

## **MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

### **REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 10, 1997**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:00 A.M., Wednesday, December 10, 1997, in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Thomas G. Winters; with the following present: Chairman Pro Tem Paul W. Hancock; Commissioner Betsy Gwin; Commissioner Melody C. Miller; Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Mr. Jarold D. Harrison, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Daryl Gardner, County Controller; Mr. Marvin Krout, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. Mark Reed, Director, Sedgwick County Zoo; Ms. Louanna Honeycutt Burress, Administrative Officer, Department of Housing & Economic Development; Ms. Lucretia Taylor, Director, Diversity & Employee Relations; Mr. David C. Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Services; Mr. Darren Muci, Director, Purchasing Department; Mr. Fred Ervin, Director, Public Relations; and Ms. Linda M. Leggett, Deputy County Clerk.

### **GUESTS**

Mr. Russ Gordon, Zoological Trustees  
Mr. Floyd Hansen, Program Director, Project Freedom  
Mr. Jaime Lopez, Project Director, Project Freedom

### **INVOCATION**

The Invocation was given by Mr. David Clien of the Christian Businessmen's Committee.

### **FLAG SALUTE**

### **ROLL CALL**

The Clerk reported, after calling roll, that all Commissioners were present.

### **CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting, November 19, 1997**

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of November 19, 1997.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Chairman Winters** said, "Commissioners, you've had an opportunity to review the Minutes, what's the will of the Board?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Minutes of November 19, 1997, as presented.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

**CERTIFICATION AS TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS**

**Mr. Daryl Gardner**, County Controller, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I certify that there are funds available for those items that we have identified requiring expenditure of funds. A listing of those items have been provided to you previously."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Daryl, I see no questions. Thank you. Next item."

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

**A. METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING DEPARTMENT (MAPD).**

**1. CASE NUMBER V-2040 - REQUEST TO VACATE A BUILDING SETBACK LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF 127TH STREET EAST AND 13TH STREET NORTH.**

**Mr. Marvin Krout**, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I have I have four items on the planning agenda for you this morning and this first case is in the White Tail Addition. This is 13th Street and 127th Street. This is part of the White Tail Addition and this portion of the addition is being developed in patio homes. The applicant has a lot that backs up to 127th, that faces Bradford court, which is off of Bradford Circle in that addition. They have a rather small and irregular shaped lot. They have a five-foot wall easement -- this would be 127th Street, it is sort of turned around so this is the north south street. They have a wall easement and a utility easement in the back yard and a rather substantial footprint for the home and the court encroaching into the size of the lot and it is not evenly shaped so their plan for the house requires the garage to encroach to the planted 25 foot front yard that set back by a maximum of 7 ½ feet. They are asking to vacate that portion of the plotted set back that requires a vacation process that is up with the County Commission case at an advertised public hearing deciding on this issue. The property owner and applicant also own most of the nearest lot on either side, so the lot on this side, although there are some lots that have been sold and a few other property owners received notice of the Planning Commission consideration of this item. There was no one who spoke in opposition and the staff and the Planning Commission have recommended approval of the dictation vacation of the building setback. I will try to answer any questions you have on this item."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Commissioner Schroeder."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "Marvin, at one time we had a situation like this in the Huckleberry Addition, where an owner who was building his own home built his garage out into the easement. David, do you recall that one? That situation?"

**Mr. David Spears**, Director, Bureau of Public Services greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "What did we end up doing on that one?"

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Mr. Spears** said, "I think it was in the purview of the City of Derby. They decided that they had to get a building permit and they had put the foundation on the easement and I believe they decided not to allow that. They had to tear out the foundation."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "This happens very rarely."

**Mr. Krout** said, "It was a Derby subdivision so they had responsibility there for reviewing the information."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "This house is not constructed yet."

**Mr. Krout** said, "No."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "The other house was also over a utility easement. In fact, it was already built over the water line."

**Mr. Krout** said, "That's right. As you see in this case, there is a front yard utility easement but they are not encroaching into that utility easement."

**Chairman Winters** said, "I see no other questions. At this time we would open the public hearing to receive public comment. Is there anyone here in the audience who would like to address the Board of County Commissioners concerning our agenda item A-1? Is there anyone here who would like to address us considering A-1? Seeing no one, will close the public hearing and limit comment to Commission and staff. Commissioners, are there other questions?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to approve the Vacation Order and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

- 2. CASE NUMBER 1717 - DEDICATION OF ADDITIONAL STREET OR ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR LEGION STREET IN AN AREA ONE-HALF MILE NORTH OF 53RD STREET (LOT 117, VAN VIEW ADDITION, SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS).**

**Mr. Krout** said, "This is an item that normally would be the kind of item that would come to you through Public Services as a consent item, but we stuck it in with the planning items. Briefly, this is an older lot, an older subdivision that is in the north part of the County between Meridian and the Little Arkansas River. This lot backs up to the Little Arkansas River. It is a very old addition, and very long narrow lots. This is Legion Avenue. This property owner has a house in the rear portion of that lot, wants to sell off the front portion and that took them to what we call the lot split procedure. We can divide a lot administratively under state law without having to go through the replatting process. As part of the process, we did ensure with the Fire Department that this was going to be an adequate way for emergency equipment to get into the rear lot. We also look at any right-of-way utility needs when we do these lot splits. This is a substandard street right-of-way so the lot split was approved subject to the dedication of 15 feet of additional right-of-way along Legion. The instrument has been provided and we are asking you to accept that dedication so that Legion becomes a street to standard right-of-way width. Be glad to answer any questions on this case."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Any questions Commissioners?"

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the Dedication Deed and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Absent at vote
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

**3. CASE NUMBER DR 97-11 - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIFIED ZONING CODE CONCERNING MULTIFAMILY SCREENING REQUIREMENTS.**

**Mr. Krout** said, "Commissioners, this item was initiated by the Wichita City Council back in May. It deals largely with property that develops within the city limits, but because it dealt with the Unified Zoning Code, as well as the City's Landscape Ordinance, the Unified Zoning Code we would like to be as uniform as possible in terms of the City and County both referring to the same document and the same standards. So we are bringing you the portion of this issue that deals with amendments to the Unified Zoning Code. Now I can give you a short version or a long version of this. I guess it is up to you. Let me give you the short version first and then you tell me if you think you want a little bit more context.

"The amendments to the Zoning Resolution for the County would include the following. Number one, in the screening requirements, we have compatibility requirements and those include screening requirements. Today, office, institutional, commercial, and industrial uses have to screen their trash receptacles and mechanical equipment either from residential view or from street view if the project is near the street.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“The Planning Commission and the staff, and yesterday the City Council agreed that in new apartment developments and all this was triggered in May by actually a request for support for tax credits for an apartment project in May of last year. That triggered the City Council to request a review of the screening requirements for all new apartment developments. The direction was fairly open ended. There was some discussion about maybe not just looking at solid screening, maybe walls and not just fences, maybe along streets and not just rear and side yards, maybe looking at surrounding projects with fences or walls even if they're not just adjacent to single family lower density areas. So the staff did look at that overall situation. We made some recommendations. We've went through the City CPO Councils. We had a public hearing with the Planning Commission. We had several developers that came to the first Planning Commission meeting expressing concern about any additional changes or regulations. We met at a special meeting that was actually hosted by Tom Bishop of Mennonite Housing with a number of development interests after that first hearing. We ended up walking through proposals and making some compromises and resulted in what I think was a consensus of those that were present there on some modest changes, not necessarily the changes that the City Council Member who made the motion was looking for in terms of masonry walls though. We came back to the Planning Commission, had a second hearing, the Planning Commission heard from additional speakers and voted to recommend the changes to the Zoning Code and the City's Landscape Ordinance.

“You don't have the City's Landscape Ordinance except for occasional cases where they are close to the City limits and they've been incorporated as part of a CUP or a conditional use or protective overlay. Normally those do not apply. So what is in front of you now in terms of the Unified Zoning Code is one, a requirement that any new multi-family that might develop in the County or mobile home parks, would have to have trash receptacles screened from view if it is close to the street or from a single-family residential area.

“Second, that new apartment projects or mobile home parks, if they are adjacent with a side yard or rear yard to a single-family area, would have to provide either a 15-foot landscape buffer or a solid screening fence. For the City there are additional landscape requirements. If they choose to landscape with a buffer for the County there is not a requirement in terms of numbers of trees or shrubs like there would be in the City. So there was an option of either providing a 15-foot landscape area or a screening fence, which is not now required between apartments and single-family in the zoning code. We require screening between office and commercial and institutional and commercial and industrial uses against residential uses but not multi-family or mobile home parks adjacent to single-family.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“The third change has to do with the existing buffer requirements for office and institutional uses. Today, in the Zoning Code, you have a choice and this is in the City or the County, you have a choice of either providing a 25-foot landscaped yard or a solid screening fence, if you’re office or institutional use next to a single-family area against the side or rear lot line. As part of the proposal, looking at apartments and how to deal with apartments and the City having already had a 15-foot buffer yard for apartments and trying to get some consistency, we thought it was appropriate to look at apartments and office and institutional uses, all with similar moderate intensity uses and so they all could be treated similar. So what we recommended was that for currently office and institutional uses where now the Zoning Code says in order to not have to do a screening fence you have to have a 25 foot landscaped yard, the recommendation here is to reduce that to 15 foot so it will be consistent with the 15-foot yard that we have for apartments next to single family who also, if they provide a 15-foot landscaped yard would not have to screen adjacent to single family with a solid screening fence. That is the short version. Probably that is enough information for you unless you have any questions. I will say that just this morning in reviewing the Resolution, I noticed and I mentioned to the County Counselor that there was a slight error in that section on office and institutional uses and the reduction of the buffer from 25 to 15 feet. We had meant to say that it applies also to apartments. That apartments would have to do a solid screen fence in those situations unless they provide a 15-foot buffer yard. But we left apartments out of one phrase so we do need to revise the Resolution to make that change and we’ll run that through the County Counselor for his approval as to form before we send it to you for signatures. I’ll try to answer any questions that you have now. The City Council did approve the Zoning Code Amendments and the City Landscape Ordinance Amendments. Most of them by a seven to zero vote. There was one that they took out separately and it was six to one approved. That had to do with the reduction of the buffer yard for office and institutional uses.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Commissioner Gwin.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “Thank you Mr. Chairman. Marvin, in the analysis and what the effect on the unincorporated areas of the County would be, that analyses mentions that you require new apartment and mobile home park developments that do not maintain a 15-foot landscape buffer yard abutting low density residential zones to erect solid screening. Is the landscape buffer, does that require the additional landscaping that the City had implemented with minimum tree planting requirements and all that?”



## Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

**Mr. Krout** said, “No. Unless you have a specific case where you have approved a CUP out at 21st and Greenwich for something lets say that would develop in the County still and there were references like we have occasionally, commercial at Belle Terre, references two of the City’s Landscape Ordinances because it is urban type development and we had recommended that it would be appropriate to use the same City landscape standards. But normally, the City Landscape Ordinance and all of its standards are not going to apply, which means that there would be no minimum landscape requirements, no requirements for trees and shrubs in the 15-foot buffer yard, either for apartments or for office or institutional uses if they choose to use the buffer yard rather than a screening fence. They have to have a 15 foot landscaped area, it could be simply grassed and it would meet the qualification of being a landscaped area.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “What cases have you brought to us lately where the City Landscape Ordinance was not required? It seems to me that everything you bring to us requires that on just about everything that we see.”

**Mr. Krout** said, “Well, I don’t think so. Usually it is just larger cases, cases where they are closer to the City. They may or may not be annexed in a short time, but they are in the area of the interest of the City and the City is providing some service and they would be annexing it at some point in the future and the larger scale commercial requests. But I would say, I mean we just had an expansion of an agricultural sales and service center out by Colwich and 53rd Street North and we didn’t require landscaping for a case like that and we wouldn’t typically in a rural or suburban area. If it is in an urbanizing area or a prominent corridor, like the Kellogg corridor or 21st Street, and it is a larger scale development and we are required to do a CUP or protective overlay by the ordinance, those are the kinds of cases that we’re looking at. Not normally though.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “Okay. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you. Commissioner Hancock.”

**Commissioner Hancock** said, “Marvin, this doesn’t happen very often as far as multi-family apartments are concerned, but it does in mobile homes. I’ve seen where mobile home development subdivision parks have been developed in the County very close to the City and I’ll just give you a scenario. They develop first and yet the area around them is rural residential, undeveloped. Would they then be required to do the 15-foot buffer?”

**Mr. Krout** said, “Yes, only if it is a park, which means it would have to basically have public water and public sewer and be developed in a high intensity. But subdivisions, no it wouldn’t apply to those situations.”

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Even though they are not in the incorporated area?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Yes. The requirement for a 15-foot buffer or a fence would be part of the zoning requirements."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Okay. I'm just seeing a situation where by this resolution it tells us that if it is next to single family residence, the 15 feet or a wall . . ."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Screening fence."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Would be necessary. But if there is no residence there."

**Mr. Krout** said, "As it is drafted and as recommended by the Planning Commission, it would apply based upon the zoning. So if the land was undeveloped, it would still apply. The idea there is that someone may . . . we don't want to prejudice the land there next to the mobile home park so that it can be good for nothing other than a mobile home park, so we want to create a buffer so that someone might come in and say I'm still ready to build single family next to this mobile home park. So that's why we require the buffer even if the land is vacant."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "So in other words, all of them have to have it."

**Mr. Krout** said, "If it is a mobile home park or if it is an apartment."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "All of them would have to have the buffer."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "So why don't we just say that?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "They have to have the buffer or the screening. I'm sorry if I haven't made it clear, but that is the intention, is they would have to have a buffer or screening and that would treat them like the Zoning Code currently treats an office or institutional use. You have to have a buffer or screening."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Okay, I got you. Thank you Marvin. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Okay."

## Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Marvin, you said yesterday that the City Council dealt with this yesterday?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Yes. They did approve it."

**Chairman Winters** said, "They did approve it. I'm probably going to be supportive of us going ahead and acting on this today and be in support of it unless someone else has something to say. I know that as we get into this stage, apartment buildings do become an apartment part of a community and the harder and tougher it is to locate them and build them, I think it really becomes a strain. But then I guess we want these projects done in a good fashion."

**Mr. Krout** said, "There was some indication that maybe it will be easier to sell some of these projects if you can say that there will be buffers that are attached to them. That was part of the original discussion was that would these regulations add to the cost of it and discourage people from investing in apartment projects. But I think a lot of that discussion was revolving around continuous masonry walls, which are expensive, which basically almost no one thought was a good idea. Staff didn't think it was necessary, don't think it is necessarily appropriate to wall in these projects. The Police Department and CPO members indicated that the aspect of visibility, that having a requirement for high walls might tend to encourage criminal activity. They were more in favor of additional landscaping in the City than they were masonry walls surrounding the project. That seemed to be a consensus."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Okay. Commissioners, are there other thoughts, comments, or questions? If not, what's the will of the Board?"

### MOTION

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the amendments to the Unified Zoning Code as recommended by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC) and adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Schroeder seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	No
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	No
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

- 4. CASE NUMBER SCZ-0755 - ZONE CHANGE FROM "SF-20" SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (3.4 ACRES) AND "LC" LIMITED COMMERCIAL (3.2 ACRES) TO "SF-6" SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND "LC" LIMITED COMMERCIAL ON PROPERTY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF 21ST STREET NORTH AND GREENWICH ROAD.**

**SLIDE PRESENTATION**

**Mr. Krout** said, "I don't see the applicants or agents, but this involves a portion of a 20-acre parcel. This is Greenwich Road and 21st Street. There is a lot of construction going on on 21st Street for the County's widening project going on in that area. This is K-96 in this area and we are looking at 20 acres that includes a corner that was part of the area zoned by the County many years ago, six acres zoned at each corner or each major intersection within three miles of the City for limited commercial uses. So that limited commercial has been there for some time. This property is owned by East Side Community Church. The church is planning to build at this location in the southern portion of the property. What they are asking to do is to basically reconfigure, I think add a little bit, but basically reconfigure the limited commercial from here to extend instead the frontage along 21st Street and they will be creating four lots along that frontage that they're requesting for limited commercial uses. They have a plat that is currently going through the process also.

"This is a case, because it is over six acres that the Zoning Code requires, the City Zoning Code has required for many years a Community Unit Plan. The Unified Zoning Code doesn't normally require a Community Unit Plan, but says that in a situation like this, where we thought that there ought to be an option for a simple process, which is the protected overlay, where you don't have to supply a big drawing and it is not as complicated or as expensive to prepare, but there would be special conditions recognizing the tracts over six acres for commercial or limited commercial uses should be looked at more closely. The plat does provide good access control along 21st Street. There are shared access points between each of those four lots, only two access points along 21st Street.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“The protective overlay proposes to add conditions that are similar to other developments that have been approved in this area. If you recall, within the past couple of years, the proposal for a theater complex required about 20 acres of Limited Commercial here. Another development had about 20 acres of commercial and then industrial to the north of that. Both of those projects have the same kinds of references to the same kind of development standards that are proposed here today which include the reference to the City’s Landscape Ordinance, restrictions on signs, the access, which is being handled through the platting process and also building exteriors. They are all part of the proposed protective overlay use.

“We feel that 21st Street is an important corridor, east and west of the City. This is kind of an executive area for the City and so the tone of development that we establish for development in this area is I think really critical to the overall attractiveness and quality of life for people who are coming in and wanting to stay in the community. So what we’ve recommended is basically consistent with what we recommended in other developments in this area. I think the church and the churches agent were new to this process and didn’t realize that we had used similar requirements in other developments so they questioned some of those requirements. The agent did at the MAPC meeting. There is a very strong tree row that you can see in here and there was some question about will we maintain it or how will we maintain it. In the end I think the Planning Commission staff and the agent were all together on that, that they would do what they could to maintain it but they realize that there would be some thinning and loss of trees as a result of the development process, including a sewer extension, which needs to go in that general vicinity. So the intent I think of the Landscape Ordinance will be to preserve as many trees as possible. We’ve seen tree rows that have been preserved along commercial projects like across from Bradley Fair and also at Central and Webb. There is an office project where they’ve done a nice job of trying to protect the trees as much as possible along the right-of-way. So in the end, that wasn’t an issue.

“There was some discussion about uses and in the end I think we took out some of the uses the Planning Commission did because the City and the County’s other Licensing Ordinance and Resolutions require separation of uses like drinking establishments and adult entertainment and so I think that those were not an issue after they were explained. That left the Planning Commission on the issue of signage. As you may know, we have a member of the sign industry on the Planning Commission and he argued that if the project is in the County then it shouldn’t be subject to any special provisions other the County’s normal standards. I suggest to you that you don’t have many standards in terms of signage in the County and it would be appropriate in this area to attach the similar standards to the ones that we recommended. In the end, the Planning Commission, there was a vote to basically remove the sign conditions out of this protective overlay, that vote lost nine to three.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“Then the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval subject to the protective overlay standards, including the sign conditions, which is basically the same kind of conditions that you would see say on West 21st Street too, where we would have no off site signs, no large billboards, no portable signs, flashing signs, and generally signs would be limited to 20 feet tall in monument and style. Those were basically the restrictions that were recommended by the Planning Commission.

“This is an aerial photograph. You can see that tree row that is on the south side of the street. Somewhat affected already by the widening and will be by the sewer, but it will still be there. This is the area that is already zoned and this is the transfer basically from this area to this area. There is a drainage area and there is another parcel which is part of the development. The church would be located basically in this location. This is the theater sign and the cemetery and funeral home surrounding that site. This is where limited commercial of 20 acres was approved and limited industrial uses of about 60 acres up to about K-96, including a new ramp at K-96 and the Greenwich interchange. This is looking north on Greenwich. This would be 21st Street where you see the construction happening. In the background, that is K-96 crossing over Greenwich, north of 21st Street. We’re looking at the site. This would be 21st Street here. Greenwich to the east. That hedge row along 21st Street. This is again looking at the site to the south and east. Looking south down Greenwich, this would be the southern and southwestern edge of the site. This is across the street from this property, basically undeveloped at this point. This then would be the southwest corner and again the intersection of 21st and Greenwich. Now we’re looking to the east. This would be 21st Street under construction here and this is the widening of Greenwich going on and the trees that are still at the edge of that right-of-way. Again, looking west down 21st Street. This is looking east and in the background, K-96 is crossing over 21st Street. This is the plat that has been submitted. You can see the four lots, access to the church parcel both from 21st Street and from Greenwich, the drainage area, and one more lot further to the east. Back to the aerial photograph and the zoning map. I’ll try to answer any questions you may have on this case.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you Marvin. Commissioners, are there questions or comments? Commissioner Miller.”

**Commissioner Miller** said, “Thank you Mr. Chairman. Marvin, when you talk about protective overlays, and I was just reading some comments and one of them was . . . I’ll have to go back and look at the name . . . Osborne-Howes. We’re not changing the zoning, we’re enriching what can occur on that spot.”

