

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

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen; Facilities Director

Project Description

1) **Location:** County Owned buildings located across the county.

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

.In 2006 and 2007, the County contracted with an ADA compliance expert to provide a "Self Evaluation" of the County's current compliance with the legislation. The Self Evaluation included a recommended Transition Plan to County ADA compliance. The Transition Plan was the result of an exhaustive inspection of all County facilities that documents specific variances from compliance, recommends corrective action for each variance and indicates a conceptual cost of complying with each variance. Seventy three county addresses were inspected with 987 individually listed variances from ADA compliance. These variances were listed in priority based on the professional's opinion of the severity of the variance and the risk of failing to promptly comply. This project would provide for a logical, planned effort to comply with the recommendations of the transition plan.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

In 1997, the county was sued by disability advocates for violation of the ADA at the Kansas Coliseum - a negotiated agreement was reached. In 2006, a renewed prospect to exposure to litigation and legal expenses became apparent. The Americans with Disabilities Act is the law and we want to be in compliance both because it is required as well as it is the right thing to do.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Without diligently pursuing a compliance effort that documents a timed plan to completion, the county is in jeopardy of lawsuits and an appearance of disregard for the law and its citizens.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

() Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Estimate Source: Architect Engineer

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Design		22,268	83,528		74,324		180,120
Construct		278,350		1,044,100		929,050	2,251,500
Total	-	278,350	83,528	1,044,100	74,324	929,050	2,409,352

CIP Project: Replace Roofs - County-Owned Buildings

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

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

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

a. Complete roof removal and replacement for various County-owned buildings.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Sedgwick County contracted with a local architectural engineering firm to complete roof evaluations for County-owned buildings. This 5-year plan, which is part of a 20-year plan, is the implementation of recommendations included in that report.
- b. This survey was completed in response to an identified need to better maintain County buildings and optimize roof investment based on consistent, expert evaluation.
- c. The Adult Detention Facility south roof was originally programmed for replacement in 2008 and has been moved to 2011. Repairs completed in 2005 will extend the useful life of this roof to year 2011 or beyond.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- 1. Most roofs will last in excess of twenty-years if properly maintained, and if they experience no storm damage. Because of these variables, we schedule replacement based on averages for the type of roof and adjust replacement schedules as needed depending on these variables.
- 2. Roof failures result in property and contents damage. Damage can be in the form of mold, ruined ceilings, damaged electrical and mechanical systems - to name a few.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2008-2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 1,082,518

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design	57,584	2,796	15,873	91,352	1,386	115,809	284,800
Construct	306,953	12,298	83,524	500,946	6,591	625,608	1,535,920
Total	364,537	15,094	99,397	592,298	7,977	741,417	1,820,720

CIP Project: Convert to Digital & Expand 800 MHz Radio System

Requestor/Title/Department: Diane M. Gage, Director, Emergency Communicationws

Project Description

1) **Locations:** 525 N. Main, 301 S. Main, 1200 E. 77th St N, 23101 W. 23rd S, 7065 S. Ida, location TBA

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

Upgrade current radio system to digital from analog. Add an additional radio site in the east-central part of Sedgwick County. All radios using the system will need to be able to receive and transmit digitally. Currently, there are over 6,000 units on the system. Not all are Sedgwick County agencies, but less than 1,000 are capable of being digital. Replace all transmitters, receivers, controllers and other related radio components. All end user radios will need to be updated/replaced. Cost estimates include planning, design, core infrastructure and Sedgwick County user radios only.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The support and parts for the current analog radio system will cease after 2012. This is due to the age of the radio system and the technological evolution away from analog radio systems. The radio system will be 16 years old and technology has changed significantly. Additionally, the FCC is mandating communications systems move to APCO 25 systems, which utilizes digital communications within a narrower bandwidth. Included in this project is an additional tower site to improve coverage in the east-central portion of the Sedgwick County. This area currently receives signals from either the 77th St N site or 7065 S. Ida. This has been an area of large growth and call volume. Public Safety units are at risk when using a portable radio in that area.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

The communications system for public safety agencies will begin to deteriorate and cease to function. The FCC could also pull our licenses and we would be operating illegally. Not all of the costs of the upgrade would be born by Sedgwick County, this will impact every agency operating on the system.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating				250,000	250,000	500,000
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	250,000	250,000	500,000

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

() Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Estimate Source: Staff Estimates, Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan/Design		100,000	150,000				250,000
User radios			500,000	500,000	1,500,000		2,500,000
Construct				21,569,000			21,569,000
Total	-	100,000	650,000	22,069,000	1,500,000	-	24,319,000

CIP Project: Modernize Fire Alarm System - Historic Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

1) **Location:** Historic Courthouse, 510 N. Main

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

) A consultant will evaluate the fire alarm system to determine to what extent the existing panel, wiring and other components must be replaced and determine the best approach to the modernization. Staff estimates the fee at 8%.

b) A fire alarm contractor will install new devices including voice messaging, smoke detectors, duct detectors, door-holders, pull-stations and other devices as identified by consultant and provide necessary system programming. The Munger building has a fire alarm system that is a satellite of the Historic Courthouse. Most of the equipment in Munger is modern, so other than re-programming, changes to the Munger system will be minimal.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The fire alarm system in the Historic Courthouse has detectors and other devices throughout the building that are obsolete and are failing. Alarms are registered on the panel, and much of the time the system fails to indicate where the problems originate. The existing alarm system does not meet current code, so this project will not only replace all of the existing field-equipment but will provide additional equipment and devices to bring the system into code-compliance. These changes will not only make the alarm system more reliable, but any alarms will provide information as to the nature and specific location of the fire alarm or trouble alarm.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Poor reliability and the potential for failure during an actual fire

