

CIP Project: Compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

Requestor/Title/Department: Lindsey Mahoney, ADA Coordinator

Project Description

1) **Location:** County owned buildings located across the County.

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

In 2006, the County contracted with an ADA consultant to provide a "Self-Evaluation" of the County's compliance with the ADA. This Self-Evaluation included a recommended transition plan for ADA improvements to County facilities. The Transition Plan was the result of an exhaustive inspection of facilities for ADA barriers; eighty-three county addresses were inspected with 995 individually listed variances. These variances were listed by priority based on the severity of the barrier and the risk of failing to promptly comply. The plan identifies the barriers, recommends corrective action, and indicates a conceptual cost for bringing the barrier into compliance. This project would provide for a logical, planned effort to comply with the ADA.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

In 1997, the County was sued for violation of the ADA at the Kansas Coliseum; a negotiated agreement was reached. In 2006, a renewed prospect of exposure to litigation became apparent. The County is committed to ADA compliance both because it is required by law, but also because it is the right thing to do. As a demonstration of this commitment, the Board of County Commissioners adopted an updated ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan in October 2008.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Without diligently pursuing a compliance effort that documents a timed plan to completion, the County is in jeopardy of lawsuits and an appearance of disregard for the law and its citizens. The ADA requires a continuing obligation to barrier removal, and that County programs and services, when viewed in their entirety, are readily accessible to people with disabilities.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2012-2016
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 2,123,475

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Project Services/Architect/Staff**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design	31,831	36,277	32,765	28,058	27,488	33,452	189,871
Construct	292,740	333,612	301,325	258,061	252,815	307,638	1,746,191
Total	324,571	369,889	334,090	286,119	280,303	341,090	1,936,062



CIP Project: D25 - Flood Control System Major Maintenance and Repairs

Requestor/Title/Department: David C. Spears, P.E., Director of Public Works

Project Description

1) **Location:** Wichita-Valley Center Flood Control Project Levees (110 miles of levee)

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Major maintenance and repair work to the flood control system. Work includes repair or replacement of toe drains that carry seepage away from the soil under the levee, flood gates, concrete, erosion control systems, earthwork on levees and channels and other critical elements of the system.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The flood control system represents a significant long term investment in infrastructure. Extensive analysis performed during the levee certification project revealed that the system is in good condition but future viability of the project depends upon making continuing investments in major maintenance and repair work.

It is widely believed that levee certification will be required by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) every 10 years. Under a separate program, the Corps of Engineers will perform an extensive inspection every 5 years. The backbone of the system is over 50 years old. In order to continue to pass inspections and retain levee accreditation by FEMA over the next 50 years or more, local government will have to expend additional funds over a period of time to repair or replace critical elements of the system.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- 1) Decertification of the levee system by FEMA which would result in increased flood insurance costs to the community.
- 2) Failure to pass Corps of Engineers inspections which would result in the withholding of federal repair funds after damaging flood events.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

Although this maintenance and repair work will improve the overall condition of the system, there is no impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2013-2016
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 2,000,000

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Facility Project Services**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,500,000
Total	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,500,000



CIP Project: Replace Center Restroom, SC Park

Requestor/Title/Department: Mark Sroufe, Superintendent, Sedgwick County Parks

Project Description

1) **Location:** Sedgwick County Park

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Replace the current facility with an ADA and code compliant building similar to the ones constructed in the north end of the park near the Boundless Playground and near the south entrance.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. The current building is inefficient, not ADA compliant, and it is difficult to keep it clean, sanitary, and odor free.
- b. The current restroom facility is also difficult to maintain as it has no exhaust system to keep the air fresh and odor free, no hot water for washing hands, the floors are not sloped properly which makes it difficult to clean and to keep dry to prevent someone from slipping and falling.
- c. In addition, the lighting is insufficient, the electrical system is not up to current code, the exterior walls are not insulated which drives up heating costs, and there is no handicap stall available

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Increased maintenance costs, marginal electrical system and lack of ADA improvements

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

The operating cost of this building would be less than the current building due to it being more energy efficient which would result in lower heating costs, lower electricity costs, and lower water consumption.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000		(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	(1,200)
Commodity 45000		(400)	(400)	(400)	(400)	(1,600)
Total	-	(700)	(700)	(700)	(700)	(2,800)

6) **Project Status:**

- New
- Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2013
- If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 132,485

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Architect-Engineer**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		132,485					132,485
Total	-	132,485	-	-	-	-	132,485



