

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

### **REGULAR MEETING**

**January 18, 2006**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:00 A.M., on Wednesday, January 18, 2006 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Ben Sciortino, with the following present: Chair Pro Tem Lucy Burtnett; Commissioner David M. Unruh; Commissioner Tim R. Norton; Commissioner Thomas G. Winters; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Ms. Lori Usher, Executive Director, Workforce Development; Mr. Don Brace, County Clerk; Mr. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager; Ms. Kathy Sexton, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Richard Yogy, Chief Information Officer, Division of Information and Operations (DIO); Mr. Jeremy Biltz, Manager, Call Center, DIO; Mr. Tom Pletcher, Clinical Director of Mental Health, Health Department; Ms. Annette Graham, Director, Department on Aging; Mr. Ron Estes, Treasurer; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and, Ms. Lisa Davis, Deputy County Clerk.

### **GUESTS**

Mr. Wes Darnell, Project Leader, Arena Design Consortium, Wilson Darnell Mann, PA.  
Mr. Michael Gisick, Member, Metropolitan Area Planning Commission.  
Mr. Bryan Derreberry, President, Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce.  
Mr. David Bayouth, Former County Commissioner.

### **INVOCATION**

The Invocation was led by Pastor Kim Dickerson-Oard of Aldersgate United Methodist Church, Wichita.

### **FLAG SALUTE**

### **ROLL CALL**

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

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

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:** Regular Meeting, December 14, 2005  
Regular Meeting, December 21, 2005  
Special Meeting, November 29, 2005

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meetings of December 14, 2005, December 21, 2005 and the Special Meeting of November 29, 2005.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Commissioners, I believe you've had a chance to review the Minutes of these meetings. What's the will of the Board please?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the Minutes of the meetings of December 14, 2005, December 21, 2005 and the Special Meeting of November, 29, 2005.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Next item please."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,000 FOR THE KANSAS TECHNICAL TRAINING INITIATIVE.**

**Ms. Lori Usher**, Executive Director of Workforce Development, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Sedgwick County has previously entered into an annual funding support for Kansas Technical Training Initiative in the amount of \$50,000. This funding, along with the financial commitments from other public and private partners, supports the 2006 operations of KTTI. The boards of both KTTI and the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority have approved a transition plan for 2006, whereby the responsibilities of KTTI will transfer to the Authority.

It's projected that the transition will be complete by the end of the third quarter 2006. KTTI is involved in a number of programs that will continue through the transition period in 2006. The primary focus of KTTI though will be the development of the aviation tech center and the technical education campus. The partnership of KTTI and the authority has been critical in supporting Sedgwick County's technical education and training focus.

Here today representing KTTI is Pete Gustav, Executive Director, in the back of the room, if you should have any questions."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay, thank you. Commissioners, any comments on this item? Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well I've been on that board, was the appointee from the county from the very beginning and I'm going to be supportive, as we finish up the mission of KTTI and start to sunset it, we haven't gotten to that critical mass of time when all the three-legged stool needs to start evolving to something different. The three-legged stool is the authority, KITE and KTTI and trying to make sure that we don't give up on KTTI before all of its mission is fulfilled, which is going to help the authority and KITE and everything we're doing I think would not be prudent.

So I'm going to be supportive of this amount of money to carry on the mission that we started, with the four major aviation firms early, probably four years ago, and now we're looking at other things like technology and healthcare and technical education in general. The county has taken over the whole arena, with the authority, but an integral part of that incubation was KTTI and it's just not quite time to sunset it yet, so I think we should step up to the plate, be a partner again with the city and the state and the aviation companies and make sure that the mission is fulfilled as we designed it four years ago. That's all I have, Mr. Chair."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Any other comments? I’m sorry, excuse me, Commissioner Unruh.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Uh, thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to just express my support for this item also. I just want to make a comment that there’s been a lot of fragmented pieces of work that’s been going on, trying to bring the different components together to get us to the place that we are today, and I just want to congratulate Lori for the work that she’s done since she’s come on as our executive director, to kind of bring this to the point where we’re starting to maybe see some light at the end of this process.

So we need to stick with the plan for just a little bit longer, to make sure that we get where we want to be and that we can bring all the partners along together so that we can provide this technical education and training that’s absolutely critical to the economic health of our area. So appreciate the work that you’ve done, appreciate the work that Pete has done and we look forward to really a successful future in technical education and training, so that our business partners in the community can complete their plans and if we’re all working together, I think that we can bring some prosperity to our area and this is a key component of that, so that’s all I had.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Any further comment? What’s the will of the Board on this item?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the funding.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Commissioners, before we go to the next scheduled item, I’d like to have a motion to allow us to take up an off agenda item. This is an appointment of Commissioner Norton’s that I believe would be appropriate we can take it up at this time.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Winters moved to consider an off agenda item.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “It would be resolution A, if you would like to read it.”

**OFF AGENDA ITEM**

**RESOLUTION APPOINTING MICHAEL GISICK (COMMISSIONER NORTON’S APPOINTMENT) TO THE WICHITA/ SEDGWICK COUNTY METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION.**

**Mr. Richard Euson**, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, “We’ve prepared a resolution of appointment to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for Michael Gisick. This is a term that would expire August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009 and I recommend you adopt the resolution.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Thank you. Commissioners?”

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the resolution.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "I know we're going to swear Michael in now. He is here today. I would like to comment really quickly. I've known Michael several years. He's very active in the Southwest Neighborhood Association. We've had a chance to visit at quite a few different events. He has worked hard to understand the south side, which I think most people know that I advocate for very strongly. I think he'll bring great knowledge of the south side to the planning commission, but he has the goal to be very involved in our community and understand planning at a greater level. We've had some great conversations and I think he'll be a wonderful appointment and addition to the planning commission."

I've held my spot open for several months, trying to find that person and not just take the first person down the pike that might be interested, and I think Michael will be a great addition to the planning commission and I'm excited that he finally accepted my offer to take this appointment."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. I think we have Mr. Brace here, if you would like to now do the swearing in."

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

**Mr. Don Brace**, County Clerk, said, "Raise your right hand.

*I do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Kansas and faithfully discharge the duties of the Office of Wichita/Sedgwick County Area Planning Commission, so help me God."*

**Mr. Michael Gisick**, Member, Wichita/ Sedgwick County Planning Commission, said, "I do."

**Mr. Brace** said, "Congratulations."

**Mr. Gisick** said, "And I want to thank you, Mr. Norton. I've enjoyed our conversations as well and I look forward to working with you and the rest of the city and the county in getting your goals met. Thank you very much.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you for serving. Madam Clerk, would you call now the next item please."

**B. RESOLUTION SUPPORTING AFFORDABLE AIR SERVICE IN KANSAS AND THE ACCOMPANYING REQUEST TO GOVERNOR KATHLEEN SEBELIUS AND THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE TO CREATE A KANSAS AIR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO PROTECT OUR AFFORDABLE AIR FARES AND BUILD OUR KANSAS AIR SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE.**

**Mr. Bryan Derreberry**, President, Wichita Metropolitan Area Chamber of Commerce, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I want to wish Ben a great start in his chairmanship of this commission and also want to thank commissioners Burnett, Unruh, Winters and County Manager Buchanan for this opportunity this morning.

### **POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

I'm really excited about presenting testimonies supporting Sedgwick County's resolution promoting affordable airfares for Kansans. I am privileged this morning to have the honor of representing more than 2,000 Chamber business members who are strong advocates of maintaining affordable and convenient air service in our region. Daily, these businesses stake their livelihood and that of their employees on their ability to access and service their customers, clients and vendors around our nation and the globe.

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

I will keep my comments brief and to the point this morning. To that end, I will describe the impressive list of public and private coalition partners supporting the Kansans for Affordable Airfares Initiative and share why it resonates so strongly across many sectors of our community.

There is an old saying in the lobbying business, 'the deeper and thicker the coalition supporting an issue, the truer the cause'. With Affordable Airfares for Kansans, we are advancing a true public/private sector coalition that is regional and diverse in its reach and representation. The City of Wichita and this county commission are part of a coalition that includes individual business leaders, companies and organizations from not only Wichita and Sedgwick County but Wellington and Derby and Hesston and Hutchinson and points beyond. Every coalition partner knows that this is a critical issue for their individual communities, economies, employers, employees, region and our state as a whole.

From a local business perspective, you should know that our largest employers, including Cargill and Cessna, have committed many dollars and hours of time working to assure the future of affordable airfares for all South Central Kansans. The Chairman of the Chamber's Board of Directors, Mr. Lyndy Wells, of Intrust Bank, has dedicated many hours and pledges many more to ensuring we continue to have a vibrant and successful Mid- Continent Airport.

This issue has been embraced by our region's best business, government and community advancement organizations, including: REAP, Visioneering Wichita, the Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition, Wichita Independent Business Association, Wichita Area Builders Association, Fair Fares, the Wichita Convention and Visitors' Bureau, Wichita Downtown Development Corporation, the South Central Kansas Economic Development District and Regional Chambers of Commerce and Businesses.

This dynamic mix of coalition partners is sure of the merits of our cause because each supporting organization recognizes that affordable airfares advances our state in the following important ways: it heightens the growth opportunities of our state's largest airport and assures that more than 1.3 million Kansans in our airport's service region can have affordable and convenient air service; it assures the continued economic development of our region and the overall growth of our state.

More than 40% of the state's manufacturing taxes and 26% of the state's personal income taxes come from South Central Kansas. If airfares increase, the region and state will lose their ability to retain our current employer base and recruit new businesses and ancilliary suppliers in this important sector. It's about jobs, high paying, high quality jobs for every citizen in our community. Employers are now using affordable and convenient air service as a 'hard screen' in evaluating whether to expand or locate in a business environment.



## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

Just this past week, Area Development magazine released a survey of more than 400 site selection consultants and business owners and they identified the top 20 issues that these gentlemen and ladies consider, with regard to expanding or relocating their businesses. Four of those 20 items had to do with access to markets, whether that's highway access, major airport access, businesses today need to get to their customer bases as quickly and as affordably as possible. This issue is also about conventions and securing travel and tourism traffic in our community. The bottom line is that it is about keeping Kansas strong and competitively growing our state in the years ahead.

It's about keeping our state's largest airport competitive against airports in Missouri and Oklahoma that can also draw passengers from our Kansas service area. If we do not stabilize or grow our competitive advantage against out-of-state airports, Kansas will lose millions in state revenues, as much as \$9,000,000 annually.

Finally, it's about quality of life. We all have times when we need to visit a loved one, family member or a friend. The reality of living hundreds of miles from family makes it imperative that we have affordable airfares to get us to where we need to go. This is especially important for recruiting young professionals to our community and keeping them here for the length of their careers.