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 251,606

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design		17,151					17,151
Construct		234,455					234,455
Total	-	251,606	-	-	-	-	251,606

CIP Project: Restore Stained Glass Windows-Kansas African American Museum

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

1) **Location:** 601 N. Water

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

County staff will develop the scope of work in conjunction with a Stained Glass contractor. The contractor will make repairs that will include removal of stained glass panels, replacement of broken pieces of stained glass, re-lead, solder all loose joints, brace bars, etc. to properly restore condition of panels. The wooden frames and sashes will be renovated, the stained glass will be reinstalled and other window components recaulked and painted as needed.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The Kansas African American Museum has 52 impressive stained glass windows plus an octagon shaped skylight. The skylight was renovated in 2004 as it had become dangerous, was coming apart, warping and in danger of falling to the main floor below. The stained glass windows, although more stable, are also in poor condition, but do not present an immediate danger.

a) The Kansas African American Museum is on the National Register of Historic Places. The church is historically significant to Wichita.

b) The stained glass windows are in danger of failing. Should they fall out of the sashes it will become difficult to repair, and repairs may result in more of a replica than original if stained glass pieces begin falling out and breaking before repairs, rendering them beyond use.

c) The renovation will extend the service life of the windows for the museum for many more decades. The building history follows, as printed in a pamphlet by AACU for the Kansas African American Museum; *“The History – In 1917, Old Calvary Baptist Church was built in the heart of the African American community in Wichita, Kansas. In 1972, while the congregation was planning to move to its new building, Doris Kerr Larkins, along with her sisters and the community, made a stand and decided to save the church. In 1974, the stand formulated in the First National Black Historical Society and in 1993, it was placed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Society changed its name to The Kansas African American Museum, inc. in 1998 and is a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization.”*

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

The pieces will continue to loosen and the potential for falling and breaking increases.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2011

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 109,731

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

Estimate Source:

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Construct		99,259					99,259
Total	-	99,259	-	-	-	-	99,259

CIP Project: Remodel Sheriff Department's Squad Room

Requestor/Title/Department: Sheriff Gary Steed, Sheriff's Department

Project Description

1) **Location:** 820 Stillwell, Wichita

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

a. Remodel and expand the existing squad room. Landscape and resurface the current parking lot.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

a. The Sheriff's Department has outgrown the current facility. Changes to improve functionality include:

1. Briefing Room. The open area used for briefings is not large enough to accommodate the staff attending. Enclosing the room would allow briefings to be conducted without distractions.
2. Supervisor's Office. Space for supervisors is limited. They share a small office which is also used to store various supplies, disposables and shift paperwork. At times, storage requirements also include shotguns and other equipment out of a patrol cars. Because it is used for storage, it is difficult for supervisors to have private discussions with subordinates.
3. Storage. Storage needs must be addressed in a comprehensive way to include temporary evidence storage and adequate lockers for deputies. Currently, equipment is scattered in available space as well as in the general area of the squad room. This does not include other protective equipment related to weapons of mass destruction (WMD), stored at a different location.
4. Work Space. Currently, the squad room includes work space for three deputies to access computers, complete shift paperwork and package evidence. This area should be separate.
5. Small Meeting Room. There are no private area for small meetings or training. Detectives and deputies often use the squad room to meet other deputies, informants, as well as citizens.
6. Canopy. A canopy is needed to protect movement of evidence from vehicles in inclement weather.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Sedgwick County will continue to incur expenses to expand/maintain a facility that has long been outgrown. This will include the purchase and construction of storage building(s) and minor remodels of the existing building. Vehicle damage and employee injury is anticipated due to the poor condition of the parking lot. Continual maintenance expenses regarding plumbing and roofing.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009-2010

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 1,030,386

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

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Design		92,982					92,982
Construct			1,156,384				1,156,384
Total	-	92,982	1,156,384	-	-	-	1,249,366

CIP Project: Interior Structural Repair and HVAC Upgrade - Historic Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Div. of Information & Operations

Project Description

1) **Location:** 510 N. Main

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

The project will provide structural repair and re-work to compromised portions of the structure of the Historic Courthouse interior. Work includes masonry repair, injection grouting, and installation of appropriate steel lintels to support openings in load bearing walls. Work also includes removing existing air-conditioning ductwork from walls and floors that had been installed through opening that were crudely penetrated leaving unsupported walls and floor that have resulted in cracks and settlement. New HVAC systems must be designed and installed that do not require large openings through the load bearing walls and floors. Insulation will be added to the attic which will reduce loads on HVAC equipment and conserve energy.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

1. Structural: Cracks have developed throughout the building as a result of mechanical and electrical projects that improperly created unsupported penetrations through load bearing masonry walls.
2. Structural: Adding structural steel lintels and/or filling openings will stabilize the building and prevent further deterioration of the structure.
3. Structural: Existing areas of cracking can be stabilized through the use of injection grouting to restore the integrity of the masonry structure.
1. Mechanical: The existing HVAC system was installed about 20 years ago using large, low pressure duct work that required large penetrations be made through existing walls of the building.
2. Mechanical: Modifying the HVAC system to a high pressure variable air volume system would provide a means to provide effective air-conditioning while protecting the building structure.
3. Mechanical: Adding insulation at the roof/attic areas will conserve energy.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Failure to stabilize the building will result in continuing and eventually serious damage to the building. The air conditioning system must be renovated before the building can be stabilized, since the majority of the structural problems were caused by installing the system without regard to the damage to the walls that was caused, which in turn severely weakened the building.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 2,130,592

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Design	173,250	385,893					559,143
Construct		1,571,449					1,571,449
Total	173,250	1,957,342	-	-	-	-	2,130,592