CIP Project: Replace Roofs - County-Owned Buildings

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** Various sites in Sedgwick County

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Complete roof removal and replacement for various County-owned buildings. In this five year CIP window, the major roof replacements planned are the Sedgwick County Extension building in 2013 and the District Attorney's wing of the Main Courthouse as well as the south half of the Sedgwick County Adult Detention Facility in 2015.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

In 2001, Sedgwick County contracted with a local architectural engineering firm to complete roof evaluations for County-owned buildings. That five year plan, which is part of a 20-year survey plan, was the original basis for the recommendations included in a County wide roof plan. That initial plan was updated during 2009-2010 with assessments performed by qualified engineers and provides an analytical and objective basis for repair and replacement.

As an example, the south half of the Adult Detention Facility Roof was programmed for earlier replacement but because of repairs and maintenance, the useful life of this roof has been extended to the year 2015.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Most roofs will last in excess of 20 years if properly maintained and they do not experience storm damage. Facilities staff schedule replacement based on averages for the type of roof and adjust replacement schedules as needed depending on storms and the environment. Failure to replace a roof before it fails results in property and contents damage. Some examples of that damage can be in the form of mold, ruined ceilings and failure of electrical and mechanical systems.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2012-2016
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 1,963,678

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Project Services/Architect Engineer**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct	58,600	30,965	109,303	1,368,698			1,567,566
Total	58,600	30,965	109,303	1,368,698	-	-	1,567,566



CIP Project: Replace Roof & HVAC Roof Top Units, SC Ext

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** Sedgwick County Extension Office, 7001 W. 21st Street

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Replace the aging and increasingly unreliable rooftop heating/cooling equipment with efficient and reliable replacements. A total of fifteen (15) rooftop heating/cooling units will be replaced. Actual configuration of the replacement equipment will be determined during the design phase. The project includes concurrent replacement of the roof.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

a. Rooftop equipment typically has a life expectancy of 15 years with proper maintenance, but the existing equipment began having significant failures in 2003. In the last several years, ten heat exchangers were replaced because they failed and could have discharged carbon monoxide into the occupied spaces. Numerous cooling compressors have also been replaced.

b. The existing equipment has poor energy efficiency and does a marginal job of maintaining comfort levels in the occupied spaces. The primary focus will be to achieve reliability, improve energy efficiency and address comfort issues. New equipment is expected to reduce heating and cooling costs by more than fifteen percent.

c. Current energy cost is \$61,000 annually. Staff estimates new equipment will reduce energy consumption by more than \$9,000 annually and maintenance costs by \$4,000 annually for the first 5 years. Over the average 15-year life expectancy, the new equipment is expected to save \$175,000 in utility and repair costs.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- 1- Increasing risk of carbon monoxide exposure
- 2- Loss of all heating, cooling and ventilation for the area served by a given rooftop unit.
- 3- Delays in benefiting from reduced utility bills from more efficient equipment
- 4- Possible inconvenience and expense of cancelled events when equipment fails

5) **Briefly describe the impact on operating budget:**

The new equipment will reduce energy consumption by more than \$9,000 annually and maintenance costs by \$4,000 annually for the first 5 years. Over the average 15-year life expectancy, the new equipment is expected to save \$175,000 in utility and repair costs.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Personnel						-
Contractuals	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(20,000)
Commodity	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(45,000)
Total	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(65,000)

6) **Project Status:** () New

(x) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2013

If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: \$503,542

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:**

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design	33,981						33,981
Construct		865,673					865,673
Total	33,981	865,673	-	-	-	-	899,654



CIP Project: Replace Exterior Joint Sealant Adult Detention North Addition

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, DIO Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** 141 W. Elm

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Replace joint sealant for pre-cast concrete panels at the Sedgwick County Adult Detention Facility (North addition). Replace joint sealant for thirteen (13) interior gyms located inside pod housing. Work will include: Remove existing sealant from all exterior horizontal and vertical pre-cast joints. Remove all sealant from thirteen (13) interior gyms located in pods. Properly clean and prepare joints for new backer rods and two part joint sealant. Sealant inside gyms will receive "pick proof" sealant to prevent vandalism.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current sealant is failing in places but the majority still has a few years useful life remaining. Pre-cast construction is reliant upon the sealant between panels to maintain the integrity of the exterior envelope of the building. The South Housing unit sealant was replaced in 2008. The need to totally replace sealant for the North addition is projected for 2015.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Without functioning precast wall panel sealant, damage is likely at structural steel weld plates that connect the precast to the poured in place concrete structure, precast panel deterioration will occur, increased utility costs will result and potential for mold and pests increases.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2015
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 149,453