**Mr. Krout** said, “I like that term. I’ll try to use that term in the future.”

## **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Miller** said, "I thought real long and hard on that one. But that is basically what we are doing it seems like. Because if we would change the zoning, if that property would change hands, whoever would purchase it after that, that zoning would still be that."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Yes, it would go with the land. It is attached to the zoning and really a protective overlay and a Community Unit Plan do the same thing. I like the term, enriched the zoning. What they do is recognize that every site is unique. Now we don't want special conditions on every piece of land in the City. We want good basic standards. That is why we looked on your last item at the standards for developing mobile home parks and apartments is that what can we do as a general rule to deal with this. The City Sign Ordinance and even more so the Sign Ordinance, for example, leave a lot to be desired in terms of the quality of development. So especially if you're in a special corridor and an area where there have been other attempts to try to maintain a certain character or you are close to sensitive uses, like residential uses or something like that, then we would be recommending special provisions in a protective overlay. In this case, because it is six acres, there is a requirement to have either a CUP or protective overlay."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Okay. I just needed that clarification. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you Commissioner. Commissioner Hancock."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Marvin, where is the Wichita City limits from this property?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Currently, the City has annexed to this corner. They have the north and west of that intersection in the City of Wichita. They are holding annexation petitions because of water being provided to the theater property and to the funeral home cemetery property and so those are eligible for annexation and probably will be annexed shortly. In fact, this property will probably be annexed shortly. Whenever property though is adjacent to the City limits, the property owner has the option of annexing first and then requesting zoning from the City or going through the zoning process and asking for zoning from the County, in which case the Unified Zoning Code says the City will honor that zoning."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Greenwich goes north and south, our map is up, and 21st Street. I didn't realize that they had annexed around that."

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Mr. Krout** said, "Your map is incorrect. I am not sure how that happened, but your map shows that the City has annexed this property that is owned by Broadway Mortuary. The City is holding an annexation petition because there was a closing and the owner asked for the City to wait and not to annex that property immediately. It may have even been on an agenda and that is how someone picked it up and mapped it, but that area is not yet in the City limits."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Okay, I've got you. Thanks Marvin."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you. Commissioners, are there other comments? Is there anyone here in the audience today who would like to address the Commission on our item A-4? Is there anyone here in the audience who would like to address the Board of County Commissioners on this item? Seeing no one, Commissioners, are there other questions or comments, or what's the will of the Board?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Hancock moved to adopt the findings of fact of the MAPC and approve the zone change subject to the additional provisions of a Protective Overlay district and subject to platting within one year; adopt the Resolution and instruct the MAPD to withhold publication until all conditions have been complied with.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you Marvin."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Thank you."



**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, “Mr. Chairman, would this be an appropriate time to bring up an Off Agenda item?”

**Chairman Winters** said, “If you’d like to make that Motion.”

**OFF AGENDA ITEM**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to take up an Off Agenda item.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, “This is regarding the 26th?”

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, “Yes, the Christmas holiday item.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Mr. Manager, we’d like to discuss the December 26 issue.”

**Mr. William Buchanan**, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The Governor, a week or so ago, announced that the State employees would be granted a holiday on December 26. December 26, it happens this year to fall on a Friday, which would make a four day weekend. That only occurs, it doesn’t occur every seventh year because of leap year, but it doesn’t occur very frequently. Yesterday, our colleagues across the street from the City of Wichita also granted that to their employees. We looked around, once we heard what the governor had done and looked around and tried to determine what the effects would be upon our operations.”

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“We have extensive 24 hour operations in the County. We have Community Corrections, who work 24 hours for those people who are out in the world trying to get their lives straightened around. We have Emergency Medical Service, the ambulance crew, who works 24 hours. We also have the Sheriff’s officers and the folks who work in the Detention Facility, our 911 operators, and some security folks. The sewer fund and the fire district also have 24 hour employees and the Fire Department clearly through the fire district has those operations. The cost to Sedgwick County would, because of our agreements and because it is the right thing to do, we would need to pay our employees double whatever the contract provisions are that the practice has been for holiday pay. We’ve also looked at the finances and believe that we can do this and it would be my recommendation that we proceed and grant that day. You have in front of you a Fire Agenda which was not previously scheduled and we want to do that also. We’ll need to take the same action in the Sewer Agenda. The County Counselor has the appropriate resolution prepared.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to declare December 26 as a holiday for 1997.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you very much Commissioners. I am sure a number of employees will be very pleased. Next item please.”

## Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

### NEW BUSINESS

#### **B. DISTRIBUTION OF PREVENTION FUNDS.**

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "You have before you a recommendation by both the internal and the external group for funding of the agencies and the agencies we wish to purchase services from for prevention. Debbie Donaldson is here and Debbie will be able to provide detailed information regarding those proposals that were submitted. She led the effort, along with help from Shelly Duncan to not only staff but to make sure that the process was done in a timely fashion. Let me begin by reminding you and others that in the budget preparation for 1997 we did a quick examination of, an environmental scan, what managers, what executives, what department heads do to try to determine what's our opportunities in the coming years and what is threatening to us and what some of our strengths and some of our weaknesses were. It was clear to us and it is clear to you that one of the problems that threatens Sedgwick County from some point of time in the past to the next decade or so is the cost of incarcerating people. We are in the process of building a jail that will cost \$38,000,000 to construct. The cost of that is spread over 15 or 20 years so the annual cost is not great, but significant. The operation cost just for the addition alone will be in the neighborhood of \$10,000,000 or approximately 5 mills of the local tax dollars diverted to, as Commissioner Miller has so aptly described as warehousing individuals. It is the lowest form of public housing. It is using our resources in that fashion. It needs to be done, it is our responsibility, it is our job. We've faced up to it, we just go about in doing it. But are there alternatives? Are there other ways in which to deal with the problem? As we talked with you about the development process it became clear that your desires were to help find alternative ways rather than building jail space or youth detention facilities, that was to take tax dollars used in our resources to start purchasing services that would prevent crime from occurring.

"We tried to examine what that might be and we have struggled through this process during this year. We have also, you need to be aware, that in our research with other local governments, researching what others are in the process of trying to do, we are having a difficult time finding other local governments who are using local tax dollars to address prevention programs. There was a community development block grant, the federal government hands money to some communities and they get to distribute those monies in ways that they see fit. That is pretty easy. If you give me a bunch of money and I'm allowed to hand it out to whom I want, that is a relatively easy task. I think it is a lot tougher to gather up your own resources to suggest to our department heads to the organizations with whom live and work in this building and in other places, that we're all going to have to pitch in to help solve this problem. That what was done in this process. So for that effort from our folks in this organization, it is a pretty amazing feat that they understand that we are in this together and I am pleased and proud of that.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“So we struggled. Debbie Donaldson reinvented or stole ideas from others and put together some groups to review this process. The process is when we went out to ask for social service agencies to send us proposals on how they would attack the prevention problem. We asked for the request for proposals and we received those in the fall. There was an external committee of folks who examined those. We call them external although there were a few staff people, but most of them were people from the community and in some cases were familiar with the social service agencies. We asked some staff members, an internal committee, to do the same thing. They took reams of paper home and did it over a weekend and we’re talking about inches and inches of proposals, and reviewed those. Both groups made recommendations. I, along with Debbie, Shelly Duncan, and others, reviewed those recommendations and asked those groups with your support and help ask those groups to come back to the table and make a final recommendation. So it is that final recommendation that is before you. The recommendation is both from the external and internal committee and it is the staff’s recommendation.

“We have \$1,000,000 to use towards purchasing prevention programs. We are recommending that the following programs be funded. That Cities in Schools, specifically for Oaklawn and Cooper, be funded that at \$99,601. That Project Freedom for the truancy program be funded for \$105,665. That Literacy Resources of the Metro Area be funded for \$8,200. The followings, we’re going to suggest some modifications in the contracts, but there is no reason to believe the dollars won’t be spent where we think they need to be spent. The Kansas Children’s Service League, we would recommend an expenditure of \$102,724.16; the Boys and Girls Club, recommended to spend \$117,340; Tiospaye, \$50,000. DCCCA, is it recommended that there is \$160,297 there. It should be noted that the DCCCA program, we believe we can do it in house for \$120,000 and that you need to make that determination. KANSEL is \$44,441. Big Brothers/Bib Sisters is \$156,476. That would bring a total of expenditures to \$894,744.16. That figure includes \$50,000 for an administrative fee. You approved the position last time to monitor contracts. These contracts would be included along with some other work that would be done by COMCARE. That is the recommendation of the internal and external committees. That is our recommendation. If there are any questions, Debbie Donaldson and I are prepared to answer those.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you. Before we start, do you think it would be appropriate if we ask if there is anybody from the public who would like to comment before we begin our discussion?”

**Commissioner Miller** said, “Yes.”

## Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

**Chairman Winters** said, "Is there anyone here today who would like to comment on our agenda item where we are discussing the distribution of these prevention funds? We'd be glad to listen to anyone who has thoughts or ideas that they'd like to share with us. I see no one coming to the podium. We certainly believe, as Commissioners, that it is important to hear from a lot of folks and I think we've all heard from a number of folks in this process but wanted to make sure that everyone here had an opportunity if they had ideas that they wanted to share. All right, seeing no one, we'll limit discussion to Commission and staff. Commissioner Miller."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all, it has taken a long time to get to this point. I think that in the long term it is definitely going to be beneficial for not only Sedgwick County as a community but to really be pointed for the families of Sedgwick County. That is who we are proposing to help. I have to send out a big thank you to two groups. The first group would be the external committee and a close second with that group would be COMCARE, who staffed the Community Planning Day, which basically was a catalyst for pulling together organizations to look at where some deficit areas were in our community in terms of services for youth and families. I'm going to . . . I cannot name everyone in COMCARE, but Deborah Donaldson is here as the Director and could certainly. Shelly Duncan was very instrumental and helpful.

"When I think about the external committee, I do need to name them because they spent many hours and lots of energy and basically building the proposal. On that committee was: Shelly Duncan with Childrens Services here, COMCARE; Tom Kimbrell, who is the Director of Juvenile Intake and Assessment; Dwight Jones, who is the Assistant Superintendent of USD 259; Sergeant Wanda Parker-Givens, who is currently a Sergeant but was a community police officer for the City of Wichita; Sergeant Mike Birzer, who is a community police officer for Sedgwick County; the Honorable Jennifer Jones, who is a Juvenile Court Judge; John Sullivan, Director of SRS; Bill Culp, was the Director of Maude Carpenter Center; Pat Hanrahan, President of the United Way; Mark Masterson, who is the Interim Director of Corrections here in Sedgwick County; and the Honorable Jean Cole, City Council Member of Wichita; and a Mr. Carl Boggues is a City Representative as whole. There was an internal committee that also worked very hard in pulling together from an intrinsic perspective what we felt Sedgwick County could best support and I would probably have to lend once again to Deborah Donaldson or to the Manager to name those individuals and I believe they should be.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“My thanks have gone out and now I have to go and turn to my Commission, my colleagues and thank you for supporting this. I can remember back, and I think it is important to go through some of this history. I can remember back on a day, it was Action ‘97, and it was pulled together by the Regional Prevention Center, and we were asked, the participants who went there, were asked to basically put down what it is that they would do for children. I wrote that I would look at bringing more services through Sedgwick County that would help families and children. I can recall Sheriff Mike Hill saying that’s your promise Commissioner, but now you’re going to have to have the support of your Commission. I acknowledged that at that time and have to acknowledge at this time that the support was there and I appreciate that.