CIP Project: Replace HVAC Roof Top Units (RTU), SC Extension

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Div. of Information & Operations

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Rooftop equipment typically has a life expectancy of 15 years with proper maintenance, but the existing equipment began having significant failures in 2003. Over the last several years, 1/3 of the heat exchangers were replaced because they failed and could have discharged carbon monoxide into the occupied spaces. Numerous cooling compressors have also been replaced due to their failure.
- b. The existing equipment has poor energy efficiency and does a poor job of maintaining comfort levels in the occupied spaces. During design, the primary focus will be to achieve reliability, energy efficiency as well as address comfort issues. More modern equipment is expected to reduce the heating and cooling energy costs by more than 15% percent.
- c. Current energy use at this facility is \$61,000 annually. Staff estimates that the equipment will reduce energy consumption by more than \$9,000 annually. Reductions in maintenance costs are expected to save approximately \$4,000 annually for the first 5 years, with maintenance savings declining in years 6 through 15. Over the average 15-year life expectancy, the equipment is expected to save \$175,000. .

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

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

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2010

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 439,392

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

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design			37,074				37,074
Construct			402,318				402,318
Total	-	-	439,392	-	-	-	439,392

CIP Project: **Replace Maintenance Building, SC Park**

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

Project Description

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

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

Replace 30 year old wood frame maintenance building with a 40 ft X 80 ft. steel insulated building.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

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

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

 () Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design		10,000					10,000
Construct			272,000				272,000
Total	-	10,000	272,000	-	-	-	282,000

CIP Project: Renovate Mushroom Restroom, Lake Afton

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

Project Description

1) **Location:** 245313 W 39th S, Goddard. Lake Afton Park

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

Remove all masonry walls, concrete floor, plumbing, and electrical systems and rebuild similar to the current structure. Reuse the concrete roof. The septic system for this restroom was totally replaced in 2007.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current building is an open-air type, meaning that it has a roof, but the walls are not attached to that roof, this leaves a opening around the perimeter of this building. The buildings roof is made of concrete in a mushroom shape. The roof and its support column are in very good condition, however, the masonry walls are not. The building has settled causing major cracks in the mortar joints and the bricks have deteriorated. The plumbing and the electrical systems in this building need to be totally replaced. The two main cast iron sewer lines both have broken where they enter the concrete floor and are not repairable without removing a portion of the concrete floor. Project Services staff and our architect-engineer have looked at this building so they both have an idea of its condition. The plan is to try and use the same design as the current building. This was the first flushable restroom/shower facility built at Lake Afton Park.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

This building is over 40 years old and without these repairs will eventually have to be closed. First, it could become unsafe due to the deterioration of the mortar between the bricks and blocks. In addition, the failing plumbing could allow raw sewage to spill onto the floor of the building now creating unsanitary conditions and also requiring facility closure. While staff will accomplish a repair to the sewer lines to fix this problem, but the fix will only be a temporary one as the remaining cast iron pipe has cracked and will eventually fail. Finally, the electrical system is also in poor condition due to exposure and also needs to be replaced.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** (X) New
 () Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):
 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design					23,000		23,000
Construct						75,000	75,000
Total	-	-	-	-	23,000	75,000	98,000

CIP Project: Outdoor Warning Activation and Report Back System

Requestor/Title/Department: Randall C. Duncan, Director, Emergency Management

Project Description

1) **Location:** Various locations throughout Sedgwick County

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

Allows existing outdoor warning system to be updated to take advantage of new NWS capability for more precise warnings. Also, provides more accurate and timely information on status and maintenance needs of the devices. In addition to an outright purchase of the system, there is a possibility of leasing.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

Overwarning costs local businesses revenue. This system will help provide more targeted warning, thus reducing interference with local business and loss of business and tax revenue. In addition, it will provide, for the first time, timely and accurate information on the functionality, status and maintenance needs of the devices.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

As other jurisdictions update to this type of system (Andover has converted in December 2006) the public may begin to wonder why we aren't doing the same.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2011

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 857,307

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

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		857,307					857,307
Total	-	857,307	-	-	-	-	857,307

CIP Project: Historic County Courthouse Stone Treatment/Repair

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

1) **Location:** 510 N. Main

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

This project addresses the accelerating problem of exterior limestone deterioration that threatens the long term viability of the Historic Courthouse. The limestone will first be cleaned with a recommended product that prevents subsequent bacterial growth which has been a problem for the building. It will then be treated in areas of the stone that have been weakened by the weathering process with a consolidant followed by the application of a breathable water repellent product over the entirety of the exterior stone. Note that this project does not include any large scale stone replacement. At present, the existing stone is considered to be structurally sound. The project will protect the eroded building that remains and provide an opportunity for another 100 years of service.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

1. The limestone has obvious and very significant deterioration due primarily to the porous natural limestone absorbing both liquid and gaseous moisture which results in freeze thaw damage to the exterior surfaces as well as interior wall spalling, peeling paint and conditions that foster mold.
2. A study to assess the present condition of the stone, done by the former Training Director for Preservation Technology and Training for the National Park Service, recommends this action to prevent further damage to the building.
3. In a Law Kindon Inc. report entitled "Overall Facility Evaluation of the Historic Sedgwick County Courthouse" regarding the condition of the stone, the following statement is provided: "It is our opinion that if some sort of treatment of the stone does not occur, it will continue to deteriorate to a point where it becomes detrimental to the structural integrity of the building".
4. Cleaning the exterior with a product designed to stop bacterial growth will provide a method of slowing exterior deterioration.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

1. If steps are not taken to protect the limestone from moisture penetration, it will continue to deteriorate at an accelerating rate. Many of the detailed/carved areas are losing their features.
2. Eventual structural damage.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 642,928