To conclude my testimony, I want to close with three parting comments. This is a statewide economic development and Kansas population growth issue. Our wide base of regional support shows the breadth, scope and importance of this issue to our state. We have tremendous interim success with two creative community efforts, Fair Fares and the business passenger enhanced frequent flyer program. These initiatives have allowed us to keep airfares low and have saved millions of dollars for the traveling public. This effort has been carried locally and now it is time to expand the public sector partners to include the State of Kansas. We need a long-term solution to level the playing field when it comes to air transportation in our state. We cannot continue to lose people and dollars to our neighboring states of Missouri and Oklahoma when it comes to air transportation.

So again, it is my pleasure to be here on behalf of our business community and the Affordable Airfares for Kansans Coalition and to pledge our support for the resolution before you. We ask that you join us in aggressively pursuing this resolution with Kansas Governor Kathleen Sebelius, our state legislative delegation, the Kansas Legislature and other interested and relevant parties to securing a victory with this initiative. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my request of support."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Bryan. I believe we have some comments. Commissioner Winters."

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

**Commissioner Winters** said, “Thank you very much. Thank you, Bryan, we appreciate your presentation very much. Just a couple of quick comments and Bryan, I know when you start listing all supporters and players, sometimes you can’t get them all but I also want to mention the building and trade unions leadership that are involved in this participation. They have really stepped up to the plate on a number of issues. Richard Taylor is here today. I’m sure he usually attends when we’re talking about arena opportunities but Richard is also part of this coalition and we certainly appreciate all of their involvement.

Commissioners, the Regional Economic Area Partnership has passed a similar resolution to the one that we have before us today and I know that we already have this on our legislative agenda, but I thought it was important enough that other local governments around this part of the state for sure are going to be passing these resolutions to just strengthen that coalition that Bryan talked about and so, that was the reason I thought it important that again, even though we’ve talked about this, I thought it was important that we formally adopt this resolution and so if, in Topeka, we can again chime in with all of the other local governments that have done a similar action. So those are the only comments I have.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you, Commissioner. Any further comments? Commissioner Unruh.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well I wanted to just echo what Commissioner Winters said, but I think as we have all of our communities and counties in this south central Kansas area join together with official declaration of their support for affordable airfares in Kansas, it should bring weigh and impact to our legislators to realize that we have unity down here and that we consider this extremely important. And most of our conversation has to do with the impact it has on the business community and economic development, but it goes beyond that. This has to do with the culture and the livability of the folks here in south central Kansas. It has to do with families being able to get in and out of our airport to visit one another and it has to do with just attracting tourists and people coming here and instead of stopping in Oklahoma City and Kansas City, they can stop at a Kansas airport, here in Wichita, Kansas.

But it’s important also that we should note the fact that the catch-ment area for Arkansas airport includes two-thirds of the state, so this is not just, you know, Reno, Harvey, Wichita, Sumner, Cowley County. This is two-thirds of the State of Kansas where people use our airport and if we want to keep that going, we need to be supportive and this effort has to be successful, so I’m very supportive, appreciate you being here Bryan and actually appreciate all the partners who are involved in this effort and that’s all I had, Mr. Chairman.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Commissioner Norton.”

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Well, affordable airfare, you know it’s one of those issues in our community that there are those that are extremely behind it and those that look at it with a little bit of a jaded eye, because it’s public money going into supporting of a private business of sorts. Years and years ago, when we were a storefront commerce, you know people walked from mom and pop business to mom and pop business and that was the mobility of the community. Well today we know we’re a global society. You do your business not just with the guy next door, but the guy around the world and it’s so critical to our commerce that we have that linkage with the rest of the world. This is a mobile society we live in. Not only is business at the speed of light and mobile, but so are people. People move around, around our country, at great speed. Gen Xers, you know, we know are going to change their jobs every five years and they move around the country and want to live in different flavors of our United States and the world, and the connection is affordable airfare. There’s a lot of other ways to travel, but the connection to the world and the rest of the country is affordable airfares.

Business today is very portable and dynamic. If we think it’s just going to stay here forever and stay doing business with the commerce next door, we’re very, very wrong and there’s two dynamics that are working here for the average guy. Number one, the average citizen needs the affordable benefits of rider-ship themselves, for their family, for their entertainment and for their own, individual business. But then secondly, they need business to benefit from this, because it’s about jobs and keeping jobs here and creating jobs and having that leg of the stool to bring new industry here to create economic value and capital and jobs. So, I know many times the average guys looks at it and goes, ‘why are we throwing money at this particular issue?’ Well, it’s not as simple as throwing the money there. It’s creating an energy for not only them as individuals to have rider-ship that’s affordable for their own personal use, but to also keep the jobs and the economy and our society strong here, so that themselves and their kids and their grandkids have a place that’s great to live and you can earn a living and I’m going to be very supportive of this. It is tough sometimes for the average taxpayer to swallow why we’re doing this, but I think it’s very valuable to our community. Thank you, Mr. Chair.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Commissioner Burtnett.”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “Bryan, actually I have a question for you, so if you want to go back up to the podium. In your long-range planning . . . I’m very supportive of this affordable airfares too, but in your long-range planning, the calls that I get are from folks who say, ‘Well, yes we have affordable airfare now going to points east, but when are we going to get something going to points west?’ In your long range planning, it is to get more affordable airfares here, right?”

**Mr. Derreberry** said, “Yes, ma’am. I think one of the immediate goals is to maintain the

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

affordability of the current airfares, but also it's a two-pronged issue. It's not only affordability, but it's westbound access and one of the firms that our coalition is going to be looking at, once we stabilize the affordability issue is how do we get more flights northwest and directly west and southwest, so we have to look at both components of the equation. The affordability component is critical, but also the access is just as vital to either a personal traveler or a business traveler, so that's going to be kind of the other bookend to the whole process."

**Commissioner Burnett** said, "Well, thank you. I just want the citizens to hear that because they need to know we're working towards a very large end result."

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

**Commissioner Burnett** said, "That's all."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "That's it. Okay, thank you. Well, I'm going to be very supportive of this also, commissioners. What we're trying to do, by this resolution, is to really let the governor know, which I'm sure she already does, that south central Kansas, being that we have the only major airport in the entire state, this becomes a gateway, the economic spine so to speak, for the entire state and it is a benefit to people that live, no matter where they live within the state of Kansas. And hopefully with the governor's support and I'm confident to say that we're going to have our delegation's support. With REAP's support, we're encouraging every city within Sedgwick County and there's 20 of them, to pass a similar resolution so that united, we may be a more effective voice and to that end, I'd like to maybe ask Commissioner Norton if he would join me and any of the rest of you that would, I'd like to go up and make an appointment to visit with the governor, maybe present this resolution, maybe we could even ask Bryan to come with us and really try to listen to her concerns, because she has, and the legislators have the same opportunities to excel that we do.

There's unlimited need out there, there's limited resources. What we're saying is economic development and our ability to reach our potential, affordable airfares, are crucial, so please reprioritize your spending and put our request up at the top. I perceive this to be long term, as beneficial as funding education. That's how strongly I feel about what we're trying to do here today, so I'd like to ask you, Commissioner Norton, if you would agree to join with me and any of you all. Maybe we could figure out a time, maybe all of us go up together. Yes, Commissioner Norton."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Well, in response to that, I would be glad to do that. Understand that from the Prosperity Summits that the governor had, the number one issue was airfares and transportation. Some of it was obviously airfare and inter-modal, some of it was highways, but that was critical to the business community, if you listen to what happened in all those prosperity summits and not just south central Kansas. Many of the other pods that were broken up for the prosperity summit had the same talking points that being able to get their wares out to the public and other states and to have people travel easily in and out of their communities was vital to the overall prosperity of Kansas, so I think it already falls within the guidelines of what the governor is thinking about. And I can’t speak for her, but having listened to a lot of rhetoric coming out of those prosperity summits, one of the tenets was, you know, affordable transportation, whether it be rail or trucking or airfares, so I’ll be glad to do that.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Well I think the timing is right and we’ve got to seize the moment, and I believe . . . I was very encouraged when we talked to our delegation that was down here and we had dinner with them. I think they’re going to get behind this, but we do have to impress upon all of the legislators that this is a Kansas problem that could turn into a Kansas opportunity. Is there anything else?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Winters moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Madam Clerk, before we call the next item, we have one more off agenda items. Commissioners, that I would like us to take up.”

**MOTION**

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

Commissioner Winters moved to consider an off agenda item.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “It says here that Ron Holt is going to be making this presentation, I believe. He’s making his way to the podium.”

**Mr. Ron Holt**, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “My role this morning is to introduce our representatives of our architecture and engineering firm, the Arena Design Consortium that will be making the presentation this morning.

We have here this morning Wes Darnell and Bill Livingston, Jeff VanSickle and Dan Wilson, representing the Arena Design Consortium, but I believe Wes Darnell, who is the project leader there, will be making the presentation, so Wes.”

**POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

**Mr. Wes Darnell**, Project Leader, Arena Design Consortium, greeted the Commissioners and said, “We’re here this morning to share with you a presentation that was made yesterday to the partners, in their consideration, and know that their meeting came to certain directions for you yesterday, but we wanted to go back over the points from that presentation yesterday, so that you could be fully versed in that information.

What you see before you is the image that I’m sure is familiar to you, the ‘arena over the river’ concept that was provided by Mr. Bayouth and I know Mr. Bayouth is with us this morning. I want

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

to say right from the beginning, this is to us a unique and exciting idea. It's something that's new and I think it captured the imagination of a lot of people, because we hadn't really seen anything yet. It would certainly set our city apart, as Mr. Bayouth has represented. It would greatly reduce the land acquisition costs, as has been represented. Would eliminate a very costly storm sewer extension, those sorts of things I think are all legitimate and I think they were well represented by Mr. Bayouth yesterday in his remarks to that group.

In fairness to Mr. Bayouth, I also want to be clear that he made no representation as to the technical accuracy or the functional issues that were addressed. This was, in his words, an artist's representation and I think his intent and his heartfelt desire was to show something here that would stimulate a consideration of this 'arena over the river'. But stepping further into that, we would like to present some of the issues that we think you ought to be considering when looking at this concept.

We have, as we have on other considerations of site, imposed a square, a rectangle actually, over the location that's been suggested by Mr. Bayouth's concept. The square represents the same amount of area, the same configuration that was used on other presentations through the fall and consideration of the site and it roughly represents the area that would be taken up by the seating bowl and the concourses that represent the main mass of the building, the arena building. As you can see, it lays pretty much centered over the bridge, in consideration for the way it was represented on the pictorial by Mr. Bayouth.

To talk a little bit about some of the issues that surround this, the first one being the economic impact. One of the stated objectives of placing the arena was to stimulate economic growth and bring other possibilities to the downtown. And you know, obviously since this is right next to Water Walk, Water Walk would, I would presume, be impacted by this.

