

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

Requestor/Title/Department: Lindsey Mahoney, ADA Coordinator

Project Description

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

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

In 2006 and 2007, the County contracted with an ADA consultant to provide a "Self-Evaluation" of the County's current compliance with the ADA. The Self-Evaluation included a recommended transition plan for ADA improvements to County facilities. The Transition Plan was the result of an exhaustive inspection of all County facilities for ADA variances, and identification of structural modifications necessary for the removal of barriers to program accessibility. This plan identifies ADA variances, recommends corrective action for each item, and indicates a conceptual cost for removal of the barrier. Eighty-three county addresses were inspected with 995 individually listed variances. These variances were listed by 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 ADA and the recommendations of the County's Transition Plan.

3) Project Need/Justification:

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

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

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

5) Briefly describe project impact on the Operating Budget:

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodity						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2011 thru 2015

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 2,605,353

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding: Estimate Source: Staff, A&E and ADA Consultant Estimates

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design	61,110	31,831	34,931	32,695	29,681	17,797	208,045
Construct	564,062	292,740	321,231	300,687	272,974	163,736	1,915,430
Total	625,172	324,571	356,162	333,382	302,655	181,533	2,123,475



CIP Project: Update Master Control and Related Peripheral Technology, Adult Detention

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

Project Description

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

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

Upgrade Master Control systems to a non-proprietary system to include redesign and appropriate upgrades of the Master Control Center (MCC); separating the existing Fire Alarm system; upgrade video surveillance system to include digital video recording, video storage, replace existing intercom/paging systems and phase 1 of upgrading locking systems.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current control system is 1980/1990's technology and is problematic to support and not compatible with the needs of staff to provide adequate security and safety to protect staff, visitors, and detainees. Although functioning, the systems are nearing the end of their expected life cycle and will continue to present a maintenance and operability problems. The Master Control Center does not provide ease of operation such as at door controls that are delayed as more demands are put on the system. Malfunctioning systems create security and safety concerns within the pods. The current paging system does not function and there are some cameras in the facility that are not rated for their current use. Based on a review of systems conducted in 2010, it is recommended that the following items be addressed: Replace existing proprietary detention control system with a new non-proprietary system; redesign and improve the master control center to increase efficiency and operation while reusing existing control wiring to monitor and operate existing devices such as door controls, and monitor switches; separate existing Simplex fire system from detention control system and install a new UL listed remote annunciator to provide 24/7 monitoring of the fire alarm system from Master Control; Retain existing pneumatic and electro-mechanical locking systems and replace malfunctioning locks; Upgrade video surveillance system for digital control and recording and replace malfunctioning cameras. Sedgwick County Counsel advises video recording shall be stored for 2.5 years; and replace existing intercom/paging system due to multiple communication problems. Based on the site assessment and subsequent report, the current systems are incompatible with current detention technology. An updated system will enhance efficiency, safety, productivity and maintainability.

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

Due to current systems nearing the end of their lifecycle it is expected staff will be faced with increased maintenance costs, systems down for extended periods of time and security lapses will become more prevalent throughout the detention facility.

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

The change to a non-proprietary system should significantly reduce maintenance and repair costs.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Contractual						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2011-2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 4,021,219

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

Estimate Source: A/E Systems Engineering Study

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015	Total
Design	259,156						259,156
Construct		3,775,010					3,775,010
Cost of bonding		56,625					56,625
Total	259,156	3,831,635	-	-	-	-	4,090,791



CIP Project: Replace Center Restroom, SC Park

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

Project Description

1) Location: Sedgwick County Park

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

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

3) Project Need/Justification:

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

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

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

5) Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:

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

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual		(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	(1,200)
Commodities		(400)	(400)	(400)	(400)	(1,600)
Total	-	(700)	(700)	(700)	(700)	(2,800)

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2013

If previously approved, project cost in 2010-2014 CIP: 126,481

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: Architect-Engineer

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct			132,485				132,485
Total	-	-	132,485	-	-	-	132,485



CIP Project: Replace Kitchen Equipment - Adult Detention Facility

Requestor/Title/Department: Paula Downs, Project Services Manager, DIO Project Services

Project Description

1) Location: 141 W. Elm

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

Replace multiple items throughout kitchen for the Sedgwick County (ADF) Adult Detention Facility. Work will include: Remove/replace existing kitchen equipment from ADF and replace with new efficient, reliable equipment.

3) Project Need/Justification:

Most of the larger pieces of equipment in the ADF kitchen were installed during the original construction in 1998 and show signs of extreme wear and use. Due to the age of the equipment, they are requiring multiple repairs. Some of the components are no longer supported by the factory, making replacement parts impossible to get. Breakdowns and repairs over the past 24 months have steadily climbed, indicating a slow deterioration in the dependability of the equipment. In addition, the large components are not efficient by any standard. For example, the walk-in cooler and freezer waste large amounts of water to provide the necessary cooling. Upgrading the equipment will allow for reduction in both utility and maintenance costs and will allow the ADF vendor to provide better quality meals with more dependable service.