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Owners Cost's			168,508				168,508
Construct			540,301				540,301
Total	-	-	708,809	-	-	-	708,809

CIP Project: Elevator Modernization - Historic Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information & Operations

Project Description

1) **Location:** Historic Courthouse, 510 N. Main

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

Upgrade or replace the elevator controls and door operators; and upgrade the hoist equipment for the elevator in the Historic Courthouse. An elevator consultant will be engaged to evaluate the condition of the equipment to determine to what extent the various components need replacement.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

1. The elevator in the Historic Courthouse is operating with its original hoist equipment and controls. The equipment is obsolete and becoming unreliable. With only one elevator to serve the building, reliability is very important since this building houses a variety of functions including the Department on Aging.
2. The project cost is based on a December 2005 proposal from an elevator contractor in the amount of \$90,000. A revised estimate was provided in December 2006 that raised the estimate by \$15,000.
3. An elevator consultant should be engaged to prepare performance specifications and to assure that only work that will be beneficial is included in the project.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

This work is being moved from 2009 to 2011 to better work around the various projects taking place in this building. This elevator machinery is very old and obsolete. This is the only elevator; and when it breaks down much of the staff working in the building have trouble getting to their work area, and some clients for Department on Aging cannot otherwise get to these offices.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 146,470

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

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Design			13,440				13,440
Construct			148,980				148,980
Total	-		162,420	-	-	-	162,420

CIP Project: Update Main Courthouse Elevator Lobbies and Restrooms
 Lobbies for floors (Basement, 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10); Restrooms for floors 2 through 11

Requestor/Title/Department: Stephanie Knebel, Manager, Facility Project Services

Project Description

1) **Location:** Sedgwick County Courthouse, 525 N. Main

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

- a. Elevator lobbies on 7 floors will be updated to match the improvements already made on floors 5, 6, 7, 9, and 11 as well as the North employee entrance. The Main Entrance Remodel Project updated the elevator lobbies and a majority of the 1st and 2nd floors. Improvements will include new ceilings, improved lighting, new tile, and paint in each lobby as well as the adjacent east and west hallways. In addition, each elevator will have smoke seals installed to meet current codes for high-rise buildings.
- b. The public restrooms on each floor are in need of upgrades: new floor tile to match the new lobbies, removing plaster ceilings and replacing with ceiling tiles, new light fixtures, new toilet and sink fixtures, new toilet partitions, new wall tile and paint. Public restrooms will be ADA compliant.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. The elevator lobbies and adjacent hallways are high traffic areas as they are the main pathways to the elevators, restrooms and additional offices. The existing finishes are dated and the existing floor tile continues to be a maintenance problem due to cracking and buckling. The lobbies currently have poor lighting, due largely to dark colors of the tile and paint.
- b. This project will complete updates needed to create a uniform appearance throughout the courthouse.
- c. Restrooms will be ADA compliant.
- d. Cost savings should be realized if the lobbies and restrooms are designed and bid together.
- e. Inconvenience should be minimized on each floor with both the lobby and restrooms being addressed at the same time, rather than two separate stand alone projects.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- 1. Restrooms will remain out of ADA compliance for nearly the entire Main Courthouse.
- 2. The look of the elevator lobbies will not be consistent from floor to floor as some floors have already been upgraded.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009
 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: \$927,280

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

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Design		77,020					77,020
Construct		850,260					850,260
Total	-	927,280	-	-	-	-	927,280

CIP Project: Replace EMS Post 9 (East)

Requestor/Title/Department: Steven Cotter, Director, Emergency Medical Service

Project Description

1) **Location:** 1010 N. 143rd St East

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

Relocation of existing facility temporarily housed at SCFD Station 38. This post had to be moved from its previous location owned by Raytheon due to a property sale in June 2002.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

a. This station houses an ambulance and crew 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and is important in covering people and projected growth on the east side of Wichita and in Sedgwick County. Current call volume is around 2000 calls annually. Multiple locations to house ambulances and crews are essential to assuring quality public services to the citizens of Sedgwick County. This is an efficient method of allocating resources for essential services and relocation is necessary to be responsive to the changing needs of our community. Response times to the area would be projected to improve by 24 seconds.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Not completing this project leaves a significant portion of the unit's 9 minute response sphere in Butler County instead of all within Sedgwick County. Our effectiveness for our constituents would improve and would better distribute call volume between this facility and units on the near east side.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2007-2011 CIP for year(s): 2011 Construction

If previously approved, project cost in 2007-2011 CIP: 749,280

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Land				90,000			90,000
Owner Cost					184,584		184,584
Construct					681,489		681,489
Total	-	-	-	90,000	866,073	-	956,073

CIP Project: **Replace Movable Wall, Sedgwick County Extension**

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

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

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: \$104,300

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

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan					8,200		8,200
Construct					96,100		96,100
Total	-	-	-	-	104,300	-	104,300

CIP Project: **Replace Shelter #2 Lake Afton**

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

Project Description

1) **Location:** Lake Afton Park

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

Replace the 50 year old building with a new, efficient, modern facility using the same design and plan that is being used for the Plum Shelter Project at Sedgwick County Park.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

This building is 50+ years old and is built from old wooden railcar lumber. It is not energy efficient, ADA compliant, or up to code. The interior of the building was remodeled in 1988, but that was only a décor change. This building was rented 42 days in 2006. The current rental fee is \$75.00/day, the new fee would be in the \$100-\$150/day range and rent 60+ days per year.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Living with a building that does not meet current building code or ADA Standards.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue					7,500	7,500
Personnel						-
Operating					(600)	(600)
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	6,900	6,900

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

 (X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2012

 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 216,576

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design					29,791		29,791
Construct					186,785		186,785
Total	-	-	-	-	216,576	-	216,576

CIP Project: **Repair Lower Spillway - Lake Afton Park**

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

Project Description

1) Location: South end of Lake Afton to the end of county property

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

Repair the spillway channel from the over-flow dam south to the county property line.