And this whole area is pretty much an area that's been studied by the City's Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Group. This is pretty much their area to continue this study, but we did want to make some observations. In addition to stimulating Water Walk, which incidentally would be cut off from this positioning of the building from the river, potentially could lead to development on the west bank, on the area west of the square, but beyond that, it's pretty much landlocked. We have the ice arena here. We have the ballpark here. We have the church here, Century II, the Hyatt and then of course the Water Walk, which is pretty much along its path as far as its development potential, and then of course we're kind of cut off by the Kellogg bridge here, so it kind of limits the opportunities for growth, based on that stated objective for the arena.

Excuse me, I'm getting ahead of myself. There we go, I'm good. Some other considerations that need to be brought to the table, as far as this location is concerned is that this is a matter that has been a subject for discussion of a lot of people, consideration from the Corps of Engineer, the State

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

Department of Water Resources would weigh in on a potential project over the river and even could have potential environmental impacts. It seems like whenever we do something over the water, we begin to get environmentalists out and we find that we have little Blue Darters or special worms or something that we have to worry about.

All of these things can, we think, potentially be solved. We agree that given time, they could be solved, but they also represent probably delays in the project and probably constraints. I know that Exploration Place considered building out into the water. Even the Bass Pro design considered for a time going into the river with part of their design and all these groups turned away from that just because of the problems associated with getting through those agencies and getting their projects accepted. I think it has to be realized that this isn't the first time someone has thought about putting something on the river and they have turned away from that for some very good reasons.

Other issues to be considered here, traffic and streets, we studied all these things at other sites in the fall and you know, I think this project or this site should be studied in the same regard. As you could imagine, getting people off of Kellogg to this site would mean a lot of unloading on Main Street and on Market. As far as exiting, coming from the east, they would have to come down and as you know and you'll see in a minute when we show the layout for Water Walk, that Lewis Street and Waterman are going to be realigned, and so it would be incumbent on them to come to Waterman and then work their way back to the arena to get to the east side.

Coming from the west would mean coming in on Lewis, getting off Seneca exit and coming down Lewis to get to the site. Coming from the north, they would come probably on McLean, but we think there's going to be some issues with McLean, which we'll be showing you here in a few minutes, some blockages of that street which could result in some traffic issues there as well.

As far as the Lewis Street bridge itself, again we'll show you some issues that we think need to be considered there that might mean that it would not be available as an arterial either. I think the last issue that I want to speak to . . . well, before we move on to other issues related to actual citing of the building, is there's some parking available at this site, but we think there's basically a shortage.

Again, we have parking that's available at Lawrence Dumont Stadium, we have parking up here by the church and we have some parking over here by Century II, but beyond that parking, there isn't a lot of support for this project, and of course if there's conflicting venues that are going on simultaneously, we lose some of that parking capacity that's already been addressed.

And the only place that we really have to go get more parking is this unimproved land right here, off the west bank, would be east of the ice arena, so we're concerned and thinking that parking also needs to be studied to really approve and understand this site.



## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

One more issue before I move into talking about solving issues, and that's what we refer to as security and force protection of the building. What we're talking about here is protecting our building from attack. These are issues that came up after 9-11, after the attack on the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City. Recognizing that this building is going to have to be supported on piers in the river leaves it uniquely vulnerable for attack from below. The fact that we have a bridge that's going to go right through the middle of the building makes it a real target for a vehicle-borne bomb, again similar to Oklahoma City. We just think that it has some real issues that need to be thought about there. We could see a scenario where you'd actually have to cut off traffic on Lewis Street and limit access to the river during events, if security became a real concern.

Okay, we wanted to talk a little bit about some of the views that would be affected by the positioning of this building over the river. What we're showing you here is the Lewis Street bridge and a shallow image here that could be the outline of the building. We're showing an imaging of about 130 feet tall here, and again in a few moments I'll explain why we selected 130 feet by the width of the bridge, which we basically showed you on the previous slide, as far as the width of the building goes.

And you can begin to understand here, as we would be on the Kellogg bridge driving across and looking towards the north, towards downtown, that we'd have a substantial amount of the visibility of the downtown corridor and the river corridor blocked by the structure.

Walking around and looking at it from the other direction, as though we were maybe walking along the west bank, or at a River Festival event, this image begins to show you what the massing of the building would look like from that direction, and the shadow that the building would cast upon the water and the riverbank underneath it.

To realize a little bit about the massiveness of this building, the width of this building would be roughly equivalent to a 42-lane bridge across the river. If you can understand, the McLean bridge is a five-lane bridge, it would be more than eight times the width of that bridge across or down the river, so it casts quite a long shadow, as you can kind of begin to understand from this image. The dotted lines there would represent the back walls of that mass. But stretching from shore to shore and up over on top of the bridge would create quite a large mass to blank out against the sky.

Again, to help you understand the length of this down the river, if we were approaching it from the west down Lewis, near the area in front of the ice arena, you begin to see the shadow, how long it goes up and down the river and you know, again the mass that would present against the skyline. And in looking at it from the east, near the boathouse, you begin to see how big that shadow is, up and down the river again. It's important to know here that, you know, this will blank out the

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

boathouse from the river. It will literally cut the boathouse off from the river.

Okay, this begins to give you a little bit of an idea about some of the other things that will have to go along with the main mass of the building and where they could potentially land on the site. As we did represent on the other projects we reviewed, we will need an entry level area for this building. We're showing one on the east and west side, about the same size as what was represented on the other projects. The service yard, which is the blue square down there, which is where the trucks would come to unload the shows. That's a good size service yard, because we have to turn 18-wheel trucks around in that yard, so that represents quite a large piece.

And then back to the entries, they need . . .”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Excuse me for interrupting. That blue area, that's McLean Boulevard, so you're saying that McLean Boulevard will have to be shut down?”

**Mr. Darnell** said, “Yeah. You know, in fairness commissioner, you know that could be put on the other side of the river, but I don't think that would be appropriate. I think it would be more appropriate to put it on the west side of the river. But in either case, the entries will also cut off McLean Boulevard, so that would mean re-routing of McLean Boulevard in our estimation or just cutting the street off in that area.

You can see that we're leaving Lewis Street open through the middle of the project, which has a little bit of logistic question itself, but going along with the idea that we'd make this work. You can see that it eats into the west bank quite a bit, as well as you already mentioned, taking out McLean and also eats into the project area of the Water Walk project as well.

Okay, to explain why we represented 130-foot high building a moment ago and to talk about the vertical considerations for this project, you see here a profile of the Lewis Street Bridge. In order to be able to drive vehicles across that, we have to have a 16-foot vehicle clearance on the top of the bridge, and we have assigned a 12-foot structural thickness for the structure. It would be necessary to bridge over all this. Thickness could vary, but we think 12 foot is about what it would be and I want to be clear that we're not saying that the building would span from shore to shore.

In all likelihood, we could utilize the same pattern of piers that are used on the bridge to break down those spans, but even at that there would be a substantial amount of thickness dedicated to creating a structure. On top of that structure is when we finally get to the event floor. The event floor is the very lowest level in our arena. That's the level at which the ice sleet would be, at which a performance would take place. That event floor would be approximately 35 feet above the adjoining shore, by the time we take in account the fact that the bridge humps in the middle, so as

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

we come back down to the shore, we add yet another lower level than at the middle, so by the time we add all that up, we're at about 30 to 35 feet just to get to the event floor. In order to get there, to get our acts up there like we had Monster Trucks last weekend, we're going to have the rodeo this weekend, to get those things up to that level would require a very large elevator, a very special, custom-made freight elevator. We understand that such an elevator is supplied at places like Madison Square Garden.

We checked into what the cost of an elevator like that is. It's about a million and a half dollars just for the equipment for an elevator that would get an 18-wheel truck up to that kind of a level. A good deal of expense and some very special circumstances necessary to do that."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Can I interrupt one more time."

**Mr. Darnell** said, "Sure."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "My problem with elevators, and I know it would be massive, you've got this event and all of the sudden, the elevator isn't working, couldn't you just have a ramp?"

**Mr. Darnell** said, "We could have a ramp. It would, as you can imagine, it being 35 feet up in the air and getting the kind of slopes we'd have to have to get large trucks up that incline, it would be quite a long . . . or very, very long ramp. It would . . . let's see. I'd have to think a minute about how long that would be, but it would be in the area of five, six hundred foot in length. You can imagine how far down the road it would have to go, just to meet the slope."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Well listen, I think this is important because my concern about elevators, you know something mechanical breaks, you've got five semi trucks, and the concert is scheduled to go on quickly, visually . . . like if we have it on the west side, if I'm taking what you just said, that's almost to Sycamore? I mean, past the . . .?"

**Mr. Darnell** said, "Yeah. It would get back at least two to three blocks away from the site to make that incline work."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "All right, thank you."

**Mr. Darnell** said, "Once we're up to the event floor, we'll have to realize that the first level that people walk on, that our patrons would come to, is the first concourse level which is about . . . probably about 24 to 25 feet above that event floor. So when we add all those numbers up, we're up in the area of 50 feet or more, just to get people up to the first concourse level. That's equivalent of like a five story building, to get people up just to the first concourse level. It would be a very long escalator ride or an elevator ride. We probably wouldn't have very many people that would

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

want to walk that on stairs, so that gets us to the first concourse. If we go with the two concourse concept, we're up again another 32 to 35 feet. So theoretically, to get to the upper concourse, we would have an 80-foot travel, or about eight stories of travel to get people up to that level. So that represents some extra costs and some extra considerations for that.

I think, at this point it's appropriate to move on to cost issues. I know that cost has certainly been one of the bigger factors that you all have been concerned about in reference to this approach. I want to tell you right now that we can't really define those costs without really doing a thorough study. That isn't just something that we can pull off the shelf from another project, because frankly we don't think this has been done before and there's really no 'go by's' or factoring that we can do off of something else that's realistic and that really is an arena. There are other things that have been stretched across highways and across rivers certainly, but nothing that represents the scope of this project.

But we did make a couple of comparisons yesterday and I'll bring those to you again. The Lewis Street Bridge which is, as I mentioned, five lanes currently. If it were widened to 32 lanes and if it were built in the year 2008, by our factoring, that bridge would cost about \$50,000,000 and based on \$50,000,000 we have to realize that we're going to go out there and put 100 to 130 foot high building on top of that bridge yet and, you know, build that bridge yet stronger to hold that building up. So we believe that, you know, at a minimum, this is a multiple of that number, in order to do that and that's before we spent one dollar to build the arena that's programmed for you and represented in the budgeting that's come to you. The \$111,000,000 construction budget would be on top of all that information and all those numbers.