“When I think about the actual pooling of funding, then that takes me to the County Manager. I am just swinging my way around here. I would not have necessarily have thought about it so I know it was innovative and creative and I said this before, but Bill, you were actually able to pull together, and some didn’t like it being called a prevention pot of money, but to pull together what funding as you said that is local tax dollars. We’re taking care of our own problems here locally, not asking necessarily for assistance from any other government entity, particularly the federal government. So my hat is off to you.

“To the public, I believe that we have turned a corner. We are actually in the process of being able to lift up, instead of looking at immediate crisis in the way of jailing individuals, picking them up off the streets and putting them away forever, but instead of only focusing on that, we’re actually looking at the front end from a governing perspective and from a local perspective, which is what we should be doing because it is our problem. So I am very pleased with where we are at this moment. We have challenges in front of us. Everyone is not happy with the process, we recognize that, but we also know that with changes comes challenges, and that is the mode that we are in. So there will be adaptations that will occur.

“Speaking of adaptations, I have some. I would like to ask the Commission to consider funding one of the organizations that was not recommended and for many reasons. That organization is Youth Development Services. It is a summer enrichment program. There were some questions about it not being a full year or even a full summer. But I consider this is as a home grown, grass roots organization, that has been doing prevention for over 20 years now. The funding request is \$39,362. Along those lines, it was already spoken to with this DCCCA request that we as an internal agency feel that it can be done for less than that. I would like for us to give that serious consideration and reduce the request from DCCCA from the \$160,297 to \$120,000. In doing that, that would be able to allow us to incorporate the youth development without changing any of the funding. At that, I’m going to stop. There are probably some other things that I’d be mentioning, but I’d like to hear from the rest of the Commission. Thank you for allowing me to indulge as I have.”

## Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you very much Commissioner. Commissioner Hancock."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you Melody. I appreciate all the words that you said and feel they are very appropriate for all those involved. When we went into this our goal or ambition was to make sure that monies that we spent in this process were strictly or as much as possible, preventative funds. We're out there trying to find young people and in some cases maybe not so young people, but people who are in the formative years of their lives who have to make important decisions and find themselves in circumstances often that are beyond their control and sometimes within their control. We would like to make those changes too, but we're looking for ways to help people realize that there are opportunities and better ways to live. Sometimes it involves teaching them and sometimes it involves helping them, assisting them, sometimes it involves protecting them. These are all people who are at risk who in time, if we don't make the investment in them now, we will be making a much larger investment in the future. We've learned that lesson. Hopefully, we'll be able to minimize that future investment. That's our goal. Certainly the things that we're doing here won't contribute to our problems in the future and with any luck they'll help. Sometimes elected officials, politicians, have trouble doing this because these are long range processes that may or not be but for the most part it will be difficult for us to recognize for many years the outcomes. Politicians are only elected for four years and we like to have results in that amount of time, some of us less. That's the fact. Sometimes we look at those things in too much of a short term. So we're going to try to be patient. We committed ourselves to prevention funding and we may in the next budget session even do more of it depending upon what comes our way and what we learn from this process for 1998 and 1999. I was very proud of the Commissioners for deciding to do this. Some of this was born out of our own frustration and our own reluctance and desire to not have to build more jail space and not having to build more detention facilities for our juvenile offenders. We recognize that we're not solving many problems that way. We're keeping people off the street but we're not being very helpful to our community.

"Melody has asked that . . . well, in all of these, as I look over the recommendations as proposed by the committees that we have, many of these organizations that we are proposing to grant are traditional service organizations that have worked in our community and have histories of assisting people in their lives. Many of them are or most of them, are organizations that are somewhat conventional. We know right now what we can expect from the outcomes based upon their funding and they do to. They did this in the past and needed the resources and the assistance and the authority to go ahead. There are others that gave proposals that we were surprised and non-conventional.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“One of them that I liked and been rooting for and we do have funds that have not been . . . we do have money left over right now based upon the proposal that is before us. One of the organizations that I have always been very favorable has been the Extension Office. Extension is not been the practice of doing these kinds of things although they are familiar with it and some of the people there are familiar with this kind of activity. When I say conventional, the Extension Office is proposing to us a rather unconventional method and it is very interactive, it is creative. It has to do with working with young people, demonstrating to them a higher quality of life and give them the opportunity to learn and act and see within themselves all the possibilities. I waited this long to talk to the Commissioners about this and I wanted to see what the proposal would ultimately be and what kind of resources we would have left. Today, I’m going to propose that we include in this proposal also the Extension Services request of \$75,000, along with what Melody has proposed. I believe we have the money to do that at this point, I’m not sure, but my calculations indicate that we do. But beyond that, I don’t favor any changes and I am very proud of the decisions that have been made and I hope that they all have the best of luck and the best of outcomes. Thank you Mr. Chairman.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you. Commissioner Gwin.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “Thank you Mr. Chairman. I got a phone call the other day after the article came out in the paper and there is some discussion about this prevention fund in the newspaper. The individual who called me, we got into a rather lengthy discussion about utilization of tax dollars and how that person thought that they ought to be spent or not. The individual indicated to me that the belief was that most taxpayers understand that there are programs and projects that require their funding, that they will pay their taxes if the amount they have to pay is reasonable, if the taxes are fairly assessed, and if they are used wisely. We had a lengthy conversation about that criteria and at the end of it we both acknowledged that a program like this one, you just recognize, that a program like this just plain makes sense. It certainly isn’t brain surgery, but it is just very simply, is just makes sense. As Commissioner Hancock as indicated, the frustration I think this Board felt at the time we had to make the decisions about expanding jail beds really did lead to this. I think each of us knew that it doesn’t answer the problem. That is not going to settle the problem. We can continue to build jail beds and I think we all acknowledge as did the person that I spoke with on the phone, that those beds will be filled as quickly as we open the door and that to do something different, to use tax dollars differently and certainly to have the foresight and common sense to use local tax dollars in this manner just plain makes sense. I may agree or disagree on the recommendations of Commissioner Miller or Hancock or the committees, but certainly the focus of prevention funds at a local level and using tax dollars wisely is one that I’m sure we all can support. I look forward to discussion and funding.



### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“I also look forward to the opportunity for maybe those who submitted in the first round and didn’t make the cut, since it appears we will have funding available, to those entities, coming forward again and giving it another shot. I anticipate or I certainly hope that we will fully fund the amount that we’ve set aside for programs that make sense. So I look forward to a second round, quite frankly, to see if we can’t find some new programs or additional ways to make this community a better place to live in. Thank you Mr. Chairman..”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you. I guess I’ll make just a couple of quick comments. I share Commissioner Miller’s thanks for all the people who have been involved in this. Thank you especially to all of the providers or the people with ideas, the school, university, and everyone else that had a plan and worked on a plan. They were all done by good people, headed in a good direction. If we had all the money in the world we would have funded them all, but we don’t, so we had to make some tough choices and every time you do that, somebody is going to be concerned about not receiving what they had hoped that they would and for that we can just say that we’re sorry that we didn’t have unlimited funds. I guess a key point that I’d like to make is I think this is a new way, as a number of folks have said. One of the things that we anticipate doing a little bit different is the accountability on the results side. It has been thought for a long time that there is no way to measure a success or failure in certain prevention funds. Working with Deborah Donaldson and her group, we believe that there are some ways to measure the results and see whether things are successful or they’re not successful. So I think this is going to be a program where we look for results and how those results can come about. So I think we will be paying attention as we go through this year because we can’t afford not to be successful. We started on this particular avenue to reduce a problem in this community and we need to be successful so we are going to monitor this very closely.

“In talking about some specifics, I can certainly support Commissioner Miller’s changes as we look at what staff has recommended and then the modification that she made on the DCCCA program and the addition of Youth Development. I can support that. At that point, if we would leave it there, then there would be some additional funds, as Commissioner Hancock has suggested, that we could look at something else. I would be interested in looking more at a number of things. I’m going to admit that I kind of breezed through the Extension project because I saw that it wasn’t recommended so I didn’t spend a lot of time on it, but I’m sure it is a good program. The only other idea I had about the unspent funds is what we did in our request for proposal was ask for people to come back to us and tell us what they’re doing and how what they’re doing would fit in to this prevention thing. Well, I wonder if we don’t have some ideas now about where some gaps are that we might ask that someone fill a specific role and put out another round saying here is an issue that we want you to deal with. How would you develop some kind of system to help with this?”

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“Two examples that I would have, again, I’m not an expert on this, so I need to look at other folks, but I look at the intake and assessment office where juveniles are first taken and way up on the list is shoplifting. I mean shoplifting is the big entrance deal into our system. If you get picked up once or twice probably nobody is going to do anything, nobody is going to say much, and maybe there is an opportunity that the first brush of shoplifting figure out what is going on in this young persons life. Why are they doing this? Try to attack the problem right there.

“The other one I’m getting more and more concerned about is the truancy issue and I guess almost from an issue of looking at what kinds of problems that causes us, which is not a very good reason to look at it, we have a lot of people in our Juvenile Detention Facility that if they would just go to school they wouldn’t be in the Detention Facility. The judges have said we know that you’ve done something wrong here and you’re not necessarily a threat of physical violence to someone, if you’ll go to school we’ll put you on probation and you won’t have to be in the detention facility. Well they go for a little bit and then they don’t go to school, they get picked up, and they’re back in the detention facility for not going to school. Well, if there was some way we could attack that problem head on, there is a way it would look to me like we could work with part of our detention overcrowding problem maybe in a pretty rapid way. So those are just two issues that have, just as I’ve started dealing with these prevention funds and with the new system the juvenile justice authority is going to bring on, two items that have just to me jumped off the page. So I guess my suggestion, if I had one, would be that I would support the changes as Commissioner Miller has suggested, but I would like to maybe take another look at what we would do on the second round with the remaining funds. Commissioner Miller.”

**Commissioner Miller** said, “I’m going to, I just feel as a governing body of Sedgwick County that this issue needs to be raised at this point in time. We talked about it a bit in staff and I believe it will be fruitful for us to discuss it for a moment now. That is the issue of Project Freedom, who has been recommended by both the committees, but to me the larger question is what is the role of Project Freedom and is Project Freedom fully in charge of what their duties and their prescribed role as the blueprint council for the County is. Some will question that and I question being able to fund an organization for providing a service which makes it appear to be a competitor for funding when the role that is being stated is instead that of a coordinating and a planning council. I just feel that we, as a governing body, need to be able to talk a little bit about that.”

**Commissioner Hancock** said, “I would like to hear someone from Project Freedom talk about this issue right now. Is there anyone here?”

### Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

**Chairman Winters** said, "I see Floyd Hansen in the audience. I don't know that Floyd came prepared to speak, but I see him standing up out of his chair. Floyd, if you would like to come up and address the Commission."