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Facility Project Services**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design				9,995			9,995
Construct				139,458			139,458
Total	-	-	-	149,453	-	-	149,453



CIP Project: Replace Maintenance Building, SC Park

Requestor/Title/Department: Mark Sroufe, Superintendent, Sedgwick County Parks

Project Description

1) **Location:** 6501 W 21st St North, Sedgwick County Park Maintenance Yard

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Replace a 30 year old wood frame maintenance building with a 40 foot by 80 foot steel insulated building.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current building is not insulated and is expensive to heat. The roof leaks, the lighting is not adequate, the plumbing is in poor condition, and the garage doors do not seal and are in poor condition. In addition, it is too small, the ceiling is not high enough to get some equipment inside, storage space is extremely limited, and work space is limited. To repair the building to make it useful, we would have to replace the roof, replace both 12 ft garage doors, insulate the building, replace the plumbing, install a new heating system, install new lighting, and raise the height of the building by at least 3 feet. Staff feel that the cost to repair the building would be more than it is worth.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Staff will have to continue to deal with poor working conditions due to poor lighting and heating systems, marginal plumbing, a leaky roof as well as inadequate storage. During the cold weather months, staff will have to continue have to wear heavy coats while they work inside this building to keep warm. Heating costs will continue to increase as this building is not efficient. These conditions limit employee efficiency and impact morale.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated. Staff work environment and security and condition of equipment will be improved.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2013
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 445,927

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Vendor**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design		29,345					29,345
Construct		416,582					416,582
Total	-	445,927	-	-	-	-	445,927



CIP Project: Preserve Exterior Blue Brick - Main Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** 525 N. Main, Main Courthouse, exterior blue brick

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

1. Clean all masonry blue brick on exterior of building using power washer (to remove any loose brick face and dirt).
2. Apply one saturation coat of clear water repellant to exterior masonry blue walls.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The glazing of the blue bricks on the exterior of the main courthouse building is showing signs of chipping and spalling due to age and exposure to the elements. As the glazing surfaces deteriorate, moisture is allowed to enter through the freshly exposed brick which can cause further damage during the freeze/thaw cycles of the winter seasons. There is no repair that could restore the glazing on the brick faces and the cost of replacing the bricks would be astronomical. This preventive maintenance project would arrest the current rate of deterioration and preserve the appearance of the building.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

If left untreated the deterioration of the blue glazing will accelerate with each freeze /thaw cycle and eventually lead to larger portions of the brick areas shedding their faces. Not only will this detract from the appearance of the building it would also pose a safety hazard if any of the larger pieces fell onto a pedestrian or vehicle.

5) **Briefly Describe impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated .

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

- 6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2013
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: \$100,011

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:** Estimate Source: Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design		4,348					4,348
Construct		95,663					95,663
Total	-	100,011	-	-	-	-	100,011



CIP Project: Replace Parking Lots on County Property

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** Various County-owned Facilities

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

a. Complete replacement for parking lots outside various County-owned buildings .

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

a. In 2003, Sedgwick County contracted with a local architectural engineering firm to complete parking lot evaluations for County-owned buildings. This plan of replacement projects is the implementation of recommendations included in that report.

b. This survey was completed in response to an identified need to use professionals to assess pavement conditions at appropriate intervals and use that data to prioritize maintenance, repair and replacement.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Primarily the delays will cause accelerating deterioration of the pavement. Additionally, if the surface becomes irregular or unstable, the increase for pedestrian injury increases.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated .

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 918,928

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Project Services/Architect Engineer**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct	129,431	248,062		471,112	70,323		918,928
Total	129,431	248,062	-	471,112	70,323	-	918,928

CIP Project: Heartland Preparedness Center: Law Addition

Project Description

1) **Location:** East of I -135, South of K-96, off New York Street

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Addition of offices, classroom space and training areas to a planned Military Reserve Center to support Law Enforcement and 911 training.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current Law Enforcement Training Center does not adequately meet the needs of Wichita Police and Sedgwick County Sheriff Departments. It is housed in a former USD 259 elementary school built in 1958. Neither tenants nor school district are inclined to make significant investments in infrastructure for heavy maintenance or remodeling. This proposed facility jointly uses space and creates natural synergies for Homeland Security training and has regional potential. Estimated costs are displayed as shared equally between Wichita and Sedgwick County. The costs are based on an Architect-Engineer's estimate provided in Dec 2008. Sedgwick County would be lead agency and receive lease payments from the City of Wichita.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Preliminary estimate of the County share of construction and owner's cost, including contingencies, is as reflected below. Construction of the Heartland Preparedness National Guard Readiness Center is now in progress. While changes to security standards after September 11, 2001 prevented the joint use of military facilities, co-location of the Law Enforcement Training Center would provide each partner opportunities to share training activities.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