There are certainly other cost factors for things we've already mentioned, escalators, the elevators, the additional space that would be necessary to house those larger units. We would suggest adding costs for protecting the building due to its special vulnerability. We think there is added costs for treatment of the riverbank underneath, added parking, rerouting McLean potentially. All these things that we studied last fall, the other four sites, should be considered and restudied for a thorough understanding of complete costs of this project.

And before we get too far, we have to understand that, you know, there's going to be delays necessary on this project because of this additional design considerations and temperamental approvals necessary, so you're going to actually see some price escalation here in the meantime. This project, every day that it goes behind another day is an additional cost and it erodes our ability to meet the programming demands of this arena.

I guess the last issue, or note I would want to make on cost, is that the tower that was shown in Mr.

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

Bayouth's scheme is not a part of this approach, as far as we're concerned. The county has been very clear that any private development would be outside of the consideration of this project. But it certainly has some merit and we think it would be a great idea to build a supporting tower or something that would work with the arena, but as far as our consideration goes, we're leaving that out of any cost studies we would do.

We think that in order to really realistically understand the cost of this building, we would have to actually do a design. We'd have to initiate a design to the point that it could be priced. It's because there are so many unique problems and the siting is so constricted here, we really would need to come up with a design that could be priced. We think the time to do that additional study, to bring it to the levels that we went to last fall and to create a design that's unique to this site would probably add about six months to the schedule."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "At an added cost . . . I mean, I assume you're not going to do that for free."

**Mr. Darnell** said, "That's a good assumption. Yeah, that's right. There would be some additional cost. Maybe you ought to . . . the cost for doing that could be compared to what we did in the fall. That price tag for studying the other sites is about \$420,000, as we represented to the group yesterday, so yes, it would add money as well as time.

Just to summarize some of what we've told you here, we do think that the idea of the 'arena over the river' is a fun and interesting idea. It has captured the minds of many citizens and we think it's because they're grasping for a vision of our downtown arena, which we haven't been directed to proceed to design yet, so they haven't been able to see anything. Given the significant issues and the forced solution that might be necessary to put the arena over the river, we frankly recommend that you do not pursue this idea any further. That would be the recommendation of the ADC.

However, if you do decide to, we think that you must understand that we need to do further study. That we must understand there will be greater costs, as far as in addition to the additional consultant expense we already talked about and more delay.

So to accurately determine the extent of those added costs would require commitment to actual building design and a study of all the issues. Finally, we recommend that instead of pursuing all this, instead of spending that money and time, that you give the design team direction to proceed with the design of the arena at the east site, as you originally committed to, so that our citizens can have a vision of what the arena will be like. We believe that we can do something that will be very pleasing and exciting, equally as exciting to the community, once they can have a vision of what would happen at the east site. Are there any questions?"

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. I don't see any at this time. I do thank you for that presentation. Commissioners, I know that this isn't something that we do normally, but out of respect to Dave Bayouth, who was a past county commissioner, I'd like to have your approval to allow him to speak and redress anything that was heard here, because I know that he has a passion for this concept. And if that's okay with you Dave, if you'd like to address us, I would like to afford you the opportunity to do so and allow you five minutes like we normally do, but please come to the podium, if you would like to. We'd like to offer you that opportunity."

**Mr. Dave Bayouth**, Former Sedgwick County Commissioner, said, "I'll be as brief as I possibly can. These are projections that a few of the locals put together. And they're as good as the projections that this committee has set forth."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Dave, you might want to stand a little closer to the mic, because . . . yeah, there you go."

**Mr. Bayouth** said, "Thank you. As far as the fair, impartial hearing or a study, you know I don't get embarrassed very often. In fact, I can't remember, until yesterday, when I was before this so called task force and the numbers they came up with. Everything was discussed, the pretty pictures, blocking out the view of the river, and if any, any of you have driven down that highway and looked to the north, at 70 miles an hour, you need something this unique. And if you'll put that square back . . . that little box you had over the river, you need something to stop people."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "They're going to put up that box right now for you, Dave."

**Mr. Bayouth** said, "Something this big and this dynamic is a landmark for the city. It's something the city has waited for for 60 years and we'll be giving back to the people something, and generations to come, for 60 years."

I don't know where they got their numbers. Certainly, it's going to cost a little bit more, but I want some net figures instead of gross figures. No matter what you think, you still have to build footings, foundations, etcetera on the site that you've chosen. All those things have to be taken out. I don't know where they've got their numbers of \$50,000,000. And all I've ever asked was a fair study and a fair hearing and what took place yesterday was not fair.

People have to understand how this enhances everything that's on that river. You know, how many subsidized buildings do you have to have to wake up? You know, I'm one of that 48% that voted

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

against this arena. Somebody has to listen to those 48%. Those 48% were calling me saying, 'Dave, I voted against that arena, but we like your plan'.

Now, where do we go from here? We've talked about parking. We didn't talk about displacing tax dollars that you're going to take by taking all this property off the tax rolls and how much it generates every year. No one talks about that. No one talks about giving the people something back for their money.

You were elected to be stewards of that dollar, and when this thing first came about and how it was handled, it was a one-sided campaign. It went to the legislators. They approved it. Well, what does it take to slow this thing down? Do we go back to the people? And that was discussed yesterday, in case you run over on your present budget, which I feel you will. Do you go back to the people and say 'We need more money'? Do you put it back on the ballot? And one of the things that was discussed was if you do put it back on the ballot, it will fail. What you're introducing today will fail.

How do you disregard something like that? You can't. That's why you need to take the time and to study this thing right, not by a task force, but design this arena and location to begin with. That's not fair. You know, you need somebody on that committee that doesn't have a conflict. That's what we need. You don't have all the answers on this new location. You've got roads, you've got everything to consider. Give me those dollars that it's going to take for that. Let's have a fair comparison, if we're going to start comparing dollars for dollars."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Dave, we're going to let you . . ."

**Mr. Bayouth** said, "I just need a couple of more minutes."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "No, just spend whatever time you feel you need to clearly explain your position."

**Mr. Bayouth** said, "You know, I do appreciate you guys taking the time. I know what a position I've put you in. That's bad, but it's worth it. What you're looking at is worth it, that rendering could be placed anywhere on that river. It could be placed south of Lewis Street. No one has looked into the options. As far as height, parts of it could be lower, same grade as the banks. No one has taken the time to really study this thing. No one has taken the time to see the dynamics of it and how it's going to impact the city for years to come.

As I told your committee, the only time that the arena that you're going to build at that location will ever break even, or ever show a profit, is the money that you have in the bank right now. It's

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

making you money. That's the only time that arena will ever be in the black. You're making money if you don't build it.

Where does that 48% go from here? Where do you want them to go? Do you want to disregard them? I don't think so. It's going to have a hell of an impact, you know, within the next . . . I don't know how many months you have left. I'm not saying give the money back, but do we have to go to another election? Do we have to put it back on the ballot? Do we have to go out and get petitions to get it back on the ballot? That's how serious we are.

And it was a one sided campaign to begin with. I can't compete with that task force. I'm one person, but I'm that average citizen. I'm that average person you were talking about, commissioner. I was that average person. Take the time. You know, if it takes six months . . . they were talking about things that, you know, there were no positives ever introduced at this meeting. They talked about access. You know, the Water Walk meandering Lewis Street, that even impacts Lawrence Stadium, ice rink, access to that. You're cutting it off going west. I don't like that plan. You don't have access to Lawrence Stadium. You have to go through residential to get to Lawrence Stadium. Come on, that is not a good plan. The City of Wichita has 29 . . . the taxpayers have \$29,000,000 in that land that's sitting there. No one ever discussed the cost of that money and how long it's going to sit there. Who is paying for the holding numbers? I don't know. You are, the taxpayer.

This isn't a county project. It's county . . . 20 cities in this county, that's their money and if it was done over, I agree with the tax force, it would fail if it was on the ballot today, it would fail. That should tell you something. Take the time, spend our dollars wisely, and one of them is to consider that 'arena over the river'. Where? I don't know. I'm not an architect or an engineer. Where did they come up with their numbers. They're out to destroy the plan. They're wanting to move on. What's the hurry? What is the hurry? Cost? Construction cost? You have to live with that every day. But you haven't given me a number. Where were the designs, when you had this on the ballot, where were the designs to tell the people what you were going to build. Where are they? You have nothing. Not one pencil mark has been placed on paper. Not one inch of land has been acquired, and you're trying to tell me it's too late. Not hardly.

We have a golden opportunity. How can the public sit there and say, 'This is it, this is what we've been waiting on'. Take the time. Take the time to study this thing right. It's a golden opportunity, gentlemen, ladies. Mr. Chairman, that's about all I have to say. If you have any questions, I'll certainly try to answer them."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Dave. We do have some comments or questions. I guess we have no questions of you at this time. Commissioner Winters, you have your light on."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd be glad to start off this



## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

discussion. I don't intend to start a debate because I don't think there's any way you can win a debate when there isn't any real facts on the other side of the agenda. So, don't mean to make this a debate and I'm going to make it as quick as I can. I tell you, there are just three things that just have jumped out at me over the last several days and weeks.

Once first is I do have a great deal of respect for Wes Darnell and his team that we've put together. It includes two other reputable architect firms from here in Sedgwick County, along with a company that builds arenas all around the world, HOK from Kansas City and I think could just stop right there and say to go against a recommendation that comes from that group I think would not be right. But I do want to talk a little bit about timelines secondly and, you know, we need to remember that we had the first ADA lawsuit against the Kansas Coliseum in 1996. Ten years ago, we realized we were starting on a process to fix the Kansas Coliseum. We delayed it in 1998, because we had the Dyna-plex come along, so we put the brakes on and we stopped the whole process. That failed, so we started up again. We stopped again in 2000, because Unified School District 259 had a major bond issue, so we stopped our project at the Kansas Coliseum until after that was all cleared and settled. Then, in 2003, we cranked back up on the Coliseum, to renovate the Coliseum, because we knew it was in much worst shape than it was in '96 and we were on this road.

Well, we stopped in 2003, to look at another idea and now we have come and we've come with a group of good partners, the city and a coalition of people interested in downtown, and we're on the project we are now. If we stop this project now and go back to the drawing board and we study the 'arena over the river' and as soon as we get that settled, then will we stop it again and take the next idea that comes along, because I'm sure there's other ideas out there, besides building it over the river. You know, I've already had people talking to me about some of the other ideas we need to study, some point in time, and so far we've taken 10 years to get to this point. At some point in time, we've got to say 'Look, we've studied all of the ideas, we've looked at all plans and we're going to move forward with what we believe is a workable solution'. And just the last thing that I want to say and I know that a number of us have different views on the site where we have even selected now, the east site by Saint Francis Street.