**Mr. Floyd Hansen**, Program Director, Project Freedom, said, "First of all, let me point out that the listing that you have here is for a project, which is already established and extending a project here in which Project Freedom is essentially the umbrella agency. We operate a coordinating center in which there are several of these kinds of relationships. In some cases we are only associated with the project, but in some cases we are the fiscal agent for that process. In this case we are the fiscal agent and I'm not sure whether that is Melody's question here or not. Speaking to a second kind of issue, essentially, Project Freedom is getting to be almost ten years old now. Early on, the process was basically in providing projects and some of you will remember the junior high school kids got together and marched in large numbers to a facility here and had an anti-drug campaign with pizza, and that sort of thing. Over the years we have evolved. Our present responsibility is as a local planning council designated four or five years ago and perhaps even I would acknowledge uncertain at the moment because the corporation for change that made that designation four years ago is no longer in operation. They've been succeeded by a child and family organization. We see our function as purely planning at this point in time. As I indicated, we have several projects which extend over months and in some cases over a years period of time, that we provide the housing for. That is not as essential to us. We receive no benefit from that. We do not charge administrative fees and that sort of thing, we simply provide a housing arrangement in which there are nine or ten different people who are functioning in different kinds of areas. So we need to differentiate, if the questions are about our role as an umbrella agency is it one issue.

"It is true that I had not planned to come here to talk about planning. We respect the County's process. We compliment the Commission as well as the staff on this initiative. I might say that it is the tip of the iceberg. There are going to be many of us back here at this podium making requests, because if we are to make a difference in the business of incarceration at one point or another it will take a larger effort. I don't say that in a negative context. I say that it is well that this Commission is taking this initiative. I'm not sure Commissioner Miller what your question was and I may not have addressed it directly."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Actually, I wasn't addressing Project Freedom, I was addressing the Commission to discuss what it is the role of Project Freedom is as we understand it and in terms of this funding cycle that we're in the midst of deciding which direction we'll go with certain organizations. So it was more of a question of asking for discussion that it was a question of explanation. But in that, the question did come from Commissioner Hancock who was asking for someone from Project Freedom to talk about your role.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“In reading, it is very clear that Project Freedom and Family Youth Coalition is Sedgwick County’s local planning council is also the blueprint council, charged with coordinating the efforts that will produce critical changes. These councils, at seven council areas, will link agencies, local government, federal projects, to make the best use of our resources. So I am just simply attempting to get a real grasp of where it is that Project Freedom is going in relationship to whether or not if indeed you’re a service provider or a linkage to services.”

**Mr. Hansen** said, “I think the best answer to that is historically we have been a linkage for that. It is not essentially our intention at the moment to continue long range to be a service provider. We expect to give all of our efforts essentially in planning.”

**Commissioner Miller** said, “Okay.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Commissioner Hancock.”

**Commissioner Hancock** said, “Thank you Mr. Chairman. Floyd, I’m still not clear. What I have from the summary of the program is a truancy program that you’re wanting to fund.”

**Mr. Hanson** said, “Let me backup just one second. We provide the housing for several projects. The truancy project is one in which we provide the housing and the financial backup for. That grant will go directly, we have a project director here if you have questions about that, this has nothing to do with Project Freedom’s planning at all. It is that we provide that umbrella kind of thing. As a matter of fact, there are I think seven projects that we involve. They do not contribute to our planning effort in any way. It is simply housing. The project that you’re referring to is housed at our facility and we become the fiscal agent and that’s the reason that Project Freedom is there.”

**Commissioner Hancock** said, “So help me understand, who is actually doing the work?”

**Mr. Hanson** said, “It is done by a project director in association with a large number of community agencies.”

**Commissioner Hancock** said, “Who are they?”

**Mr. Hansen** said, “The project director is here if you’d like to hear from him, I’d be glad to introduce him and have him discuss that if that’s the question you’re asking. Jaime Lopez is here. He is the Project Director. I’ll let him address specific questions.”

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "What I'm trying to understand is not only the role that Project Freedom has but specifically this \$105,000 that we're proposing, what it will be used for, who will be doing the work, so forth and so on. I want to know some details. We haven't been clear on Project Freedom."

**Mr. Jaime Lopez** said, "Initially, when this program first began, we were needing some type of fiduciary agency to funnel the money through for a non-for-profit. So Project Freedom stepped up along with some efforts from USD 259 and others and so that is why that has kind of continued. But as far as details, the amount of money that we had requested would be money that would cover my salary, another person's salary, and then the creation of an African-American specialist that would begin to address the issues in the African-American community, along with some youth employment issues and other issues that we felt were kind of a cadre of different issues that we have come up with in the 2½ years that we've been in existence. So those monies would go initially to fund individuals and efforts by our program to continue working within the Hispanic community, the Asian community, and begin working with the African-American community on issues surrounding truancy."

"We receive recommendations from the juvenile court systems. We receive them from the schools themselves. We also are in collaborative partnerships with communities and schools and other efforts. We just try to work with anyone that might have issues that we might be able to address either by language or cultural sensitivity. Our arms are pretty much every where. In essence, we've got about 75 kids that we are not even able to address as of yet because there are only two staff people as of right now. With the money that we were asking for, we were asking for an additional two staffing persons along with continuation of our efforts. I hope I have answered."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "The focus is on the issue surrounding truancy?"

**Mr. Lopez** said, "Truants themselves. They are identified by the juvenile courts. The judges will contact us and then we provide services. Basically, what we do is we go into the home and we do a risk assessment model, which is a Cadelonno-Hawkins model, which is one of the requirements of the County had requested that we try to utilize that model and that is the model that we've been using for 2 ½ years. What that model does, it gives us a picture of the problems that are going on with a child, the family, the school, and any of the surroundings. It gives us an idea as to what we need to address to ensure that the child or that family will be able to get beyond that hump of the truancy. In many cases, it is just that the child doesn't want to go to school or the family doesn't care. It is a multitude of different issues, but at least it is some kind of a component that allows us to go beyond that rather than trying to just do a Band-Aid approach."

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "We are basically talking three people who do this work?"

**Mr. Lopez** said, "We have a case load of about 125 right now."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Okay. Out of the \$105,665, how much of that would you and the two other people be receiving? In other words, as the umbrella agency, would Project Freedom retain some of that?"

**Mr. Lopez** said, "No. All of that money would be directed to the program itself."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Okay, thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Appreciate you being here."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Commissioner Gwin has a couple of questions."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "I guess I have some basic questions. Mr. Lopez, does your program have its own identity?"

**Mr. Lopez** said, "Actually, the name of it is Wichita Community Together Succeeding on Truancy or if you take the acronym, it is Wichita Acts on Truancy."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Okay. Your organization, you've been working on this for 2 ½ years, right?"

**Mr. Lopez** said, "Yes, ma'am."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Do you have any outcomes that you can share with us?"

**Mr. Lopez** said, "Sure. Enclosed in the original proposal we have given a summary of the 2 ½ years that we've been at work. We have taken a group of 100 kids and we had reduced absenteeism by 50.2%. We had raised their GPAs by 26.3%. We had reduced negative reports and those are reports that if they go to the principals office or cause any kind of problem, we reduced that by 26.7%. Crime had dropped within those school area patterns by about 30%. So we could show actual tangible results of being able to work with a very controlled area but also being able to show here is an improvement in GPA, here is a reduction in absenteeism, and so we use those projections and those measurements. That is what we said we would accomplish were we given an opportunity to receive the funding for another year."

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Commissioners, I like the program. I think Mr. Lopez can be able to demonstrate that it works. What I'm a little curious about is why can't we just fund his program and with the administrative oversight that the County is going to have and the measuring outcomes and accountability and all that, I don't know why we couldn't fund your program directly without having to go through Project Freedom. I don't know that it is necessary."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "I'm still trying to understand it myself. Project Freedom might keep the books. Floyd has mentioned fiscal responsibility, I don't know."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "I don't either."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Commissioner Miller."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. For clarification, I know that the program works and this is once again as Commissioner Gwin was stating, has nothing to do with the outcomes of the program or even funding the program. Because this program could literally walk to another organization and still act through it. So my big question is that I think we are all pondering is because of the role and the linkage between, it is a reported one and it needs to be a real one or not one at all, but the relationship between Sedgwick County and Project Freedom as our arm for planning in this community, we need to figure out if we're going to support planning in this community through this arm or are we going to not support it?"

**Chairman Winters** said, "Okay."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Planning, not programming through this organization."

**Chairman Winters** said, "I understand what the difficulty is. I believe I see what is happening. I don't know that I can tell you why, but in listening to the program described, I'm comfortable with the program. I'm not exactly sure I understand Project Freedom's involvement yet but I have confidence in our group that looked at this, headed by Debbie Donaldson, and based upon their recommendation that this is a workable plan, I'm prepared to go ahead and support it because I know where it is going to end up and who is going to end up with the responsibility to try to have something happen. As we go through even the next couple of years in thinking about the new way that we're going to be looking at juvenile justice, I think Project Freedom is still going to play an important part as we think about the planning and the blueprint, council planning, or whatever that is, I think they're going to be there. I personally am not going to be concerned right now about what they're doing in this project because I know where the money is going to head, what the project is. I'm going to be comfortable supporting Project Freedom."

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Miller** said, "One other comment that I need to make at this point in time, understanding that I'm about to be reappointed to the Board of Project Freedom, I have no intention of voting. I would like Project Freedom to be pulled out as opposed to voting for the total package because I have every intention of abstaining. I will not vote. I simply wanted the conversation. I thought it was appropriate that the conversation happen."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Very good. Commissioner Schroeder."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Hancock and I were just discussing this issue of trying to decide and figure out who is delivering what service and how. I think that is kind of the same problem we had years ago in the mental health community where there were quite a few agencies wanting the same outcome but had maybe a different theory or different way of delivering the service. I think we have that same issue here in some respects. It is how we deliver it. It is the points that you want to emphasize with the kids and the families, but the same outcome is better children and better family values, stronger grades in school, et cetera. The end result is to keep children out of trouble, keep them out of jail. I have a sister who is a teacher in a junior high school. Yesterday, she was given her tenth troubled, very troubled, and sometimes dangerous student. She has ten in her class out of I'm going to say 20 to 30. It is my understanding that that probably exceeds the school district policy. The point is that it is unfair to her and it is unfair to those kids who are there that want to learn. There isn't a day go by that she is not somehow abused, either called a name, sworn at, or threatened. Then on top of that to have a parent or parents come into her classroom and do the same because their child is failing. It is a system that has let a lot of kids down. It is also letting teachers down. It is also letting kids down who want to learn because they are obviously in that same atmosphere with those other kids, seeing the same problems, and it is disruptive to them and probably to their view of what is going on in this world. So I'm anxious to get going on the program. I think this idea is a great idea. I think all of you are to be commended for what you are trying to accomplish. It was mentioned earlier that there is only so much money to go around and it is our thankless job to decide who gets those dollars or that funding. But the process will be ongoing from year to year and there may be times when others receive the funding and some don't, but I think we're in a critical need right now and I think the Commission's job is to decide which best meets that critical need. It is not that I am going to rate anybody differently. I'm not going to say that you're not doing the job that I'd like you to do. It is just limited funding and we're trying to find the organizations that we think will deliver what we need at this point in time and that may change in a year or two also depending upon society. I'm understanding of everyone's problems. I'm understanding of what you want. You just need to understand from our point of view that we are limited in all that we can do. I think this is also a good opportunity for the community as a whole to really find out what it is that is going on in their schools, the ones who are not aware of it and hopefully we can help those students and help their families at the same time."