3) Project Need/Justification:

a. The lower drainage basin located from the main overflow dam south to the county property line is in poor condition. Since the floods of 1993 when existing structures were damaged, this basin has developed major erosion problems and this erosion is now threatening the main road that encircles the park. This road today is a safety hazard as the south side of the crossing has washed out leaving a 15 foot drop-off. There is no guard rail to protect drivers or pedestrians.

b. It is readily evident that during every rain that creates over-flow conditions this wash-out worsens, and eventually that road crossing will fail. In 2001, the County funded an engineering study to develop a design concept project that would repair the defects and provide stability in that area.

4) What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?

Each time we have a high water event, the project cost will increase due to extensive erosion. The erosion is threatening the concrete vehicle crossing by undermining the roadbed which will result in the crossing washing out. If this project is not completed, the stability of the main concrete dam will be threatened and could fail causing flooding downstream.

5) Impact on Operating Budget:

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 3,614,335

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design			300,664				300,664
Construct				2,783,099		530,000	3,313,099
Total	-	-	300,664	2,783,099	-	530,000	3,613,763

CIP Project: Replace Carpet - Sedgwick County Extension

Requestor/Title/Department: Paul Drouhard, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

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

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

Replacement of carpet, base and transition strips. Limited replacement of floor tile.
The project will include furniture moving and similar work.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The Extension Office opened in January 1994. The floorcovering is original, and the carpet is getting worn out and in many places the carpet is separating from the backing.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Potential tripping hazards if conditions are not monitored closely and repaired promptly.
Unattractive.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2010
If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 52,099

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

Estimate Source: Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct			52,099				52,099
Total	-	-	52,099	-	-	-	52,099

CIP Project: Expand Parking-Plum Shelter & Bait Shop, SC Park

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

Project Description

1) Location: North of Plum Shelter, south of the Bait Shop and adjacent to current parking lot

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

- a. Construct a new 30 space parking lot for shelter users, fishermen and path users for Plum Shelter
- b. Construct 30 new parking spaces adjacent to and south of the existing Baitshop parking

3) Project Need/Justification:

- a. Currently there are eight marked parking spaces in the parking lot for the bait shop, one space is reserved for the pay phone, and the other is the handicapped stall, so actually there are six spaces available. This lot is not adequate in size for Baitshop customers, walkers, and fishermen who all use this lot.
- b. In addition, there are eleven marked parking spaces between Plum Shelter and the restroom building located directly north of Plum Shelter. One of those spaces is a handicapped accessible spot. These spaces are used by all that use the park, and on days when Plum Shelter is rented, parking is at a premium. As a result, people that rent Plum Shelter end up parking long distances away and have to walk to the building.

4) What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?

Our customer service is affected when people want to access the baitshop, a building they have rented, use the path, want to go fishing, or use the restroom and they have no place to park their vehicle.

5) Impact on Operating Budget:

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 145,768

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design		35,505					35,505
Construct		110,263					110,263
Total	-	145,768	-	-	-	-	145,768

CIP Project: Install Outdoor Warning Devices

Requestor/Title/Department: Randall C. Duncan, Director, Emergency Management

Project Description

1) **Location:** Various locations throughout Sedgwick County

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

The scope of this work includes designation of a site for installation, purchase of outdoor warning devices, and the purchase of poles to mount the devices on. Also included is the cost of installation of the device.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

Local governments are required to warn citizens of impending emergencies, but they can't be held accountable because a particular person fails to hear the warning.

The installation of outdoor warning devices furthers the goals and objectives of Sedgwick County Emergency Management. These activities further protect lives in case of severe weather event.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Rapidly growing areas of Sedgwick County will not have access to the Outdoor Warning Devices.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2008-2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 236,437

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

Estimate Source: Prior Year Cost plus Inflation

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct	44,548	45,895	47,271	48,627	50,086	51,000	287,427
Total	44,548	45,895	47,271	48,627	50,086	51,000	287,427

CIP Project: Replace Carpet - 905 N. Main

Requestor/Title/Department: Mark Coronado, Operations Manager, Dept. of Corrections

Project Description

1) Location: 905 N. Main, Wichita KS 67203

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

Remove all furnishings from offices, storage closets and corridors. Remove all carpet, cove base and transitional materials. Make repairs to wall boards if damaged by cove base removal and to floors as needed to correct gaps or offsets at cracks and control joints. Install new carpet, cove base and transitions, replace furnishings. All labor to be scheduled with minimal impact to daily functionality or daily operation with work in high traffic areas and building corridors completed on evening and weekend hours.

3) Project Need/Justification:

The carpet throughout this facility was installed in or about 1992 and has served its intended life. There are areas of wear, stains that can no longer be removed as well as areas that have begun to fray and zipper. This is a high traffic facility, the dated look and aged appearance of the carpet provides a less than favorable impression to our customers and guests.

4) What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?

The facility sees the traffic of more than 1300 clients each month. Traffic is further impacted by client families and representatives from outside agencies. Not completing this project in a timely manner will contribute to an aesthetic impression that distracts from the nature of professionalism in the services provided at this location.