But I just went back over one of the presentations we had. We had our first public meeting back in April of 2005, then the Neighborhood Development Steering Committee met. We had the second public meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup>. We had the third public meeting on September the 29<sup>th</sup>. We had the fourth public meeting on October 27<sup>th</sup> and this east site just rose to the top. I mean, it wasn't we selected it in secret. It wasn't that there was any kind of subterfuge. It just rose to the top and we all talked about other sites along the way.

So I think we've got to this point in a very orderly fashion and I just . . . again, I respect former commissioner Bayouth's plan and vision but I just can't believe that if he were sitting in this seat,

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

he would make a decision to spend more taxpayer dollars on this project, so I think we'd need to be very careful about adding cost to this project, so I think we've done our due diligence in asking the architects to take a look and I think we've got, to this point in time through a very methodical and thoughtful process. I'm going to be supportive of staying the course. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Commissioner Unruh."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a couple of comments also about this whole issue that's before us now and I appreciate, Commissioner Winters, your review of the process that we've had and how that it has been methodical and logical and inclusive and open and transparent, and all those words that make for a good process. I wanted . . . a couple of just personal reactions to the proposal that we're talking about right now and that is that the picture that we have, as Mr. Darnell referenced early, simply is not a representation of an arena. Now, it's a picture of something over the river, but that's not an arena. That's a two or three-story building that there is no scale in the drawing. It doesn't show the appropriate relationships to other buildings. It has engendered a terrific amount of interest, because it is such a dramatic drawing, but as we have seen today, an actual arena is 135 foot above ground level. It is a huge, massive building, backed right up against the flyover and, I mean, that's one thing that people need to understand. The picture that they've fallen in love with is not an arena. It's something else.

And I know that was not the intent of Mr. Bayouth, or the artist that drew that, to try to deceive anyone, but in fact that is kind of the practical result. That people are looking at something, calling it an arena, that drawing is simply not an arena and I don't want to go rehearse Mr. Darnell's presentation, which was very thorough and complete, but when you add up all the considerations that were given by professional people and their consortium of architects, the bottom line is that although this is an attractive idea, it's a bad idea. This idea won't work. Somebody, some time has got to say 'This is a bad idea'. It costs too much, it's impractical, we've got to shut down streets, there's a whole bunch of things about it, but it simply is not a good idea.

So I guess I'm very much committed to the process that we've got . . . that we've started and I think we ought to proceed with it. I think we've got sufficient ammunition to say that we are making the right decision. I wanted to react, and perhaps this again is just some personal comment here. All comments are personal, I suppose, but I have a personal reaction to a couple of things that Dave has said.

I've been in the automotive repair business for 40 years. I was a wrestling official, high school wrestling official for 10 years, and that's just background to say it's pretty hard to insult me. You know when you've been in automotive repair and you've been a zebra for a long time, you know, people have said a lot of things to me, and I don't let things bother me. And I also want to say that

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

Dave Bayouth and I have become friends lately and I appreciate that friendship, so I want to say this as gently as I can say it, and that is I believe your characterization of a so called task force is a wrong characterization. We have some wonderful civic leaders who are involved in the task force. They give time. They give energy.

They give money to this process and during yesterday's meeting I know that there's a great deal of emotion that's been invested by Mr. Bayouth and so I want to give him, you know, full breath to say what he thinks he needs to say, but at the meeting yesterday it was not a 'kangaroo' meeting. It was not a kangaroo court. The folks that were involved in that meeting included presidents of banks, executive directors of the Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce and their president, the executive director of the Wichita Area Builders Association, and their representatives, the executive director of the Downtown Development Corporation and their representatives, the executive director of the Wichita Convention and Visitors Bureau and their representatives, there were city council people there, there were county commissioners there. We had the executive director of the labor delegation. There were builders and contractors. There were architects even from competing firms, architects there that didn't represent our Design Consortium, executive director of the sports commission. I mean, maybe that's enough to say that that's enough to say that these are people who are involved in our community, who are invested in our community and to characterize them as a kangaroo court is unfair, improper, so Dave old buddy, just want to let you know how I think about it.

But at any rate, I'm going to be supporting moving forward and this is probably all I need to say, except I'm very appreciative of the arena strategy group that's been put together and the professionalism, the education and the intensity that they've brought to this project. Mr. Chairman, I'm done."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Good. Thank you very much. Commissioner Burtnett."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Well I just wanted to say that when I first saw the pictures, just like everyone else, it was 'oh, this is a really pretty picture'. But my first thought after that was, common sense kicked in and I thought, 'well, where's the staging area going to be', and I started looking at all the questions that we have been trying to figure out for the site that we've already picked.

Then when we got the cost estimates from Mr. Bayouth, I looked at this and thought, 'well, where did he come up with these numbers?' because there's no name here to say where these numbers came from. So I am very appreciative of the presentation today from the Arena Design Consortium and Wes, thank you for this because you have addressed, I think you have taken the time, I think we have done our due diligence to show that there are some real problems with this particular design or

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

idea.

I'm not an architect or engineer either, so I have to take your word for it and common sense again kicked in and said, 'This is something I think we needed to look at'. So I believe we have looked at this and I am willing to stay the course and go with our east site and move on also. That's all I have."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well, as we've gone through this whole process, I have to tell you, I've been a pretty independent thinker, when it comes to talking about sites and where we want to place this. You know, I think Ron Holt and Wes Darnell will tell you that we had four sites and I came to them with a fifth site. I called it a hybrid. It was different. It was a new idea. It was outside the box. So I certainly understand former commissioner Bayouth's idea and his belief that you can change people's minds, you can lay new ideas on the table. That alternate thinking is not bad, because I think that way myself. Alternate ideas and alternate sites are a part of our due diligence, as we try to figure this out. You know, I believe there are experts. I believe there are smart people, but I think there are also average citizens that have good ideas too and you take them and you put them through filters, as I did as I was trying to go through all this mess and I came up with a fifth site that I thought was pretty practical and had some pluses and minuses.

At the end of the day, we moved forward with the east site and I've got to tell you, I still would prefer to have the arena closer to the river corridor, because I think one of our amenities of the downtown that we need to take advantage of is the river. So for me, practically, I still don't believe that the east site gets it close enough to the river. Now whether it needs to go on the river is a different thing, but adjacent to the river has always been important to me. In fact, I'm okay with it going on the west bank of the river. That happens to be in my district and wouldn't that be a coup.

I don't mind that maybe it goes along with Water Walk. I never liked the west location because it dropped down right over the middle of Market Street, but you know, there's still a lot of empty land right there. There's land across, on the west bank so certainly I've not been opposed to any alternate ideas, alternate sites, alternate thinking, as we try to slog our way through this very important issue for our community. I mean, this is . . . Commissioner Bayouth is right, this is a 50-year deal, the decisions that we make for this community is going to have long-term implications for its viability, for its energy downtown, for its economics and for its entertainment value. All of those things are in this mix. So I'm here to tell you, I'm open to new ideas and in fact, as chairman, I'm the guy that kept pushing us to get the Coliseum finished. And at the end of my term, all of the sudden we're moving ahead on a downtown vote, and all the work we've done on the Coliseum kind of got put to the side and now we're flexible and adaptable and going a different direction and people voted and we moved in a totally different way.

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

I have to tell you, I've talked to a lot of what I just call average taxpayer citizens, guys that work, play by the rules, pay their taxes, vote and have a voice, and all of them have said, take a look at it. But when I've talked with them further, take a look at it didn't mean take a long, protracted study of it. It was 'get some experts' and certainly not myself, but get some engineers, gets some architects, get some folks that understand these dynamics, let them put it through a filter and give you some kind of suggestions on whether this is workable, doable, something besides a visionary idea and I think, I hope that we've done that. I think we've had people look at it.

Certainly, I've had plenty of average citizens weigh in both ways. Taxpayers that say, 'Move on, we've already voted, we voted for the blue cloud, don't spend any more money, don't come back to us asking for money, move ahead'. And then I've had people say, 'You know, that was a very provocative, energetic, visionary idea, please take a look at it' because it would be an icon for our community for years and years. And I think we've tried to do that. Certainly I've talked to a lot of people. I have kept my mind as open as it possibly could be. I know for some people that's pretty scary, that my mind would be opened up, but it's the truth.

In my case, I have looked at it from all angles, and I just believe it may be time to move on. We've put it through the filters. We've asked people to look at it. We had a group that I think has high integrity in our community looking at it one more time, and at this point I think we're just going to have to, as a body, try to figure out where we go next. Having said that, I'm still open to ideas, as we try to do the best for our community that we possibly can. That's all I have."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Well commissioners, let me see if I can't wrap this up just a little bit. It was discussed that we should pay attention to the 48% of the people that voted no for this downtown arena. I contend that we have to pay attention to the 52% that voted for it. And what they voted for, after a thorough and meticulous look at it, the City of Wichita has tried for over 10 years, they had a concept that they wanted an arena in their downtown city that it would revitalize the downtown area, but they never got further than that concept. We tried to accommodate them, as Commissioner Winters has said. We've delayed our concept and we had a plan already in place for rehabilitating the Coliseum, and we said that we would stop that and see if they could go somewhere with their concept.

And for 10 years they tried . . . I don't have to regurgitate all the failed attempts, but when we made the decision that we had to go forward now on getting ourselves ADA compliant at the Coliseum, we had a plan for a state-of-the-art sports and entertainment venue facility to be built on our 44

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

acres up there by the Coliseum. The City of Wichita, a consortium of the business leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, all of those organizations that you mentioned, Commissioner Unruh, came to us and said, 'look, would you look at this concept that we've been trying to develop and see if you could come up with a plan'. And we did and we sat down with that same group and unanimously, the group endorsed the plan. We then, Commissioner Winters and I took the point, we had five public meetings to get input from the community.

We told the City of Wichita and those other partners of ours 'You tell us where you want it built'. You tell us, in your opinion, where would provide you the best opportunity for a neighborhood arena redevelopment and we then got the infamous 'blue cloud'. We took that to the vote of the people and we had a lot of detractors. I don't have to mention any names but one fellow's initials was Karl Peterjohn, that said 'you're lying to us'. You're going to dupe us into voting for this and as soon as we vote for it, you're going to ask us for more money. We said, 'No'. We said, this tax goes off in 30 months, it's \$184,500,000. Trust us.

Now, before we even turn one shovel of dirt, it's being talked 'Well let's go back and say we might need as much as twice as much'. Sorry, that's a breach of public trust. I for one don't have the courage to do that. I want to prove this time that when the government says 'Trust us' you can trust us.

But I want to talk about some elements . . . let me first say something. It's been talked about, 'this is a vision'. A concept without a well thought out plan for implementation at best it's a dream, at worst it's an hallucination, but it most definitely is not a vision.