**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“But I really appreciate all of you being here and participating in the process and doing what you are for the community. I really appreciate it. It makes a difference to everybody and obviously to the tax payers of this community. The end result is that we have a safer, better community, and it costs us less to maintain this community because we have and will make a difference in detention and law enforcement in those areas that hopefully we won’t have to spend so much money in those areas. I’d rather spend it up front, as Melody has mentioned. I think that is a better place to put it. Thank you.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you both for helping clarify what you all are doing.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “I’m prepared to make a Motion on the Project Freedom recommendation and do it seperately so that Commissioner Miller can abstain.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Okay. Let’s take a Motion on Project Freedom’s project.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to approve the funding recommendation of the committees and fund Project Freedom’s Truancy Program in the amount of \$105,665.

Chairman Winters seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Abstain
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, “Commissioners, I would then propose that we take the rest of the list as recommended by the staff. Commissioner Miller has suggested that we change the DCCCA amount from \$160,297 to \$120,000. That we include Youth Development Services for \$39,362. I personally can support that. Do you want to take those as a group like that or do you want to walk through them one at a time.”

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "That's okay, it is just a housekeeping issue. Do we have to have that \$.16 on that Kansas Children's Service League? Can we drop that? Okay, whatever motion you make, whoever makes it would you take off the \$.16? It just creates an accounting problem. I don't know how it got there to begin with?"

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "I'd like to have a balance after that. What would be our balance?"

**Chairman Winters** said, "Could somebody add that up?"

**Commissioner Miller** said, "It should be \$106,190,084."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "But if we take the \$.16 off?"

**Chairman Winters** said, "You're confusing me now. I think that should add up to about \$890,000."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Was that correct Mr. Manager? I'm pretty sure it is \$106,000."

**Chairman Winters** said, "To me, that adds up to \$893,000."

**Commissioner Miller** said, "He's asking what's left, so it is \$106,190."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "That would be identical to this memo? So \$106,190, thank you Mr. Manager, I've got that."

**Chairman Winters** said, "So if it were made into a Motion, there would be \$106,000 left."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "I'm prepared to make that Motion."

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to accept the recommendation of the committees with the exception of DCCCA, which we will reduce to \$120,000, and with the addition of Youth Development Services in the amount of \$39,362, and the adjustment on the Kansas Children's Service League to \$102,724.00 to eliminate the \$0.16.

Commissioner Schroeder seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "That concludes this item. I think we'll take a short break here, but before we do that, do we want to address how we're going to talk about this \$106,000? Does anybody else have a comment they want to make at this time?"

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "It would be our staff's suggestion and recommendation that now this action has occurred, we will be back to you in a week or two, probably two, with a proposal about how we would proceed and I would suggest that we would be able to distribute those funds sometime around the first week of February."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "The first week of when?"

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "February."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "How about if we do like the Chairman suggested, identify what we've funded and look for areas? Can you do that that quickly?"

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "Probably."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Okay."

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Miller** said, "Will you be letting us know if it will actually go out for proposal again or are we going to identify what we've already received?"

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "We will bring you back a process within two weeks."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Well, if we could perhaps even at our next staff meeting discuss some of the direction that we want to head."

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "Okay."

**Chairman Winters** said, "All right, Commissioner Hancock, did you have anything else you wanted to add at this time? You look like you're about ready to say something?"

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "This seems to me . . . we've already read all the proposals, it seems to me like we could get on with it and get on with it faster than what we're talking about. I mean, there were some good questions posed by those committees and there were some almost and some maybes and we're not quite sures. It seems to me that it wouldn't be very hard by next Tuesday's staff meeting for those folks to come in, sit down, and tell us what those were and move on."

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "Commissioner, that would be one approach. The other approach that we would like to examine would be that now this decision has been made, we understand what services we're about to purchase. Are there areas that we need to purchase that aren't covered by these services? For instance, is there some issues about shop lifting or truancy that if they are the two most important issues, are there services that we need to look at that design those services and then ask for request for proposals. So if we follow your method it would be very easy to do. If we take a different approach it may take just a little bit longer."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Okay, let's visit about it Tuesday for sure."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "That's what I'm talking about. It may be February before we get around to this and do the deal, but I'd like to get on with it, get on with the discussion."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "I'll put it on the agenda for Tuesday's staff meeting."

**Commissioner Hancock** said, "Is that okay Bill?"

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Chairman Winters** said, "All right, at this time we've concluded the prevention issue. I want to thank all of you who were here on this issue to listen to the discussion and participate in it. Thank you very much. At this time we're going to take a ten minute break."

**The Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners recessed at 10:45 a.m. and returned at 10:55 a.m.**

**Chairman Winters** said, "I'll call back to order the Board of County Commissioners from our short recess. Commissioner Schroeder."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "Well, I was hoping the County Engineer would be sitting in his seat when we started. I just told him to be here."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "He certainly listens to you doesn't he? He's coming, here he is."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "Anyway, just a note of congratulations to our County Engineer. The other day he notified us that he has been elected to the grade a Fellow, by the American Society of Civil Engineers. In this letter it says, a select few out of more than 122,000 members receive this designation. I just want to recognize David today and say congratulations, well done."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you very much."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "Do you have a comment?"

**Mr. Spears** said, "I just want to say thank you for mentioning that. It was quite a surprise."

**Commissioner Schroeder** said, "You're welcome. You almost missed it."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Madam Clerk, we're ready for Item C. Would you please call that Item?"

#### **C. PRESENTATION OF ZOOVISION 2020.**

**Mr. Mark Reed**, Director, Sedgwick County Zoo, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Real quickly, I would like to introduce Russ Gorden, he's president of the County Zoological Society. He'd like to say a few words at the very end of my presentation. Also, Craig Rhodes and Lee Engler, from Wilson, Darnell, and Mann, who without them we would not be looking at this Zoovision 2020 today, as far as actual design and the work that they helped us on."

## **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“Very quickly, we have a great zoo in our community and one of the factors for that is that we’ve had a master plan that started and developed with the zoo originally in the early 1970s. We did not have any pretty pictures and we’ve gotten to the point with potential donors coming up, that we needed something visionary where we could show people where the zoo is going in the future. Basically, we just flushed out the existing master plan, some things were left on, and I’m just going to give you a quick highlight today of what was shown to the Board of Trustees about two weeks ago. Without further ado, if we could turn on the slide projector.

### **SLIDE PRESENTATION**

“Today, we’re just going to hit some highlights on the future South American farm and some information on the aquatic complex and the expanded service area with a new veterinary hospital, which we are working on presently and fund raising. There is a possibility of a jungle expansion, expanding Asian steps, an area of the zoo that has never been worked on yet. A new elephant facility, an area here for lions, wart hogs and meerkats. There is a missing component in our South American pampus and Australian outback. One of the major new components of this Zoovision 2020 is the new gorilla exhibit. This just gives you a bigger blow up. I thought I’d mention, and I talked to Mr. Spears about visiting with us on our parking lot. We know in the future, over the next 23 years, and that is why we picked this 2020, in the year 2020, we need to expand our parking lot. We’ve got a section here that is missing. We do have overflow over here. We’ve got a very ugly entrance that we want to soften up with landscaping. We do picture an entrance showing with a male grizzly bear, water features, and plants. I know Commissioner Schroeder asked me many years ago what I thought of our entrance and I gave him a brief answer.

“As you first enter the zoo, we want to bring back the flamingo exhibit. We’ve got some predator problems in that we have to do a different management system. Then the first area here, over in the farms, we have a farms of the world, we have a missing component is the South American farm. We envision sort of a Inca little hut and a walk through actually in with the animals, unlike this one, with female alpacas and llamas and guinea pigs for people to be able to have that hands on contact with the animals. One of the major components we’re missing in the Asian farm is we want to bring in the two hump camel. Moving to the next thing, the aquatic complex, which we get asked about quite often, is quite a ways down the line. It is the one exhibit that we know we’ll be looking for a rather large endowment. But right now, everything that we’re building and raising money for, we’re also trying to collect 20 to 25% endowment. But we envision a large outside sea lion, seal display. As you walk inside you would be able to view it from the inside. There would be about a 100,000 gallon tank of reef fishes with sharks, sea turtles, a fairly large penguin display, and then smaller tanks for things like the giant pacific octopus and other theme tanks, lion fish, and so forth.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“The area dealing with our jungle and the herpitarium, in this area right here. I forgot, the restaurant. In the center of the zoo. One of the problems that we do not have is enough indoor seating. It does get hot out here in the summer time. We need someplace that people can sit in comfort with air conditioning, ceiling fans. We envision incorporating and bringing up this to the edge of the water, making one of the ponds bigger so that you are actually out partially over the water possibly, viewiing into the giraffe exhibit in the future. The gorilla exhibit would have nice panaramoic view inside the restaurant. Something that we could also rent out. As I mentioned earlier, the herpitarium is all but finished. We do want to expand the outside yard for the tortoises. The males and females, to stimulate breeding, need a little bit of room to get away from each other. And at some point in time, we have the capacity to, by adding three walls, double the size of our current jungle building. We have a lot of animals that we cannot display together because they sort of like eat each other or harass each other. It is the major theme building of the zoo and by all studies indicate that it is the more popular thing the visitors do come and see. There is a lot that we can do in displaying the animals of the jungles and tropics and get across the educational message about the rain forest.

“In our North American prairie, which was one of the first projects that was done as a partnership, with Capital Program with the County and the Zoological Society. There is just some fine tuning. We want to be able to have it so that people on the boat ride, that the bison can go all the way down into the water in the canal so that when you’re going by in the boat and there is nothing between you and the bison that you can see. We want to add an eagle flight cage. Where the eagles are now, we want it to become hawks. They are looking for zoos to take on captive bred whooping cranes. They do pass through Cheyenne Bottoms and we have an area in the North American Prairie for them. Also, black footed ferets.

“The next area, we have this veldt building, which is only half built. There is a wooden temporary wall that has been there for 26 years. This side going down here is supposed to be all Asia, we’ve walked out of North American going to the Asian Steppes. The primary animal on that side of the building will be the Asian One-Horned or Armored Rhino from India and Nepal. These animals were down to about 900 and there are over 2,000 now. They are the largest of all the rhinos. They are about 7 ½ feet at the shoulders here. Down further, we have these now, we have developed a pen, our old Asian walk through. We have babies born, it’s with the group. They’ll have a group of Malayan Tapirs. This is the Lesser or Red Panda from China that is also a partial bamboo eater like Giant Panda, and the Babarussa, that has tusks that grow through the upper roof of its mouth here. These are all highly endangered species that they are looking for additional zoos to pick up to house.