5) Impact on Operating Budget: None

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: (X) New - Last requested in the 2007 CIP Process
 () Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):
 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: Harry Street Carpet, LLC

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		46,156					46,156
Total	-	46,156	-	-	-	-	46,156

CIP Project: Additional Courtroom and Chambers in the Main Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Ellen House, Court Administrator, 18th Judicial District

Project Description

1) **Location:** 525 South Main

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

Addition of one trial courtroom and chamber space for judge, administrative aide, and court reporter within the main courthouse.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

In order to maintain the quality of service and meet the case processing time standards set by the Kansas Supreme Court, additional courtroom space is required. Overall case filings have increased approximately 20% in the past ten years. This increase has resulted in the Kansas Legislature approving two new Judicial positions (with staff) effective January, 2009.

One area that has seen tremendous growth and necessitates an additional judge, is Family Law. The District Court saw Family Law case filings grow from 5,778 in 1996 to 8,706 in 2007. Family Law cases tend to have more hearings and last longer than any other case type. They often include such issues as child custody, child support and visitation. There is no evidence of a trend reversal.

As Sedgwick County continues to grow, so will the number of cases filed in the District Court. The Eighteenth Judicial District currently has one of the best records of case processing in the entire state. It is imperative that the courtroom resources are increased to accommodate the increase in judges and to maintain the current level of service to the citizens of Sedgwick County.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Due to the ever increasing caseload, without an additional courtroom, hearings will be delayed. Additionally, there will be no office space for an elected official and his/her staff.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating	7,500	8,500	9,500	10,500	11,500	47,500
Other-						-
Total	7,500	8,500	9,500	10,500	11,500	47,500

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design		130,897					130,897
Construct		1,570,207					1,570,207
Total	-	1,701,104	-	-	-	-	1,701,104

CIP Project: Additional Courtroom and Chambers in Juvenile Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Ellen House, Court Administrator, 18th Judicial District

Project Description

1) **Location:** 1900 E. Morris

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

Addition of one courtroom and chamber space for a new judge and staff within the Juvenile courthouse. Courtroom will be capable of supporting of trial by jury.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

In order to maintain the quality of service and meet the case processing standards set by the Kansas Supreme court, the Kansas Judicial Council, and the Kansas Legislature, additional courtroom space is required. Overall case filings have increased approximately 20% in the past ten years. This increase has resulted in the Kansas Legislature approving two new judicial positions (with staff) effective January 1 2009.

One area that has seen explosive growth that necessitates an additional judge is the Juvenile Child in Need of Care Department. There has been an astonishing increase from 186 cases in 1996 to 992 cases in 2007. These are difficult, frustrating and emotional child abuse and neglect cases requiring multiple hearings. These cases also require timely decisions. The primary question often is whether the child or children will be permanently removed from the family home and placed elsewhere. Time is often the enemy of children who are temporarily placed.

The Board of County Commissioners and County Manager's office show great foresight as the Juvenile Court building was designed so that an additional courtroom could be added without having to re-engineer electrical, mechanical and structural components.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Due to the ever increasing caseload, without an additional courtroom, hearings will be delayed., and the Court would not be able to meet federal and state time requirements. Additionally, there will be no office space for an elected official and his/her staff.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	7,500
Other-						-
Total	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	7,500

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

() Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Estimate Source:

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design		111,486					111,486
Construct		1,163,136					1,163,136
Total	-	1,274,622	-	-	-	-	1,274,622

CIP Project: Planning for Regional Park

Requestor/Title/Department: Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager, Sedgwick County

Project Description

1) **Location:** to be determined

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

Participate in joint planning with other local entities for one or more regional parks

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

This joint planning effort is consistent with the Visioneering Wichita initiative to improve local recreation opportunities and quality of life by "Providing community spaces, green areas and recreational opportunities that celebrate our natural environment, our cultural diversity and our youth."

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Fewer recreational choices for citizens.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

() Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Estimate Source: Staff

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan			150,000				150,000
Design							-
Construct							-
Total	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	150,000

CIP Project: Heartland Preparedness Center--Infrastructure

Requestor/Title/Department: Bob Lamkey, Director of Public Safety

Project Description

1) **Location:** East of I-135 and south of K-96

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

a. Provide 35% Design of a Military Reserve Center (MRC); a Master plan for the proposed site that includes the MRC and future law enforcement and fire training facilities as well as needed site infrastructure.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

a. Wichita and Sedgwick County have entered into an agreement to provide local funding support for a Military Reserve Center (MRC) which will consolidate National Guard and Marine Reserve functions at the site. The MRC is the anchor tenant in what is hoped to be a combined law enforcement and 911 training facility. To execute the military component, local funding for 35% design (federally reimbursable if project moves forward) and infrastructure to the site (not reimbursable) is required. Cost for master planning for fire/law component is also not reimbursable. The long term hope is to create a training center that meets current and future training needs, locally and regionally. The project is now moved to the 2011 Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP) from the 2009 FYDP; design and construction of infrastructure is timed to meet that schedule. Both design and infrastructure have been inflated by 5% (per Facilities) from last CIP for two years to account for new timetable.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

This CIP is part of an agreement with COW and the Kansas National Guard. Not doing this project would likely result in cancellation or delay of project. In place infrastructure is required by Federal government to do the project

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2009-2010

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Estimate Source: Architect-Engineer

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan	264,413						264,413
Design		213,456					213,456
Construct			1,741,103				1,741,103
Total	264,413	213,456	1,741,103	-	-	-	2,218,972