Let's talk about some of the mechanics. We've been talked to by our experts that said 'In order for them to really develop a well thought out plan, they need upwards to six months and 420,000 additional dollars. Where is that money coming from? I don't know. It wasn't part of the 30-month thing. Six months . . . now let's talk about it. That means after that we have to go for a vote. We don't have the extra money, so now we're going to have another vote, maybe it could be . . . If now is January, February, March, April, May, maybe we could hurry up and get it on the April primary. Then guess what folks. We've got to wait until the next legislative session, because what they approved was 30-months, so now we have to have another vote of the people. First we have to have six months, then we have to have a campaign to educate the public on it. Then we're going to have to wait until . . . last time it was April before they voted on it, April of 2007, so you're not looking at a six month delay. You're looking a year and a half, two year delay and 420,000 and a vote of the people and trying to get the legislators again, when we're already asking the legislators, 'you know, we really want affordable airfares', 'we want to increase our education allowance'.

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

It is an idea that came to us too late, but the point that I wanted to make is this isn't a vision. It was a dream that apparent to me, with our experts, and I agree with you Commissioner Unruh, when we've had people that we've relied on that know how to construct and build things and they do not recommend it, they don't have an oar in this fight. I mean, let's talk about it, I think they would start smiling and rubbing their hands together, 'Goody, now we've got a project twice as much, we're going to be able to make twice as much money'. So I think the credibility of these experts saying, 'This won't work and we don't recommend it' for me is very credible evidence.

We had a meeting yesterday, not one of our partners disagreed with it. They all agreed that we need to stay the course and continue on the plan, the well thought out plan that this county has developed to give Wichita a sports and entertainment venue that the citizens of this community will point to with pride for the next 20 to 25 years. The action before us right now, as I see it, the consultants have said that if we want to go farther and develop this, they would like to have six months and upwards to \$420,000 and I need to know if that's the will of the board, if you wish to continue this study, or do you wish for us just to continue on the plan that we had, so I don't know."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Mr. Chair, I'm ready to make a motion."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Please do."

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Winters moved that after study and consideration, we reaffirm the commission's decision to move forward with the east site for the new arena, the site that was chosen on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Any further comment? Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well, I'll vote yes for this, but you know, we are pretty well going on the east site, but if there's alterna . . . if we find out that that's not workable, I want to be sure that we keep an open mind that there may be alternate sites that we would consider. Just keep the door open for that. Probably still in the downtown area, blue cloud area, but if we make sure that if there are some things that present themselves as road blocks, that we stay flexible."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Did you want to make that as a substitute motion?”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “No, no. It was just a comment. I’m going to be affirmative on the vote, but I wanted to make that because that has always been my little bit of a hitch on this, because I voted for the east site, but it was not ever my preference as a site, and want to make that public one more time. It’s not the place I really want to put the arena.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “I understand and that’s so noted. And I will say, once again, that this was the recommendation of every partner that was in that room last night, yesterday, that we continue to stay the course. We’ve got a plan in place, now let’s just bring it to implementation. Thank you. There’s no further comments. Madam Clerk, call the roll please.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Next item please. Or if any of you didn’t want to stay for the entire rest of the agenda, you can feel free to leave. Let’s take just a couple of seconds. Let’s take a five-minute break please. We’re recessed for five minutes.”

**The County Commission recessed for five minutes and returned to the commission room at 10:44 a.m.**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Madam Clerk, will you please, call I believe it’s Item C.”

**C. RESOLUTION REPEALING POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF HISTORIC PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND RESCINDING RESOLUTION #242-1990.**

**Ms. Kathy Sexton**, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “This . . . a little background on this item. Some years ago, in 1990, the county commission passed a policy establishing an historical public building construction review committee. Its purpose was to review and make recommendations to the commission about any repairs, remodeling or other construction for historic buildings built before 1920, owned or used by the county for public purposes, very specific purpose. I think the committee was used a couple of times, at that time, but has not been



**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

used in well over a decade and so today we're recommending that elimination of this committee occur.

It has not been active and we really have a different process for all construction review, remodeling of these same buildings, which is our local historic preservation board and staff here at the Metropolitan Area Planning Department. Also the statewide committee review and if necessary the federal review. So we participate in all levels of review required and it's helpful for those projects and really do not need this committee anymore, so would request your approval of this resolution and authorization of the Chair to sign."

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Resolution, and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Winters seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Next item please."

**D. DIVISION OF INFORMATION AND OPERATIONS.**

**1. PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL REPORT OF CALL CENTER OPERATIONS.**

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

### POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

**Mr. Richard Vogt**, Chief Information Officer, Division of Information and Operations, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I bring to you today the first annual report of the Sedgwick County Call Center. I direct your attention to the video screens. Call Center recently finished its first calendar year. Actually started in February, but most of 2005 it was in operation. Before I get into the report, a quick reminder of why the Call Center was formed, why we believed it would be helpful. It all has to do with call volume peaks and valley.

All of the departments who contributed staff had their own peaks and valleys in call volumes. They had their own call takers who would answer phones and sometimes the calls would be more than they could handle. For the Treasurer, it would be tax statement time. For the Appraiser, value notices. For the County Counselor, the DTU Office. It was when mailings went out and of course, for the elections, it's the weeks leading up to any election.

During these peak times, not all calls were answer. Some people just gave up and they hung up after waiting about four, four and a half minutes. The average person will give up and try again later. The key is that these peaks and valleys from the various departments were not at the same time. They overlapped each other. We thought we could leverage those peaks and valleys, the valleys in one department and a peak in another department to get more calls answered. And so we had several goals that are listed here.

We wanted to get a higher rate of handled calls or answered calls. People actually get to a live person, a short wait time for those callers. A shared knowledge among all of the call takers, the idea being that if they all had this same knowledge, a person was more likely to get all of their questions answered by talking to one person, and increased efficiency. We know that those kind of moving people around does not give the kind of efficiencies that can be achieved if one person has all that information.

So in February of 2005, as I mentioned earlier, the Call Center was formed, inception, staff from the Treasurer, Appraiser, County Counselor and Election Commission. We have a total of nine Call Center specialists, one DTU specialist and a supervisor and a manager. The Treasurer contributed five staff, four of those coming from the tag office because half of our calls, right at half of our calls are tag related. People, and I'll show you a graph in a little bit, it shows you those peaks around the beginning of the month that people are calling about tag related information. Five came from the Appraiser's Office, one from the County Counselor's Office and one from the Election Commissioner Office.

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

All of the goals that I mentioned earlier we met or surpassed, even though the calls remained about the same, around 212,000 for the year, the handled calls went up 18%, that is again handled means they got to a live person. Abandoned calls dropped in half, they were cut in half. And we think the difference between those two numbers, 18% and 51% is that in 2004 the same person would call, abandon the call and then call back later and they probably called four or five times. This time around, we believe most of those people are getting answered. We know most of those people are getting through on the first call. Calls that are . . . people are on hold less than 20 seconds, kind of our ideal call, those numbers doubled. We had twice as many people who had to wait that very minimal amount of time. The percent of the calls that were actually handled were up by 20%, from 72 to 86% and as you can see, the average wait time was cut down by almost two-thirds and even the handle time, the time it takes to actually get the information, has gone down. We believe that that is attributed to the common information, the knowledge that each call taker now has all the answers, there's less of a transfer going around.

Here's kind of a graphic representation of the same kind of information I just gave. Blue represents calls that were handled, the maroon represents the abandoned calls, those are down and then the calls going up, the calls being handled within 20 seconds, a dramatic increase there.

Here's, very quickly, an average daily call. This is the pattern. You can see the peaks there, they coincide almost routinely with the beginning of the month, although the one at the end of November and early December would also coincide with tax statements going out and the one early in the year, you can't read the dates, but that second bold line there is April 1<sup>st</sup>, which would be coinciding again with value notices and also tax statements, kind of our perfect storm during the calendar year. Several of these instances represents 1,200 or more calls in a week, so a heavy call volume, but handled almost . . . and we had four or five months where the call handled was over 90% and I think we topped out around 95-96% one of the months during the summer. Here's again a graphical representation of . . . the actual is the dark blue is the actual from 2004. We established a goal for ourselves, the pink line represents the goal. And then the 2005 actuals exceeded the goal every single month during the year, so elated about it. It's very exciting. We think the operation has been a tremendous success and will continue to be a tremendous success.

Before I open myself up for questions, I want to highlight . . . Jeremy, why don't you come up, in case some of the questions are for him. Jeremy Biltz is the Call Center manager, running the operation. Also, Ron Estes is here today, I think on a different item, but he's here. I'd like to acknowledge him. He's one of the members of the team and also County Counselor Rich Euson is here as well. I don't see that anybody else is here from the Call Center. We have a steering committee that meets every three weeks, talks about the operation. All of the contributing departments attend that. It's a very well attended, lot of good ideas.

One interesting idea that came up during the year was handling the people that come into the tag

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

office with a question. They just stop on their way to work or whatever, and they have a question and they see the long lines there, well we put a phone in and if you pick up the receiver on that phone, it automatically calls the Call Center. Now we had not a lot of calls. Probably sixty of seventy calls like that, but it's advantageous for them to know that they can just pick up that phone and get a live person at the other end for their questions related to tag. So, any questions?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I don't see any. I'll make one comment and then I do see a comment, that Richard, this is an excellent presentation. This is a tremendous example of county working efficiently. My only recommendation to you is why don't you make next year's presentation, if I were you, right before my evaluation. I think it might help you. But we do have a comment from Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well I think it's wonderful, Call Center and getting the synergy of all the groups together is wonderful for our constituents. How do we monitor the quality control? Does Jeremy have a way to access a call, listen in on it and then, you know counsel folks on 'well you could have asked this question or answered it this way or directed them in this manner', for the quality control of the quality of the call in being handled, as opposed to how fast it was handled or how fast it was answered?"

**Mr. Jeremy Biltz**, Call Center Manager, DIO, greeted the Commissioners and said, "To answer your question, the technology exists to record phone calls and listen in and we have ordered that, but it has not arrived yet. We haven't been able to implement it. What we do, we started in October to run a report that lists the phone numbers of people who have called in and randomly call a portion of those people back and ask them to take a short survey. And in 2005, in those last couple of months, we did around 190 surveys and as far as call satisfaction, 91% of these respondents to the survey gave us the top two, it was from one to five, with five being the best, 91% either say four or five for satisfaction, 90 1/2% gave a four or five for the helpfulness of the caller and 96% said their issue was resolved with that call and we continue to do that. We try to get at least three every week for each individual, which gives us a nice sample by the end of the year to rate as well. And if complaints or issues come up, through those surveys, we do talk to the individual staff about that.

