completed, four (4) or five (5) years from now, with the amortization schedule having an additional option to delay payments further with a set principal, there is time to seek additional funding. He recommended between now and then, approaching the USDA to refinance the loan with them due to their lower interest rates. He believed that the City had a very good chance of this as the environmental is complete and the only step left in that process would be approaching the USDA for

approval. Another option that he presented was for staff to seek additional funding between now and loan payments starting to cut down on the cost of the loan. Staff stated that they are still awaiting word on appropriations from the federal government to the amount of five million five hundred thousand dollars (\$5,500,000). He urged caution to not get so much funding that the project cost drops below two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000) because the City would then forfeit the loan forgiveness amount of two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000). Mr. Coltrane stated that he was available for the next four to five years to assist on these options. Staff stated that they have been in contact with federal representatives on the status of appropriations. They learned that three (3) of twelve (12) appropriations bills had been passed by the federal government since the shutdown. Unfortunately, Caney's appropriations request is in one of the nine bills that had not been passed yet. They went on to state that this is not a good thing nor is it a bad thing. Additionally, they stated that the City should hear the results on the Kansas Water Office grant in early February. Staff stated that additionally, The Administrator, Clerk, and Police Chief met with a representative from the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Kansas that was very supportive of the City's project and offered to have her staff assist the City with loan and grant applications. Staff continued to state that they continue to apply to every applicable grant. Staff gave kudos to the Police Department for utilizing all available resources to apply for strategic grants and bring additional dollars into the community. Mr. Coltrane stated that his contacts at the Kansas Water Office that weigh in on the decision for funding allocations, and they all agree that this is a worthwhile project and have stated that they will share their support for the project when the time comes. City staff stated that they are making contacts with high level officials that will help the City obtain funding in the future. Council Member Patterson asked what the timeline on the project was if it was approved. Staff stated that it would be quick and that it was time to move on it, so the City does not lose out on the forgiveness. Mr. Coltrane stated that if it were approved tonight there would be a few items that needed to be executed quickly so that drawdowns could begin this year. Staff reiterated that at the end of the day it is the Governing Body's decision but that further delays could cause the price to continue to balloon and current funding options could change. Council Member Patterson asked which of the options could the budget support. Staff stated that in 2029 when payments commence the budget should be able to support Option one (1), the twenty (20) year option. Mr. Coltrane stated that if the City pursues the USDA option two (2) is moot. Council Member Burch stated that she did not like the interest or total from option three (3), the forty (40) year option. Mayor Elliott and Council Member Culver stated that at the end of the day either we are doing it or we are not, but that it was time to decide. Mayor Elliott stated that it will be a mission for everyone and that it will take the full Council and staff to search for grants. Council Member Patterson asked if it could be voted on tonight with the verbiage on the agenda being what it was. Mayor Elliott asked if it could be pushed to the next council meeting. Mr. Coltrane stated that it would not be

frowned upon but would delay drawdowns potentially into 2026. It was determined that a special meeting would be held the following evening at 6:30pm in the regular meeting location. Mr. Coltrane stated the loan agreement will need to be approved, the ordinance will need to be approved, and a legal opinion from the City Attorney.

H.2. Receive and discuss the third quarter treasury report.

Staff stated that they are aware of a negative in the report and reiterated that the only thing that puts the City in a cash violation is if the ending balance is negative. Not a negative in the quarter. Mayor Elliott inquired whether this was the last quarter with the grocery store. Staff stated it was not as the transition period extended into the fourth quarter.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COUNCIL MEMEBR PATTERSON, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER DYE TO APPROVE THE THIRD QUARTER TREASURY REPORT.

MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

H.3 DISCUSS AND CONSIDER THE CHRISTMAS PARADE ROUTE AND AUTHORIZE THE STREET CLOSURES FOR THE EVENT.

Mayor Elliott asked if it was the same route as previous years. Staff clarified that that was correct and that the route would be from Wood St to High St along Fourth Avenue. The shutdown would start around 5:30 and the street would be reopened after the parade concluded.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COUNCIL MEMBER CULVER, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER DYE TO APPROVE THE CLOSURE OF FOURTH AVE FROM WOOD ST TO HIGH ST ON DECEMBER 4TH, FROM 5:30PM UNTIL THE PARADE CONCLUDED.

H.4. DISCUSS AND CONSIDER THE PURCHASE OF NEW POLICE VEHICLES IN 2026 USING CAPITAL OUTLAY FUNDS.

Staff stated that the staff had begun soliciting bids for this project about a month back. To date, four responses had been received for consideration but that not all of them were able to thoroughly address the needs laid out in the solicitation documents. Staff stressed that this purchase has been budgeted in the capital outlay and is being made within the bounds of the Police Departments 2026 budget and that additional funds were not being requested. Staff stated that the order is in the preferred order and that the documents in front of them