The operating cost of this larger facility is expected to increase over the existing leased former school. As the design is developed and refined, estimates will be updated. The estimated cost below reflect a half share of costs for maintenance, custodial services and utilities based on square footage. Operating costs will be shared between the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000			122,337	127,354	127,354	377,045
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	122,337	127,354	127,354	377,045

6) **Project Status:** () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: \$14,789,739

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Project Services/Architect**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan	20,000						20,000
Design		2,098,068					2,098,068
Construct			27,441,410				27,441,410
Cost of Bonding		31,472	411,622				443,094
Total	20,000	2,129,540	27,853,032	-	-	-	30,002,572



CIP Project: Construct County Administration/Tax Building

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** Downtown location to be determined

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

This project will construct a new building of approximately 74,000 square feet and a new parking structure containing approximately 362 stalls to accommodate 14 Administration & Tax Group functions. In addition, the project will remodel approximately 38,000 square feet in the Sedgwick County Main Courthouse to be used for criminal justice functions. Building will accommodate current and future (through 2019) departmental growth. Total square foot needs were developed based on department needs and established space standards that considered job functions and support space needs. Construction would support latest technology and reasonable standard interior finishes found in typical “office type” construction. It is anticipated that the building will be constructed in the downtown area.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The Administration,/Tax and Criminal Justice groups are currently located in the Main Courthouse, Historic Courthouse and other leased spaces. There has been no available space for future growth. Historically, as these groups needed additional room and space became available, it was assigned without regard for efficiency. Currently, departments are not strategically placed within an optimum location; rather, space assignments have been dependent upon what has become available within County owned facilities or a lease space was identified. As criminal justice needs increase in the Main Courthouse, additional County departments will be required to acquire other space. Having departments separated in various buildings hinders their ability to function efficiently, share support space and other resources, and to provide the best customer service. Building and owning space may be a more cost effective long term approach than leasing space to meet future space needs.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Currently there is no space available in County owned buildings. Future space needs will need to be addressed through lease space. Without this project departments will not realize efficiencies of space and co-location.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

Maintenance costs for such things as grounds maintenance, utility expenses, maintenance personnel costs, custodial services and regulatory compliance are indicated below. The numbers are extensions of the average square foot cost of operating our current inventory of buildings.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Personnel 41000					125,800	125,800
Contractual 42000					180,560	180,560
Commodity 45000					31,820	31,820
Total	-	-	-	-	338,180	338,180

6) **Project Status:** (X) New
 () Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s):
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP:

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Architect-Engineer**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Design			1,825,085				1,825,085
Construct				30,283,213			30,283,213
Total	-	-	1,825,085	30,283,213	-	-	32,108,298



CIP Project: Replace Shelter #3, Lake Afton Park

Requestor/Title/Department: Mark Sroufe, Superintendent, Sedgwick County Parks

Project Description

1) **Location:** Lake Afton Park

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Construct new enclosed shelter that will replace Shelter #3 which was removed in 2004. This building will have kitchen and restroom facilities as well as a meeting room. The projected rental fee will be \$200.00/day and the estimated annual rental days are 75.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The Park cannot meet the current demand for these shelters as they are very popular for family gatherings, weddings, parties, and camp-outs by camping clubs/groups. We turn people away on a daily basis who are looking for a facility like this. The building will be available for rent 365 days a year.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Not being able to satisfy customer demand..