CIP Project: Heartland Preparedness Center: Law Addition

Requestor/Title/Department: Bob Lamkey, Director of Public Safety

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current Law Enforcement Training Center does not adequately meet the needs of Wichita Police and Sedgwick County Sheriff Departments. It is housed in a former USD 259 elementary school. Neither tenants nor school district are inclined to make significant investments in infrastructure for heavy maintenance or remodeling. This facility jointly uses space and creates natural synergies for Homeland Security training and has regional potential. Estimated costs are displayed as shared equally between Wichita and Sedgwick County. Design and construction estimate inflated 5% from previous CIP to reflect new project time table.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Preliminary estimate of the County share of construction and owners cost, including contingencies, is \$5,874,946 for 2010, as reflected below. The project is dependent on approval of the Heartland Preparedness Reserve Center. County funds have not yet been committed to this project. These are planning numbers only. New proposed site plan in Jan 2006 and changing LE requirements indicate need for additional City-County joint planning/cost estimating in 2007.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2010-2011

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 6,537,581

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

Estimate Source: Achitect-Engineer

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan	20,000						20,000
Design			348,888				348,888
Construct				6,168,693			6,168,693
Total	20,000	-	348,888	6,168,693	-	-	6,537,581

CIP Project: **Replace Shelter #3, Lake Afton**

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

Project Description

1) Location: Lake Afton Park

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

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

3) Project Need/Justification:

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

4) What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?

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

5) Impact on Operating Budget:

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue				15,000		15,000
Personnel						-
Operating				(1,200)		(1,200)
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	13,800	-	13,800

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2011

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 373,790

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct				373,790			373,790
Total	-	-	-	373,790	-	-	373,790

CIP Project: Courthouse Entrance Plaza

Requestor/Title/Department: Stephanie Knebel, Manager, Facility Project Services

Project Description

1) **Location:** 525 N. Main, Main Courthouse Plaza, east side of the building

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

- a. Replace expanse of paving with green buffer between curb and main entrance doors. Create an inner circle planting area close to the main doors which will provide seating opportunities.
- b. Site improvements will include; a water feature, additional seating, and plantings.
- c. Historic Bell will be relocated to the grounds of the Historic Courthouse and the "bell tower" area will be removed and replaced with green area and media/gathering area.
- d. Security for vehicle approach will be enhanced with changes in grade and the addition of planters and seat walls to provide a natural barrier between vehicles and the building.
- e. Media/gathering needs will be met with power/data connections in the plaza area and an appropriate staging area that does not prevent pedestrian entrance to the Courthouse.
- f. Way finding signage and informational kiosks to feature a "celebrating people of Sedgwick County" theme will be installed. Informational kiosks will be used to showcase County functions and community information.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Project will address security issues by using creative barriers that allows the Courthouse entrance to be functional and inviting.
- b. Media/gathering space will be enhanced with power/data so that cables and equipment are not placed along pedestrian walkways.
- c. Courthouse will appear "approachable and friendly" by removing the extensive concrete and replacing it with "green space" to be used by employees and citizens.
- d. Signage and kiosks will celebrate the people of Sedgwick County and showcase County and Community information and services.
- e. Site amenities will enhance the citizen experience when coming to utilize Government services, which are often time not by their choice.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- a. Continued security concerns regarding vehicular access to the County Courthouse.
- b. Inappropriate staging/space/power/data needs for media and other gatherings.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): Future

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: Not included In CIP

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

Estimate Source: A/E and Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Design						177,757	177,757
Construct						1,872,072	1,872,072
Total	-	-	-	-	-	2,049,829	2,049,829

CIP Project: Improve Elm Street - Main to Market

Requestor/Title/Department: Stephanie Knebel, Manager, Facility Project Services

Project Description

1) **Location:** Elm Street from Main to Market

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

- a. Provide diagonal parking stalls on the north and south side.
- b. Provide loading/delivery zone space.
- c. Site amenities such as lighting, signage, seating, trash receptacles, landscaping and a gateway feature will be added to create a campus atmosphere

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Currently there are 21 parking stalls located on Elm Street. This project will add 4 additional parking stalls and a delivery/loading zone. Vendors often park their trucks on Main Street to make deliveries to the Historic Courthouse and Munger Building. This causes interruptions in vehicular traffic flow on Main street and compromises pedestrian safety.
- b. Site amenities will create a campus atmosphere and provide opportunities for employees and citizens to enjoy green space.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- a. Pedestrian mobility will continue to be a safety concern in the intersections of Elm/Market and Elm/Main.
- b. Deliveries will continue to be made from Main Street which will compromise safety.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 450,439

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

Estimate Source: A/E and Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design						42,590	42,590
Construct						448,352	448,352
Total	-	-	-	-	-	490,942	490,942

CIP Project: Improve Elm Street - Water to Main

Requestor/Title/Department: Stephanie Knebel, Manager, Facility Project Services

Project Description

1) **Location:** Elm Street between Water and Main

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

- a. Street will have diagonal parking stalls on North and South sides. Revised parking format will net 18 public parking stalls on the north, and 9 law enforcement and 10 handicap stalls on the south side
- b. Create a pedestrian level plaza where Elm Street meets Main Street.
- c. Inlet modifications to alleviate flooding on the street
- d. Site amenities such as trash receptacles, seating, signage, lighting and landscaping.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Available street and parking garage parking stalls in the Courthouse complex are extremely limited. Currently there are 9 law enforcement parking stalls on the north and 10 ADA parking stalls on the south. Project will add 18 public stalls that do not currently exist and maintain 9 law enforcement and 10 ADA parking stalls.
- b. Law enforcement and handicap stalls will be located on the south adjacent to the Main Courthouse.
- c. Pedestrian traffic is heaviest at the intersection of Elm and Main Street between the parking garage to the County buildings. The pedestrian level plaza will encourage vehicles to slow down as they turn into Elm Street.
- d. Inlet modifications will help alleviate flooding in the street for improved pedestrian access and mobility.
- e. Site amenities will provide opportunities for employees and citizens to utilize streetscape seating and green space.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