And sometimes you just . . . people will be upset that they have to pay taxes or about something that the call taker doesn't have any control over. We do take that into account, but that's how currently we are keeping track of the quality of the calls and hopefully sometime this quarter or this half of the year, we'll get the call recording software installed and we can do that as well, to randomly sample some of those phone calls, listen in and talk to the staff about those issues."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Well I just think that any time you’re giving feedback to someone on their job, the quicker you can do it, studies show, the better. Because, you know, if it goes a month later, they don’t remember the call, they don’t remember what they said. The quicker you can give that feedback, the better the whole system will be, and it’s great to hear you’re going to have that capability, just to make those numbers even better, but to make the taxpayer 100% happy with it. Ninety percent is good, but 100% would be better, so that’s wonderful. Thanks, that’s all I have.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thanks. Commissioner Unruh.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Thank you, Mr. Chair. Appreciate the presentation and want to congratulate you on tremendous success during this last year of operation, and I’m proud of those results. However it seems to me that one of the larger messages or greater inferences that we can take from this is in a day when many people consider government at any level to be unresponsive and uncaring, this is an effort on our part that we want to be open and accessible and responsive to our constituency and I think that larger message is very important and I hope that our constituents pick up on that, that we’re trying very hard to say ‘Here we are, we’re friendly and we want to be helpful’.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Right. Any other comments or questions, commissioners? What’s the will of the board on this item?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Burtnett moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you very much, Richard. Next item please.”

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

### 2. PRESENTATION OF REPORT ON AUTOMATED VEHICLE LOCATION PROJECT.

#### POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

**Mr. Kent Koehler**, Senior Project Manager, Division of Information and Operations, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Here today to give you an update on this project. You've seen me before you several times, buying different pieces of it. Well, now we're back to give you an update on the project. And just a little bit of a reminder, this is the first project that we're actually building something or ending up with a system through a partnership with the City of Wichita, Sedgwick County and the State of Kansas, specifically the Department of Transportation. All agreed several years ago to fund together and to work together to build projects and build systems and this is the first one and we would not be here today if it was not everyone working together well.

First thing I want to go over are some of the reasons for the project, why do we think we need it. The first point was improved safety for responders. Really what we're talking about is this is more specific for law enforcement probably, but if they get into trouble, if something happens, we know at least where their car is. Up until this point, it doesn't happen that often, but officers may not know for sure where they're at. Well, this way, their dispatchers will know where they're at and can send help at least to their vehicles.

And this could also come into play for firefighters that are out doing brush fires or something. A unit gets away from the others, maybe no one knows for sure where they're at, they get into trouble, we'll know where they're at. We'll see them on a map. Also, we want to determine the closest resource. We want the closest unit to go, for example with ambulances we do need to know who is closest. Right now, with the technology we had, we didn't know where they really were. We knew where they said they were and where they said they were heading, but this way the dispatchers, their own staff will know where they're at. They'll be able to see where people are. Hopefully, it will let us be a lot more efficient in how we send people and where we send them to.

Another item is provide additional information to the first responders. Well that will take advantage of the laptop computers in the vehicle, things where they currently have books that they have or just relying on memory. On the laptops, they'll be able to store, electronically, these books. They'll be able to put pictures, be able to put instructions for various addresses, so it's right there at their fingertips. They don't have to call anyone. It's right there. Hazardous material information is right there at their fingertips. They'll have it. They don't have to call anyone.

In the future, we'll be able to display the historical movement of vehicles. This project did not include recording where everyone went and playing it back. What the plan is, as we roll into the

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

new facility, with the new computer-aided dispatch system, is to be able to play back where people were. You can use it to respond to complaints or allegations of poor behaviors. You can say, 'No, here's where this vehicle was, here's how fast they were going and here's the exact time they were there'. You can also do it, possibly look at studies of how long it takes to get somewhere. Or we can make the best recommendations of who goes what direction.

What all in this project was included, well we purchased and installed hardware in over 400 vehicles. These are first responder vehicles belonging to Sedgwick County Sheriff, Sedgwick County EMS, Sedgwick County Fire, City of Wichita Fire and Wichita Police Department. We put laptops in the vehicles that needed them. There are a few vehicles out there that had laptop computers that were in good shape. We put mounting hardware to mount them that didn't have them or had to replace. We also had to install radio modems in most of the vehicles. Some of the law enforcement vehicles had modems, but they've been there for seven years and we're upgrading the system. We also upgraded our mobile data system. Sedgwick County owns and operates a mobile data system. It's a wireless system that allows us to talk county-wide. It's been in place for over seven years. It's actually worked very well, but it needed upgrading.

Where we went, we basically increased the capacity of it five times. We also added the ability to receive ABL information or GPS from the satellites, location information for vehicles. That information includes your exact location, latitude and longitude, the speed they're traveling, as well as the direction they're traveling.

Also, we upgraded the computer-aided dispatch system. We need to be able to see the vehicles on the map. We also want to be able to use those for that location to make the best recommendation, take that into account. Also, as part of this, we'll provide mapping to non-dispatch personnel. They'll be able to see units and this is for the public safety agencies. They'll be able to sit in their offices and see where their units are. Let's them monitor and see how things are going and it may reduce calls to dispatchers, checking to see where people are.

Currently, we've got modems installed in the ambulance and EMS supervisor vehicles. They're actually really going to be our first group that's fully done and ready to go. Fire District is installing their equipment. They're probably, between now, a fourth to a half done. Installation of Sheriff's vehicles will start soon. They had to wait until we had the mobile data system done, the upgrade completed, because they currently are on the old system and they could not give up the ability to run queries, run tags, get dispatched calls.

Wichita Police Department has installed two vehicles. They've got two vehicles that are basically demo vehicles, brand new vehicles with all kinds of new equipment in them and they're ready and Wichita Fire Department has just started, with some of the work they're doing, putting all the antennas on the vehicles.

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

As far as the infrastructure, where we're at, the mobile data infrastructure we completed last week, actually it's working fairly well now. The CAD system, phase one of that we completed last week also and this is not abnormal, in testing it worked perfect, put it live and it ran into a couple of bugs.

As of late, late yesterday afternoon they had it fixed and I believe they were going to roll it live this morning. You know, you test and test and you still end up with problems when you go live.

What are our next steps? One of the next steps is once we get the dispatchers where they can see their units moving around, we'll start installing software out to the various agencies that are involved. Let them be able to see where the vehicles are, get them trained and then work out the process on how we get updates out to them. It's a little tougher to update everybody else's computers, instead of just the ones at dispatch.

Also another phase of this is to be able to provide a data stream or information about all the vehicles to the City of Wichita. They're going to develop their own program to be able to record this and track it for historical use.

Our goal now is to complete installation on the county vehicles by April. We're well on line to do that. The project is actually paying county employees overtime to do this, so it doesn't slow down other work. We were able to get approval to do that from the federal folks. And then the City of Wichita plans to complete their installation by summer.

And now I'll get to probably the more dangerous slide for me. Do you have any questions for me this morning?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I don't see any. I'll just make one comment. Let me see if I can boil down the entire . . . you liked the project and you hope we can go ahead and carry it out to full implementation. Is that basically what you're asking of us?"

**Mr. Koehler** said, "Just I told you I'd give you an update, and one other thing, we do plan, within hopefully the next few weeks, to be able to show you some of this in action. Plan to be able to show it so you can see it on a map and put some vehicles on display, let people see where this money we're talking about is going. We would probably do it on a test system, not the live system, because we just don't know what would pop up."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "We do have a comment or a question. Commissioner Norton."



## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

**Commissioner Norton** said, “We have an extra one we could put on Chairman Sciortino’s car, so we know where he’s going?”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “What, you want to . . .?”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “If you’ve ever watched him drive out of here, you wonder where he’s going sometimes. Well, I think it’s a wonderful project. It’s nice to have an update. Generally, we talk about spending the money and then I have to ask you, ‘Where’s Kent, come up and tell us what all this really is’. I think this is, you know, a wonderful technology that’s going to make our first responders and our citizens much safer and it certainly enhances the system, so that it works better. You know, I’ve often wondered trying to be a dispatcher and figure out all the different possibilities of fire, police, Haz-Mat, emergency vehicles and where they’re at and how do you control all that. In one map they’re going to be able to tell all that and understand where people really are, as opposed to guessing and I think it will take a lot of worry away from the dispatchers. That’s such a stressful job as it is, and to have the technology to make it so much easier for them to visually understand where vehicles are is going to be wonderful, but I think it’s a great technology, keep working on it and let’s hope that all the bugs get out and it works just like you want it to.

My final question is, when you move to the new facility, is all of this going to move pretty easily? It’s all part of the system now, so we’ve got the vehicles done, but the equipment used at 9-1-1 and dispatch all moves pretty easily and is convertible?”

**Mr. Koehler** said, “Right. Well we were fortunate, because when we started this, we still had not decided who the new computer-aided dispatch system vendor would be. Once we went through the process, we ended up with the same vendor we have now, I mean, honestly much to my surprise.

No, it will move, that’s the nice thing. This will be a lot simpler to move. Of course it won’t be bug-free, but it’s actually using the same mapping and ABL components with the new systems as we’re using now, so it will make that part of it a lot easier move.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Good. That’s all I have Mr. Chair.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you, Commissioner Norton. Any other questions? What’s the will of the Board on this item please.”

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Winters moved to receive and file.

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Next item please.”

**E. DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES.**

**DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES – COMCARE**

**1. AGREEMENT WITH KEITH BOMHOLT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL APARTMENTS FOR THE TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PROJECT.**

**Mr. Tom Pletcher**, Executive Director of Clinical Services, Comprehensive Community Care (COMCARE), greeted the Commissioners and said, “For Marilyn Cook, who needs to be in Topeka this morning. The HUD founded transitional housing project offers stable housing, mental health services, addiction treatment services and representative payee services for transitional housing project participants.

The addition of these four units to the existing agreement will enable it to expand from its current number of 16 units to 20 units, allowing additional participants in the program itself. The cost of leasing these additional units is covered at 100% by the grant, with no cash match for the rent subsidies required.

You may recall the newspaper article in late December that chronicled the story of one of the residents. This 28-year-old man entered the program in March of last year and continues to be a

## **Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

resident who receives the full compliment of services to assist him to be able to remain in the community. He previously had Social Security income, but lost it when paperwork was returned to that organization unopened during his four years of homelessness.

He had part-time employment at one time, but was unable to keep it because of lack of supports. Now the affects of his illness are much more stable and he's more engaged in the community, being a member of Breakthrough Club, also volunteering his time at Project Independence. He's working with staff members to obtain competitive employment and describes his goal of wanting to work and give back to the community.

This expansion of the project will allow additional people to obtain these kinds of services and hopefully these kinds of results. I would ask that you approve this agreement and authorize the Chairman to sign. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them at this time."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. I see that we do have one question or comment. Commissioner Burtnett."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "I have a couple of questions and then one comment. In our backup information, I think this has happened to me once before, it says 'In October 2005, COMCARE was notified that the technical submission for the 2002 enhancement grant had been approved'. Why is there a three year difference in that? I know there's a reason, I just can't remember."