## **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“We also want to cover this in a mesh netting. We have the normal assortment of predators you find in a large 247 acre facility now with coyotes, racoons, possum, and things like this. There are a lot of birds that we can't put out unless they are in an aviary, so we see incorporating that area where the tapers, babarussa, and the lesser pandas in a mesh net so we can have a compliment of all the birds you'd be seeing in these areas.

“Going down to a future expanded area, we're looking at tigers and guars here. I'll show you some pictures. We get a lot of requests, when are we going to get the tigers here? We wanted to have an adequate room. We invision expanding the water moate about 300 yards and this will also allow the tigers to get into the water and swim, which is what they normally do. This is one of the few cats that really likes water. This is the guars, this is the largest of all the wild cattle in the world, found in Southeast Asia. It gets up to about 7 ½ feet at the shoulder. We've got a tremendous interest, because of our agricultural base here in the midwest and various forms of wild cattle. These will also kill you. You have to work very carefully with them.

“The last part here, we have komodo dragons and gerials right now. They are all youngsters. Eventually those gerials will get to about 22 feet and the komodos about 12 feet. Then along side, this is the persuwaski horse or the last wild horse on this planet. Currently they are extinct in the wild, since 1950 some have been returned to preserves in China. They are looking for additional zoos throughout the world to take these on. This is an animal that is being reintroduced. This is the komodo dragon, a full length at about 12 feet, 350 pounds. They will outgrow eventually where we have them in the jungle building. Actually, the island that they are found is not a jungle island. We actually don't have them in the right habitat. The elephant display here. Elephants are highly social animals. We have some concerns about just having two. If we are going to do this right, we should be breeding these elephants. We maybe moving up to Kansas City sometime to get them impregnated and adding a female or two but we also need some additional area. We have invisioned a plan of viewing where it is across from water so there is no barrier other than the public rail. We'd have a dry moat in back so it would be visible from the boat ride with no barriers and putting together a group of four or five African elephants. In that southern part of the zoo, this is an Asian theme restaurant with Asian elephants, but we envision doing an African themed restaurant overlooking the elephant yard, future lions, looking back the other way possibly catching the tigers. What I'm not mentioning is that we've located a very small little aviary and little monkey exhibits throughout the place. We're going to need some expanded visitor service capacities with these new exhibits as they are built.



### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“As I mentioned right now, we’re fund raising right now for our animal hospital. We know that the next major public exhibit and we anticipate somewhere around the year 2000, we’re sort of already working on preliminary designs, is dealing with lions. We’re in a situation, we have pure lions that import from Africa. There is a need to bring these lions and bring them in and have a pride of four females with the male that we have. Showing that they are not necessarily buddies as portrayed in Animal Kingdom movie here on the lions. The wart hog is one of the favorite prey. We have a neat story line that we are going to talk about when we do this exhibit. The inquisitive meercats displayed around this exhibit. They are great sun worshipers and the public does know what these are now from Disney’s movie.

“We have a few small unfinished components of our South American Pampas area. Whoops, I forgot, we’re going to do African here for a minute. Let me back that up. Currently, right now, this is where the African building is. I’m just going to talk about this building and the hippo exhibit. We had the first underwater viewing of hippos. It is only good for about an hour a day, twice a day. The technology is there. Toledo has it, San Diego has it, we can have the water looking like this at all times. The inside of the building we presently have is the only building that has not kept up with modern technology and probably was not anywhere near the cutting edge when it was built where all the other facilities of the zoo have been. It does have a wooden roof. We want to rip off that wooden roof and put in skylarks. You can get in landscaping, airconditioning, proper heating and so forth and you can have inside rhino and hippo and giraffe exhibits with planners in a natural situation instead of the building that we have right now that is greatly outdated. Just to show you, just adding Kal-Wal lighting systems in the giraffes here at the Brookfield Zoo getting more light in. That building is way too dark for the animals.

“Now we’re go to the Australian and the Pampas Outback. There are some small animals, the tazmanian devils, there really is such a thing as a tazmanian devil. Here is one of the two mammals in the world that lays an egg. There are some things that we just can’t display. Also our spectacle bear is currently in the South American Pampas are basically in a small rectangular cage and we’d like to get them some more room. There is a place there in a more naturalistic exhibit. Where the alpaccas are, since they’ll be the South American Farm, and we currently do have an Estate left to us by Vera Taylor, a school teacher, there may be enough money or at least come close to realizing the South American Farm in the next year or two. We’re actually going to start looking at the design and the cost estimates this summer. We’ll add some brocket deer and giant anteaters where the alpaccas are now.

### **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“Lastly, we have an area for gorillas right now to the Koch exhibit. It is the charismatic megavertebrae that we know that will bring people in in big numbers. It is the most requested animal that we get questions for. At one time we did not envision it here at the zoo. Gorillas were all grouped at several zoos in bigger groups for breeding. We’ve been very successful there and they are looking for zoos now. We know that with a moments notice and notification and building construction, we could have three to five males here and the females would follow later. We have enough space for two yards, one would about twice the size of what the chimps are in and the other about the size of the area the chimpanzees are in. We envision a nice naturalistic exhibit, sort of what we’ve done for the chimps. We think we can even do better. The gorillas, believe it or not, are not as destructive as chimps are. At the same time, we’d add one of the lesser apes, the gibbon or the siamang here. People would either enter going through the gorillas or gibbons and tie into the orangatans and go out by the chimps or visa versa. It would make a complete complement of the apes and man complex.

“We have not done this with estimates of how much all of this is going to cost. We know we can not develop the zoo past its operating capacity and to maintain the high quality standards, this will come as we think it can be developed. This has more or less been a visionary guide for the Board and the County to look at it as we consider new things in the future. I was asked at the trustees meeting how much I thought the whole package would cost at today’s dollars and somewhere between twenty and thirty. Then you get into endowment questions and so forth. We have not yet estimated what the manpower costs would be, which is what the County is covering now. But we have already implemented several things since this was done up last February. We added the pavilion. We’ve added some stuff in the service complex using this as a guide. I just wanted to say that when we started out on this project, a year ago we were looking for grant funding to do a visual vision of where we see the development of the zoo was going and about that time Craig Rhodes, who I introduced earlier, approached us that Wilson, Darnell, and Mann would be interested in doing this. They spent two weeks with us, probably at a value of \$20,000. Lee Engler was the principle contact. We had a meeting with the zoo staff and going over and over things, tried to dream realistically and keep common sense in mind. I was going to ask if Russ would step forward and say a few words. Then any questions we would be glad to entertain.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Okay. Thank you. Welcome Russ.”

## Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997

**Mr. Russ Gorden**, Zoological Trustees, said, "Thank you. I was basically brought here today to keep Mark brief and he did pretty good and probably to answer a few of your questions if you have any questions. Let me make just one or two comments. Since this was inadvertently made public several weeks ago, I'd like you to know that this is not a major capital campaign as of yet. Our total focus remains on the \$2,500,000 veterinarian clinic. This is purely a working plan to help us deal with the growing operational explosion at the zoo and look towards what the future will bring and meet those challenges with additional revenues. Without a plan to work with, it is pretty hard to be fiscally responsible. So this plan, this vision, even though very much embraced by the trustees, helps raise a lot of questions and we will be addressing them. In fact, one of the side benefits of a plan like this in our current fund raising for the hospital, we now have a complete menu when we go out to talk about the needs of the zoo and one of the really fine benefits was that recently in trying to raise money for the hospital, we found a project that met with a groups need that will hopefully be able to announce that involves an entire exhibit. My very last comment is very dear to my heart. When this was somewhat prematurely broached to the public in the paper, the impression might have been left that this 25 year project, many millions of dollars, would fall completely in the hands of the private arena. It is not true and it is also not possible. I mean as you know you represent almost half of our operating budget today. We couldn't continue to do what we do without the County in our partnership. We certainly would want to presuppose that you wouldn't be interested in some major campaign in the future wherever that might lie. So I did not want to leave the impression that we wouldn't be knocking on your door, if necessary, with some pretty good ideas. Do you have any questions Commissioners?"

**Chairman Winters** said, "Commissioner Gwin has a question or comment."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "The Zoological Society has been working on . . . you've had a zoo plan for a long time as to vision and where you might be expanding. Have you been able to realize . . . I remember prior to this one, have you been able to realize in a systematic manner of the way you've planned the growth and the expansion of the zoo to this date?"

**Mr. Gorden** said, "It is uncanny how accurate the original plan is and how closely we've adhered to it. Now this has been tweaked a great deal. Starting about ten years ago with the American Prairie, going through the Koch exhibit, the zoo growth was phenomenal. We are on plan. But we don't have a rigid order. A lot of that has to do with where the capital comes from and what really the needs are. We're also very interested in what the community thinks ought to maybe be the next exhibit or two. Exhibits aside, we have operational issues. We're growing pretty fast and it is getting very expensive to operate the zoo. We will not out pace our ability to operate and I think that is the promise that I should leave with you, that's why the trustees are there. Did I answer your question?"

## **Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Yes you did, Russ, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you. I see no other questions. I guess I would certainly make the comment that in my experience as being a Commissioner I think this partnership that the Board of County Commissioners and County government as a whole has with the Board of Trustees has resulted in a remarkable facility in this County. I don't think it ever would have happened if there hadn't been that partnership early on and I have certainly witnessed the trustees at work and that is a group of committed citizens to this facility. There is no question in anybody's mind that that is not a group of hard working individuals that want that zoo to be the best that it can be. Right now the Board of County Commissioners is very proud of the fact that we have the number one tourist attraction which means we have a facility that enhances the quality of life for the citizens that live here and those who come for some reason, a vacation or business. I think it has been a great partnership and I hope it can continue for a hundred more years."

**Mr. Gorden** said, "Chairman Winters, thank you for those comments. They're appreciated by the Board of Trustees. As you know, we are definitely the envy for profit and non-profit and government and private citizenship getting together and I understand there are some people looking at how we do it right now and would like to copy us."

**Chairman Winters** said, "Well, I think the two key items would be to have a good project on which you're working and then have dedicated trustees or board members. I think those would certainly be the two that stand out. Thank you Russ and thank you Mark for making the presentation. We thank the architects at Wilson, Darnell and Mann for all the work that you have done for the zoo project. We think that is a real partnership of being on that team and we appreciate your work too. Thank you all."