- a. Parking demands for the Courthouse Complex will not be met.
- b. Flooding problems in the street will continue to affect vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow.
- c. Pedestrian safety will continue to be a concern at the intersection of Elm and Main Streets.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 759,604

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

Estimate Source: A/E and Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design					76,029		76,029
Construct					800,304		800,304
Total	-	-	-	-	876,333	-	876,333

CIP Project: Improve Main Street - Elm to Central

Requestor/Title/Department: Stephanie Knebel, Manager, Facility Project Services

Project Description

1) Location: Main Street between Elm and Central

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

- a. Construct mid-block raised crosswalk with wide approaches to place emphasis on pedestrian crossing and to serve as a vehicular traffic "calming" measure.
- b. East side of street will add 22 parking stalls.
- c. Main street will be reduced to 3-lane traffic.
- d. Site amenities such as lighting, way finding signage, seating, landscaping and a gateway feature will be included to create the campus atmosphere.

3) Project Need/Justification:

- a. Construct mid-block raised crosswalk with wide approaches to place emphasis on pedestrian crossing and to serve as a vehicular traffic "calming" measure.
- b. East side of street will add 22 parking stalls.
- c. Main street will be reduced to 3-lane traffic.
- d. Site amenities such as lighting, way finding signage, seating, landscaping and a gateway feature will be included to create the campus atmosphere.

4) What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?

- a. Parking demands for the Courthouse Complex will continue to not be met.
- b. Pedestrian mobility will continue to be a safety concern at Elm Street and mid-block intersections.
- c. Vehicular traffic will continue to compromise pedestrian safety.

5) Impact on Operating Budget:

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 948,006

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: A/E and Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design						78,100	78,100
Construct						822,108	822,108
Total	-	-	-	-	-	900,208	900,208

CIP Project: Improve Main Street - Pine to Elm Street

Requestor/Title/Department: Stephanie Knebel, Manager, Facility Project Services

Project Description

1) **Location:** Main Street between Pine and Elm

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

- a. East side will have 24 diagonal parking stalls.
- b. Main street will be funneled to 3-lane traffic from Pine Street to Elm Street.
- c. Street parking in front of the County Garage, Ark Valley Lodge and Human Services (635 N. Main) buildings will be replaced with landscape features to enhance pedestrian traffic flow.
- d. Site amenities such as benches, trash receptacles, way finding signs/graphics, and a gateway feature will promote a campus atmosphere and provide improved pedestrian circulation.
- e. Crosswalk indicators and signage will be added at the intersections of Pine and Elm to emphasize pedestrian safety and slow vehicular traffic.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Currently there are 23 parking stalls on the west and east side of the street combined. This project will limit parking to the east side only in an attempt to improve security to the County owned buildings and improved pedestrian circulation.
- b. Pedestrian traffic is heavy along this street with 2 intersections that are not managed with traffic signals. Narrowing the vehicular traffic to 3 lanes and adding diagonal parking, will slow traffic.
- c. Landscape and site improvements will create a campus atmosphere needed in the area.

Estimate Source: A/E and Facility Project Services

- a. Pedestrian safety will continue to be a concern at the Pine and Elm Street intersections, along the street due to vehicles driving down Main Street and exiting the parking garage.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: 979876

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

Estimate: A/E & Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design						84,942	84,942
Construct						894,964	894,964
Total	-	-	-	-	-	979,906	979,906

CIP Project: Upgrade Courtroom Audiovisual

Requestor/Title/Department: Ellen House, Court Administrator, 18th Judicial District

Project Description

1) **Location:** 525 North Main

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

Plan, design and modify existing courtrooms to support changes in courtroom technology. This project will incrementally upgrade courtrooms throughout the main court house.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The use of technology has become increasingly important in the practice of law. Today's attorneys present evidence using PowerPoint, video, graphic boards, and high resolution evidence presenters (ELMOs). Just as the presentation methods have changed, the way that information is then presented to judge and jury must change as well.

When the courthouse was built in 1958, no one could have foreseen the broad use of technology in the courtrooms. Gone are the handwritten transcripts and single data sheets. Everything about today's courtrooms require electrical outlets, network connections, microphone to recorder feeds, etc.

Funding of this project would allow the court to upgrade courtroom with all the wiring necessary to utilize modern technology for effective evidence presentation. Imagine trying to explain the intricacies of DNA using only a dry erase board.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Over time, the Court has slowly adapted to these changes. However, the result is a courtroom with wires, cords, and power strips strewn across the floor. This is hazardous in a number of ways. Breakers are blown, attorneys and witnesses trip, and jurors must negotiate over wires going to and from the jury box and deliberation room.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** (X) New
 () Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s):
 If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP:

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

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		885,000					885,000
Total	-	885,000	-	-	-	-	885,000

CIP Project: Expand Shop for Reserve Apparatus at Station 34

Requestor/Title/Department: Gary E. Curmode, Fire Chief, Sedgwick County Fire District #1

Project Description

1) **Location:** 3914 West 71st Street South

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

Project scope includes additon 1400 SF of heated space with two overhead doors to an existing metal shop building. It also adds 2000 SF of concrete driveway to the structure for vehicle access. Construction materials are same as existing building.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

New additon will provide added storage for the growing fleet of fire reserve vehicles and for a small equipment repair area.

4) **What are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

If we do not complete the project, we will not have adequate storage of reserve equipment. It would increase the risk of vehicles freezing, or being subjected to other damage during inclement weather.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Impact	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2008-2012 CIP for year(s): 2010

If previously approved, project cost in 2008-2012 CIP: \$218,510

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Plan			40,798				40,798
Design							-
Construct			200,023				200,023
Total	-	-	240,821	-	-	-	240,821