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

The Commodity and Contractual budgets would be impacted since this will be a building that will have heating and A/C, and kitchen facilities. Utility costs for a year are estimated at \$1500 and operating costs would be under \$500.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue				15,000	15,000	30,000
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000				(1,500)	(1,500)	(3,000)
Commodity 45000				(500)	(500)	(1,000)
Total	-	-	-	13,000	13,000	26,000

6) **Project Status:** () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2014

If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: \$446,039

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Facility Project Services**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design			7,419				7,419
Construct			438,620				438,620
Total	-	-	446,039	-	-	-	446,039



CIP Project: Replace Movable Wall, Sedgwick County Extension

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** 7001 W 21st Street

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Replacement of the movable wall system in 4-H Hall. Work will involve removal and installation of new track, trolleys, ceiling repairs, and 18 each 4' wide x 15' tall wall panels; and two pocket doors to cover panel storage area.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

a. The Extension Office opened in January 1994. The wall system is in 4-H Hall, which is the large open area at the east side of the building. The movable wall system is used with virtually every event in a variety of configurations, requiring the configurations to be changed virtually every day. Some events want the whole space open, others are divided in two, while others will use a 60/40 or 50/50 separation to provide three sections. Without the wall system, groups cannot be separated for different events or separate activities within the same event. If the wall system is not kept operational, Extension Office staff is certain events will be lost.

b. The 1994 movable wall system is obsolete and parts are no longer available. Repairs returned all of the panels to usable condition approximately mid-year 2005, but even after the repairs half of the panels are in poor condition and the remainder are in only fair condition; and the trolleys are virtually worn out and replacements are not available.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

As the panels become unsafe to use, staff will remove them from service to prevent them from falling and injuring anyone.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated .

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:**

- () New
- (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): 2013
- If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP: 110,466

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Vendor**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design		7,461					7,461
Construct		103,005					103,005
Total	-	110,466	-	-	-	-	110,466



CIP Project: Replace Carpet, Second Floor, Adult Detention

Requestor/Title/Department: Major Glenn Kurtz, Detention Division, Sheriff's Office

Project Description

1) **Location:** Adult Detention, 141 W. Elm , 2nd floor Administrative area

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

The project will replace all of the carpet on the second floor of the Sedgwick County Detention Facility. Areas to be included the Sheriff 's Administrative area, the public hallway, the training room, the chaplain's office and work area and all of Detention Administration. Carpet replacement will require moving modular, stand alone, and misc. furniture, as well as boxes, and other office items.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The carpet in the areas listed above has not been replaced in over twelve years and is reaching the end of its service life. In addition, the carpet is coming loose from the concrete floor causing trip hazards that require regluing or repair. Finally the carpet does not contribute to a professional appearance for the Sheriff 's office as it will no longer come completely clean after shampooing.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

The carpet will continuing to present a tripping hazard and require either regluing or repairs.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated .

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** (X) New
 () Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s):
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP:

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Vendor**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		29,826					29,826
Total	-	29,826	-	-	-	-	29,826



CIP Project: Construct EMS Garage Facility

Requestor/Title/Department: Scott Hadley, Director, Emergency Medical Services

Project Description

1) **Location:** Area of 1015 Stillwell

2) **Scope of Work to be Performed:**

Construction of a new facility to store ready units in compliance with state regulations. The facility will include six ambulance bays as well as space for storage, training and equipment maintenance.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The reserve ready fleet has increased and future call demand will create a need for a place for a shift to start and end while being moved to higher volume as the deployment plan will suggest. Furthermore, additions to our ambulance fleet for surge ability as increased and we have outgrown our current facility's capacity to house them. Kansas State Regulation is explicit and mandates how ambulances are stored and housed ; K.A.R. 109-2-5 (j) reads as follows:

Each operator shall park all ground ambulances in a completely enclosed building with a solid concrete floor. Each operator shall maintain the interior heat at no less than 50 degrees Fahrenheit. Each operator shall ensure that the interior of the building is kept clean and has adequate lighting. Each operator shall store all supplies and equipment in a safe manner.

The facility would also be used to store surge supplies, provide an area for training on ambulance operations, and serve as a maintenance area for equipment repair.

4) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Delaying or not completing this project would increase the risk of the department being out of compliance with State Regulation which could potentially jeopardize our Ambulance Service Permit. Additionally, competing for space with other departments to stay in regulatory compliance interfering with the effective functioning of that department. Finally, not being able to properly store ambulances by regulation (parking them outside) creates potential for wind or hail damage.

5) **Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:**

The following impacts on the operating budget for increase utility cost are anticipated and will be requested in the departmental budget.

Impact	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Revenue						
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000				4,020	4,020	8,040
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	4,020	4,020	8,040

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2012-2016 CIP for year(s): Watch List
 If previously approved, project cost in 2012-2016 CIP:

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Facility Project Services**

Phase	Prior year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Land				168,750			168,750
Design				37,044			37,044
Construct				490,760			490,760
Total	-	-	-	696,554	-	-	696,554