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Schroeder seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

**D. RESOLUTION DESIGNATING COMMISSIONER MELODY C. MILLER AS  
SEDGWICK COUNTY'S REPRESENTATIVE ON THE PROJECT FREEDOM  
FAMILY AND YOUTH COALITION BOARD.**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Schroeder seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**E. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SEDGWICK COUNTY TO ISSUE TAXABLE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 1997, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF NOT TO EXCEED \$150,000,000 ON BEHALF OF RAYTHEON AIRCRAFT COMPANY.**

**Ms. Louanna Honeycutt Burress**, Administrative Officer, Department of Housing and Economic Development, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Back in March of 1990, the Commissioners took action to approve a Resolution of Intent to issue Industrial Development Revenue Bonds on behalf of Raytheon Aircraft Company in an amount up to \$400,000,000. Over the years, you have issued the bonds and through 1996 approximately \$214,000,000 had been issued on behalf of Raytheon. That leaves about \$186,000,000 left in the Resolution.

“As we all know, Raytheon has been located in the County for many years, providing literally thousands of jobs for Sedgwick County residents. They come to us each year in request that the Board of County Commissioners issue revenue bonds to finance various projects throughout the State. This year, the request is for \$137,000,000 in Industrial Development Revenue Bonds. Most of that will be utilized in Sedgwick County, however, Raytheon does have facilities in other parts of the State and a portion of the proceeds will be used to finance projects in Butler and Saline County. Approximately \$2,000,000 of the proceeds will be used to finance buildings and improvements, equipment, and machinery in Butler County, and about \$700,000 will be utilized for facilities in Saline County. That leaves slightly more than \$134,000,000 which will be expended in Sedgwick County. This morning, Mr. Wenhinkle, Bond Counsel for Raytheon, is here, as is Mr. Jim Gregory from Raytheon. If you have specific questions regarding this issue, I will defer to bond counsel. I would request that action to approve the issuance of these bonds.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Okay. Thank you Louanna. Do we have questions or comments?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Winters** said, “I don’t know that it needs many more comments because I think all of us who live in this community are certainly aware of the impact that Raytheon has on our community with a very positive way of providing quality jobs and continued investment in this community means to me a continued commitment to making Sedgwick County the home of just a super fine aircraft company.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“Commissioners, unless there are other questions, we’ll call for the vote on an issue that I think is very beneficial to this County. Madam Clerk, please call the vote.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you Louanna. Jim Gregory, thank you for being here. Mr. Wenhinkle, thank you for being here. If we would have had those technical hard questions, I’m glad you were here. Thank you very much. Next item.”

**F. RESOLUTION ACKNOWLEDGING REMOVAL OF NATIONSBANK, N.A. (MID-WEST), SUCCESSOR BY MERGER TO BANK IV, N.A., AND ITS ASSIGNEES, AS TRUSTEE UNDER CERTAIN TRUST INDENTURES AND APPOINTING INTRUST BANK, N.A., WICHITA, KANSAS, AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE.**

**Mr. Richard A. Euson**, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Intrust Bank has agreed to act as Successor Trustee under the various bond issues involving Raytheon Aircraft. This Resolution is required to confirm your acceptance of that designation and we recommend it for your approval.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you. Commissioners, are there questions or comments? What’s the will of the Board?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Hancock moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Next item."

**G. PERSONNEL POLICY 4.505 CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIP.**

**Ms. Lucretia Taylor**, Director, Diversity and Employee Relations, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Back in October of 1996, the Department of Diversity was tasked with developing a policy that looks at consensual relationships. What we started to do was to look and see what kind of policies were out there, what other governmental entities had in place. Basically, we looked at some sample policies. We reconvened our sexual harassment task force committee. We looked at a policy that COMCARE had developed that looked at relationships between former clients and staff. Basically, the consensual relationship policy says that employees, we are not discouraging employees to date one another and it is really talking about dating, but it is also talking about dating in the supervisor employee relationship, which can often times create conflicts of interest. When we are talking about conflicts of interest it may be where an employee believes that the supervisor is entering into a relationship with a worker, a subordinate, an employee, that there may be undue benefits, benefits that would relate to the terms or conditions of that person's employment. So basically this is what this policy is addressing, the relationship and conflict of interest that a supervisor subordinate relationship can create. It also can create issues of sexual harassment, particularly if a relationship ends or sex discrimination. Policy will address the means and mechanisms in which to address those kinds of relationships.

"One of the methods of addressing it is to make sure that if a supervisor is involved in a relationship with their subordinate employee, at a minimum we are requesting that they self identify and also no longer supervise. That may be a restructuring of duties or responsibilities so that someone will have the responsibility of supervising that employee except the one that is involved in the relationship.



**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

“Also is alternative arrangements, that is what the policy states as alternative arrangements. If an alternative arrangement can’t be made, what we would like to do is possibly seek a transfer for one of the individuals or parties involved in the relationship to another department. That is what the policy says. I would recommend that you adopt the policy and I’d be happy to answer any recommendations that you may have.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Thank you Lucretia. A question I have is can you describe the group that helped work on this, who put this together? It was not done in a vacuum I understand.”

**Ms. Taylor** said, “No, it was not done in a vacuum. What initially happened is I was tasked to look at a policy and we have a sexual harassment task force which was in place back in ‘93 or ‘94 that is a committee made up of individuals from COMCARE, made up from EMS, we have a representative from the Legal Department, Susan Erlenwein of Environmental Resources was the Chairperson of that committee. Basically, what we have started to do was relook at our sexual harassment policy. As we started looking at that policy, we were also looking at the consensual relationship policy as well. So we know that there are some departments where people date and get married and we have those issues occurring too, so we wanted to have that committee together to look at these policies and make recommendations. We also put information over the internet and asked other organizations, other governmental entities, other private and public sector employers, what do you have, what are some sample policies that you can give us to give us some guidance as to what we needed to do.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “So there were seven or eight people on the committee that worked on this project?”

**Ms. Taylor** said, “Yes, exactly.”

**Chairman Winters** said, “Commissioners, are there other questions or comments of Lucretia?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to approve the policy.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you Lucretia. Next item."

**H. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF MONIES FROM THE DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS FUND TO THE SPECIAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT FUND. ALL DISTRICTS.**

**Mr. Spears** said, "Item H is a Resolution to transfer the balance of our budget from the Division of Highways Fund to the Special Highway Improvement Fund at the end of the calendar year in accordance with K.S.A. 68-590. Recommend that you adopt the Resolution."

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you David. Next item."

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**I. PURCHASING DEPARTMENT.**

**1. RECONSIDERATION OF ITEM SEVEN OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' NOVEMBER 20, 1997 REGULAR MEETING.**

**Mr. Darren Muci**, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “ Item one is a reconsideration of this item from the November 20 meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts. The recommendaiton was to accept the proposal of Xerox Engineering Systems. That amount is \$69,489.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to approve the recommendation of the Board of Bids and Contracts.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, “Next item.”

**2. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' DECEMBER 4, 1997 REGULAR MEETING.**

**Mr. Muci** said, “These are Minutes from the December 4 meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts. There are five items for consideration.

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**(1) CARPETING - BUREAU/CENTRAL SERVICES**  
**FUNDING: BUREAU/CENTRAL SERVICES**

“Item one, various carpeting for the Bureau of Central Services. It was recommended to accept the highlighted items and a negotiated bid of Carpet Value. That includes deletion of some of the items. That amount is \$44,551.

**(2) RIP RAP - BUREAU/PUBLIC SERVICES**  
**FUNDING: BUREAU/PUBLIC SERVICES**

“Item two is rip rap for the Bureau of Public Services. It was recommended to accept the low bid of George M. Myers for \$12,600.

**(3) FTIR SPECTRUM ANALYZER - REGIONAL FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTER**  
**FUNDING: REGIONAL FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTER**

“Item three is an FTIR spectrum analyzer system for the Regional Forensic Science Center. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Perkin-Elmer Corporation for \$49,651.

**(4) PERSONAL COMPUTER HARDWARE & SOFTWARE - JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY**  
**FUNDING: JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY**

“Item four, personal computer hardware and software for the Juvenile Detention Facility. Commissioners, this item was brought to you before. The Department of Corrections found additional monies for additional purchases. That amount is \$9,226. It is an additional computer, printers, et cetera.

**(5) 800 MHZ PORTABLE RADIOS - EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE**  
**FUNDING: EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE**

“Item five is 800 MHz portable radios for Emergency Medical Services. It was recommended to accept the sole source bid of Motorola for \$32,659 to match existing equipment. I will be happy to take questions and recommend approval of the Minutes provided by the Board of Bids and Contracts.”

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Schroeder moved to approve the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Thank you Darren. Next item."

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**J. CONSENT AGENDA.**

**1. Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment Contracts.**

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Rent Subsidy</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Landlord</u>
V97066	\$182.00	4	Thomas Pinkston
V97067	\$204.00		Irvin Burhenn

**2. The following Section 8 Housing Contracts are being amended to reflect a revised monthly amount due to a change in the income level of the participating client.**

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Old Amount</u>	<u>New Amount</u>
V95007	\$227.00	\$185.00
V97063	\$463.00	\$250.00
V861001	\$231.00	\$212.00
V96105	\$325.00	\$350.00

- 3. Order dated December 3, 1997 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 4. Consideration of the Check Register of December 5, 1997.**
- 5. Budget Adjustment Requests.**

<u>Number</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Type of Adjustment</u>
970715	Treasurer	Transfer
970716	Finance General Solid Waste Program	Transfer
970717	Capital Projects	Supplemental Appropriation
970718	Legal	Transfer
970719	District Attorney	Transfer
970720	Sheriff	Transfer
970721	Environmental Resources	Transfer
970722	Personnel/Legal	Transfer
970723	Finance	Transfer
970724	Corrections	Transfer
970725	Appraisal	Transfer
970726	Information Services	Transfer
970727	COMCARE TSH Children's	Supplemental Appropriation
970728	Corrections	Transfer
970729	Finance	Transfer
970730	Aging	Transfer
970731	Detention Facility Expansion	Supplemental Appropriation
970732	Public Services (H/W)	Transfer
970733	Public Services (H/W)	Transfer

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

<u>Number</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Type of Adjustment</u>
970734	Belle Terre South Phase 1-Street	Supplemental Appropriation

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "Commissioners, you have the Consent Agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it."

**MOTION**

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

There was no discussion on the Motion, the vote was called.

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Paul W. Hancock	Aye
Commissioner Melody C. Miller	Aye
Commissioner Mark F. Schroeder	Aye
Chairman Thomas G. Winters	Aye

**Chairman Winters** said, "Is there any other business to come before this Board? Seeing none, the Regular Meeting is adjourned."

**K. OTHER**

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

**Regular Meeting, December 10, 1997**

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF  
SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS**

---

**THOMAS G. WINTERS**, Chairman  
Third District

---

**PAUL W. HANCOCK**, Chairman Pro Tem  
Second District

---

**BETSY GWIN**, Commissioner  
First District

---

**MELODY C. MILLER**, Commissioner  
Fourth District

---

**MARK F. SCHROEDER**, Commissioner  
Fifth District

ATTEST:

---

**James Alford**, County Clerk

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_, 1998