**Mr. Pletcher** said, "Sure. The way that I understand this is that we apply for and are given the grant itself. Then we have to go back and say 'These are all the details how we're going to use the money, how we would like to be able to use the money' and with all those extra details, then they come back and say again, 'Okay, now we agree with all of these specifics that you would like', and that's the reason for the delay is in the review process and the allocation process."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Okay, and so how many years have you been doing this?"

**Mr. Pletcher** said, "We're just finishing the second year of the project itself."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Okay, and are there other housing providers, or is Mr. Bomholt the only one?"

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Mr. Pletcher** said, “I believe that he is currently the only one that we are leasing from at this time. All of his units are in one location, and that gives us the ability to support people in one geographic location.”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “Okay, and that brings me to my comment. I do know Mr. Bomholt pretty well. He’s a good friend of mine and on number seven of the agreement, it talks about interest of public officials and others, and I just want to make it clear that I have no personal interest or interest of any corporation, partnership or association with Mr. Bomholt, so that everyone knows, and that’s all I had.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “All right, thank you. Commissioners, any further comments or questions? Okay, I’ll entertain a motion please.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the Agreement and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you very much. Next item please.”

**DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES – DEPARTMENT ON AGING**

**2. CONTRACT WITH CITY OF HAYSVILLE, KANSAS TO PROVIDE A SENIOR CENTER FOR ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.**

**Ms. Annette Graham**, Director, Department on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, “What I bring before you today is the contract for the Haysville Senior Center. If you recall, at the end of December, I brought all the other mill-levy contracts for the aging services and this is the last one

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

that goes with our mill levy contracts for 2006.

As of June 2005, approximately 300 unduplicated people have attended more than 60 available activities and events held at the Haysville Senior Center. This item is within the 2006 budget, which is approved by the Sedgwick County Commissioners and last year, the Sedgwick County Commissioners did approve the implementation of some changes for senior center funding to put them on a formula based funding for the . . . starting in 2006. We did design some new criteria and requirements for the senior centers to meet for this year and this year, for the budget they will be receiving \$33,926.

The senior centers are certainly a very important component in the service delivery continuum for seniors in our community. They provide a valuable resource for seniors, and especially as we're looking at the changing demographics, more and more they play an important role in making sure that individuals in this age and older do remain physically active, socially involved, involved in their community, receive adequate nutrition, engage in certain activities and education and wellness initiatives, so it's a very important program that we're really excited that the commissioners have approved funding for and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Annette. Commissioners, any comments or questions? Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well, I'm going to be supportive of this. It is the last one out of the whole group and Haysville's got a new director, they're looking at building a new senior center. How does this compare . . . the new formula compare to what they got last year?"

**Ms. Graham** said, "There is an increase in funding for them. They did a change in levels. As you remember, we did identify levels, multi-purpose senior centers level one, level two and then we had the senior centers level one, two and three. We added a new level for that. They were moved from a multi-purpose senior center down to a senior center level three because of the criteria that was set up, but they did receive an increase in funding for this year."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. And how often do we revisit their level? Because if they build a new senior center, it's going to add a whole new dimension to what they'll be able to deliver, as far as programs and availability."

**Ms. Graham** said, "And the funding formula that was adopted, it was that if they raise up their activity levels and meet the new standards, I think it is for two years, then they can apply to be funded at a different level, but that of course would be based on the funding availability and the decisions of the commissioners at funding time."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Mr. Norton** said, “And we’ll revisit that again at budget time, I’m sure. Okay, that’s all I have Mr. Chair.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you, Commissioner Norton. Any further questions or comments with Annette? Commissioners, what’s the will of the board on this item please?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Contract and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Winters seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you very much, Annette. Next item please.”

**F. ADJUSTMENT TO THE TREASURER’S STAFFING TABLE TO EXCLUDE TWO PART-TIME POSITIONS, B114, AND INCLUDE ONE FULL-TIME FISCAL ASSISTANT POSITION, B114, IN AUTO LICENSE.**

**Mr. Ron Estes**, Treasurer, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The last several years, the vehicle tag office has tried to use part-time positions to staff during peaks and valleys within . . . serving the customers when they come in. And what we’ve discovered is it’s very difficult to get part-time employees who are knowledgeable on the statutes, knowledgeable on the regulations, as well as the

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

computer systems.

We currently have four part-time positions within the vehicle tag office. What we are requesting is to convert two of those part-time to a full-time position, with the intention that that full time position would then be out front, working with the citizens as they come in to handle their business.

The net effect of this is we've estimated the real difference would be due to benefits, depending on what the new employee selects as their benefit option, but the maximum amount of that additional cost would be \$11,400 if they picked the higher end of the benefits and we can handle that in the vehicle tag budget."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Is that all, Ron, on your presentation? Okay, commissioners, any questions or comments of Ron?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the adjustment to the Treasurer's Staffing Table.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Let me just make one comment, Ron. Just maybe on the item that came a couple . . . we are very appreciative in the efforts that you have done in the Treasurer's Department since you've taken over, and phone calls I used to get, I no longer get and it just seems like your department is running a lot smoother now and you're to be complimented on that. So, I just thought I'd offer that publicly. If there are no further comments, would you please call the roll, Madam Clerk."

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

Chairman Sciortino

Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you very much, Ron. Next item."

**G. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2006.**

**Ms. Iris Baker**, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The meeting of January 12<sup>th</sup> results in four items for consideration today.

**1) SEVEN PASSENGER MINI-VANS- FLEET MANAGEMENT  
FUNDING: VEHICLE ACQUISITION**

First item, seven passenger mini-vans for Fleet Management. Recommendation is the low bid from Steven Ford in the amount of \$96,980.

**2) FULL-SIZED ¾ TON 4X4 EXTENDED CAB TRUCKS- FLEET MANAGEMENT  
FUNDING: VEHICLE ACQUISITION**

Second item, full-sized ¾ ton, 4X4 extended cab trucks for Fleet Management. Recommendation is low bid from Don Hattan in the amount of \$47,376.

**3) CHEVROLET IMPALAS- FLEET MANAGEMENT  
FUNDING: VEHICLE ACQUISITION**

Item three, Chevrolet Impalas for Fleet Management. Recommendation is low bid from Don Hattan Chevrolet in the amount of \$68,914.

**4) FOUR-DOOR, FOUR CYLINDER ENGINE SEDANS- FLEET MANAGEMENT  
FUNDING: VEHICLE ACQUISITION**

And the fourth and final item, four-door, four-cylinder engine sedans for Fleet Management. Recommendation is the low bid, meeting specifications from Laird Noller in the amount of \$68,356.

Would be happy to answer any questions and I recommend approval of these items today."



**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “One question, just on number four. There seemed to be a fairly large . . . well, yeah, 14, \$15,000 difference in some of the other bids. Was there something in the specifications that Steven Ford and Don Hattan couldn’t comply with? Oh, they’re only for five. Why would they do that? Why would they make . . . if the bid called for six, why would they bid on five?”

**Ms. Baker** said, “The initial, the original bid was five and an addendum added a sixth vehicle. They did not acknowledge the addendum. Their total was five, so the comment, based on unit cost, if you look at the unit cost, the low was Steven Ford and it didn’t meet the wheel base dimension. The next low was Laird Noller, at a unit cost of \$11,381. Don Hattan would have been next.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay, that’s fine, I’m happy with that. Commissioners, any more comments or questions on this? What’s the will of the Board on Item G please.”

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you very much. Next item please.”

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**H. CONSENT AGENDA.**

- 1. Order dated January 11, 2006 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 2. Special Payroll Check Register of December 30, 2005 and Payroll Check Register of January 13, 2006.**
- 3. General Bills Check Register(s) for the week of January 11 – 17, 2006.**

**Mr. William P. Buchanan**, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Commissioners, you have the consent agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Winters moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. I believe now, if we want, why don’t we take up ‘Other’ now and then I have an Executive Session. So, Commissioner Norton.”

## Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

### I. OTHER

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well, I just think it would be appropriate today that we acknowledge the passing of Jan Kennedy, the former Treasurer of Sedgwick County, who for eight years had served our public very well and I think it was a sad day when we found out that she had passed away. I don't know all the details, whether she'd been sick or whatever, but she had served her community for eight years and has been a part of the Sedgwick County elected staff for quite a few years, so I think we should acknowledge that passing."

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

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well, that was the same comment I was going to make, was just to share our regrets on the death of Jan Kennedy, former Sedgwick County Treasurer. We certainly were sad to hear that. That's was the only comment I had."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "All right, thank you Commissioner Winters. Commissioner Unruh."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to mention the fact that it's great weather, good time to go visit at the Sedgwick County Zoo. We're having great attendance so far, this January and while you're there you can take an early peek at the Cargil Learning Center. That's a great asset going to be added to the Sedgwick County Zoo and looking forward to a grand opening in early March. Mark that down, and commissioners, I'm sure we'll be invited and opportunity to see the facility once it's complete, but that's all I had, Mr. Chairman."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "One thing on Jan Kennedy that I can say, you know, we've had our difference in the past, but the one thing that she did that the citizens of Derby I know are most appreciative of, she opened up that tag office and they're able now to go up there, much more easier, get their tags, get some other information.

As a matter of fact, because of her opening up that office, we had for a while the ability of our appraiser to have an office there and it's not working out too well for the appraiser and we're in the process of trying to find him another location, but that kind of jump started almost a mini-county office facility out in the region, and I think the people appreciated it and it was because of her efforts and she piloted the on-line thing so there were some very good things that she did and I kind of think all of us are saddened by her passing. So, that's all I had and if there is no further questions, then I turn it over to our Chairman Pro Tem."

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Burtnett moved to recess into Executive Session for 15 minutes to consider consultation with legal counsel on matters privileged in the attorney client relationship relating to potential litigation and legal advice and that the Board of County Commissioners return to this room from executive session no sooner than 11:40 a.m.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "This meeting is recessed into Executive Session."

**The Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners recessed into executive session at 11:25 a.m. and returned at 11:45 a.m.**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I'll call the meeting back to order and for the public record, make it a fact that no binding action was taken in Executive Session. Is there anything more to come before this board today? Mr. Manager? Mr. Euson? This meeting is adjourned."

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

**Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006**

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**BEN SCIORTINO**, Chairman  
Fifth District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**LUCY BURTNETT**, Chair Pro Tem  
Fourth District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DAVID M. UNRUH**, Commissioner,  
First District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**TIM R. NORTON**, Commissioner  
Second District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**THOMAS G. WINTERS**, Commissioner  
Third District

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Don Brace**, County Clerk

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_, 2006