contain all of the information that was received from each vendor. The preferred vendor for this project for staff is Community Leasing Partners in Junction City. Staff stated that they had the best interest rates and were a one stop shop. This vendor would place the order to the manufacturer on behalf of the City and also has an upfitting facility where the vehicles would be upfitted after they arrive at their location. From there they would ship the completed vehicles to the City, and would then ship the vehicles to the Police Department. The next vendor, Landmark Dodge, was comparable. Billing would be annual. The interest rate for Landmark Dodge was 5.44% for the five (5) year lease. The next vendor had a lower down payment, but higher interest rate and the vehicles were vehicles present on their lot, so they would not match. Options three (3) and four (4) were returned late but included and they were not as detailed. Staff continued to state that Community Leasing and Victory were the most recommended. Community Leasing Partners were the most detailed and the upfitter broke down the costs for each vehicle. Breaking down the purchase, there would be four (4) Dodge Durangos for patrol and then a K9 Durango. The K9 Durango will be the most expensive but the upfitting includes door pops and everything for the dog's safety. The quote for it breaks down every piece of equipment going into the vehicles. The maintenance budget on the five (5) vehicles being replaced has exceeded their maintenance budgets consecutively since the Police Chief started. Staff stated that they would prefer to be paying on these new vehicles that they know are reliable rather than spending the same amount of money just to keep the vehicles they have on the road. Council Member Patterson asked if once the current vehicles are sold if the proceeds from those sales would then be put towards the payments on the new vehicles. Staff confirmed that to be true and it would be going back to the Police budget. Staff clarified that these vehicles will be delivered to the City ready to go as well. Council Member Culver sought clarification on the fleet vehicles listed as being the first to go. Staff clarified that that was correct and that the Explorers had to go first. Council Member Burch sought clarification on if there were any mile stipulations. Staff clarified that there were no annual mileage caps and that the vehicles would be staying in Caney and not be take home vehicles for officers living outside of town. Mayor Elliott asked what the timeframe would be once approved. Staff clarified that upon arriving at the upfitter, around seven (7) to eight (8) weeks. Staff believed that they would likely arrive in late February to early March. Mayor Elliott stated that in his opinion the Explorers are junk and that some of the vehicles are not even worth additional necessary changes. He went on to say that the we have gotten into the cycle of taking parts out of one to put into another and he himself had donated an engine to one vehicle to keep it rolling. Staff stated that the lack of strategic planning has resulted in the fleet being neglected. Mayor Elliott inquired if any of the current vehicles could be sold fast to help mitigate some of this cost. Staff clarified that yes that was a possibility, and that some of the vendors had offered trade in options but staff wanted to show the raw numbers and not put a rosy tint on the item. Council Member Holman stated that he'd rather make a mistake because the Council acted rather than be inactive. Mayor

Elliott stated that he initially was not a fan of the Durangos but that he had come around after the Durangos that neighboring Counties had received held up well. Staff stated that once these new vehicles come in, additional standard operating procedures will be implemented to protect these new assets. Council Member Culver stated that he had been here for thirty (30) years, and he could not remember a time that the City had ever purchased a new vehicle. Staff stated that the capital outlay line item has restrictions on how it can be utilized. Council Member Dye stated that at this point it is a need, not a want and this will protect our officers.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COUNCIL MEMBER CULVER, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER PATTERSON TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF FIVE (5) NEW POLICE VEHICLES COMMUNITY LEASING.

MOTION CARRIES 6-0.

H.5. DISCUSS AND CONSIDER VARIOUS BUILDING PERMITS RECEIVED AND APPROVED BY CITY STAFF AND THE PLANNING & ZONING BOARD.

Mayor Elliott stated that this was per Council Member Patterson's request. Council Member Patterson stated that this was more of a for information purposes. Council Member Patterson requested clarification on the process that the building permits go through. Mayor Elliott stated that they are sent to the Planning and Zoning Board and then approved by staff, that Council does not review them. Council Member Burch stated that this needs to be a uniform process and that City staff should be aware and be able to answer questions if people ask what construction is. Staff laid out the process. Staff stated that building permits go to the Planning and Zoning Board then get approved by the Code Enforcement and then returned to the requestor when payment is made. Staff suggested that prior to many of the staff and elected officials starting their tenure in their roles many of these things were not enforced so a degree of compassion should be applied because the enforcement is new. Staff agree with Council Member Burch that the building permit form could use a redo and the process publicized. Mayor Elliott and Council Member Burch concurred that staff should contact the City Attorney about what to do if someone does not get a building permit to improve the enforcement arm of the process.

I. DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

I.1 MAYOR – JOSH ELLIOTT

1. A resident wants to get handicap/ADA compliant playground equipment and requested if City staff could support this idea.

2. New landfill repository with the goal being something for the future of Caney. New location would be on the back NW corner of the current site and paperwork should be forthcoming.
3. All of the water meters are in, save a few 24 hour locations
4. Requested that since a contractor was not used resulting in savings, could the proceeds from scrapping them be used as a bonus for Public Works staff.

I.2 POLICE CHIEF – IKE DYE

1. Working on stop signs at Sixth and Main.
2. Place the Purple Heart plaques.

I.3 CITY ADMINISTRATOR – ANDREA SIBLEY

1. Big donation of trees from John Deere, unsure of where to place them.

I.4 CITY CLERK – ADAM LANTER

1. Working on sending past due water bills to collections.
2. CDBG Housing update.

I.5 DEPUTY CITY CLERK – TYLER GOZA

1. Bond payment issues but were quickly resolved.

I.6. UTILITIES CLERK – JALISSA JONES

1. Water billing issues stemming from the switch over, but they are starting to dwindle.

J. COUNCIL COMMENTS

J.1 COUNCIL MEMBER BURCH

1. Appreciative to Chief Dye for the report

2. Requested that he agenda packet be sent out earlier.
3. Requested information on the staff Christmas party.


J.3. COUNCIL MEMBER BUTTS

1. Gravel at wood and Taylor could use a touch up.

K. INFORMATIONAL

L. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COUNCIL MEMBER CULVER, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER PATTERSON AT 8:15 PM.


Joshua D. Elliott, Mayor

Attest:


Adam Lanter, City Clerk