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

Kitchen equipment will continue to fail and potentially delay meals from being prepared on schedule. Some equipment has been determined to be unsafe and has extreme wear and damage due to heavy daily commercial use. The age and deterioration of current equipment adds to increased utility costs, increased potential for mold and pest problems.

5) Impact on Operating Budget:

There is no significant impact on the operating budget.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Revenue						-
Personnel						-
Operating						-
Other-						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: (X) New

() Previously Approved in 2010-2014 CIP for year(s):

If previously approved, project cost in 2010-2014 CIP:

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services/Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		391,442					391,442
Cost of bonding		5,872					5,872
Total	-	397,314	-	-	-	-	397,314



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

Requestor/Title/Department: Randy Bargdill, Director, Emergency Communications

Project Description

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

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

Replace analog radios with radios capable of operating on a digital system.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The upgrade of the current analog radio system to a digital system will result in a portion of radios used by County departments to become unusable as they do not have digital capability. It will be necessary to replace those radios. If the radios are not replaced, employees will not be able to communicate using the system. While the purchase of these radios may not ultimately come from Capital Improvement Project funding, the issue will need to be addressed and radios purchased timely.

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

If the radios are not replaced, employees will not be able to communicate using the radio system.

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015	Total
Contractual						-
Commodities	3,000,000					3,000,000
Total	3,000,000	-	-	-	-	3,000,000

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2011-2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 25,250,000

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

Estimate Source: Staff, Vendor

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan	100,000						100,000
Design	150,000						150,000
Construct	22,000,000	3,000,000					25,000,000
Cost of bonding		45,000					45,000
Total	22,250,000	3,045,000	-	-	-	-	25,295,000



CIP Project: Replace Roofs - County-Owned Buildings

Requestor/Title/Department: Steve Claassen, Facilities Director, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

1) Location: Various sites in Sedgwick County

2) Scope of Work to be Performed:

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

3) Project Need/Justification:

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

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

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

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

5) Briefly describe project impact on the operating budget:

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodity						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) Project Status: () New

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2013

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 1,061,603

7) Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:

Estimate Source: A/E, Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		58,600	427,077	109,303	1,368,698	-	1,963,678
Total	-	58,600	427,077	109,303	1,368,698	-	1,963,678



CIP Project: Replace Exterior Joint Sealant Adult Detention North Addition

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

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

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

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2015
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 149,453

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design					9,995		9,995
Construct					139,458		139,458
Total	-	-	-	-	149,453	-	149,453



CIP Project: Replace HVAC Roof Top Units, SC Extension

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

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

- a. Rooftop equipment typically has a life expectancy of 15 years with proper maintenance, but the existing equipment began having significant failures in 2003. In the last several years, ten heat exchangers were replaced because they failed and could have discharged carbon monoxide into the occupied spaces. Numerous cooling compressors have also been replaced.
- b. The existing equipment has poor energy efficiency and does a marginal job of maintaining comfort levels in the occupied spaces. The primary focus will be to achieve reliability, improve energy efficiency and address comfort issues. New equipment is expected to reduce heating and cooling costs by more than fifteen percent.
- c. Current energy cost is \$61,000 annually. Staff estimates new equipment will reduce energy consumption by more than \$9,000 annually and maintenance costs by \$4,000 annually for the first 5 years. Over the average 15-year life expectancy, the new equipment is expected to save \$175,000 in utility and repair costs.

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

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

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

The impact on the operational budget is that replacement will annually reduce energy consumption by \$9,000 and maintenance costs by \$4,000.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractuals		(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(16,000)
Commodity		(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(36,000)
Total	-	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(52,000)

- 6) **Project Status:** () New
 (x) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2013
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 502,368

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design			38,051				38,051
Construct			465,491				465,491
Total	-	-	503,542	-	-	-	503,542



CIP Project: Replace Maintenance Building, SC Park

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

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

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

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

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

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (x) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2011 but deferred
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 405,151

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design	10,000		9,009				19,009
Construct			436,918				436,918
Total	10,000	-	445,927	-	-	-	455,927



CIP Project: Preserve Exterior Blue Brick - Main Courthouse

Requestor/Title/Department: Marty Sigwing, DIO Facilities Manager

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

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

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

- 6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2012
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 95,255

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design			5,071				5,071
Construct			94,940				94,940
Total	-	-	100,011	-	-	-	100,011



CIP Project: Repair Lower Spillway - Lake Afton Park

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

Project Description

1) **Location:** South from spillway to property line

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

Repair the spillway channel from the over-flow dam south to the county property line. This portion of the project addresses needed panel replacements in the stilling basin below the dam.

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

There will be little to no budet impact when this project is completed.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2011, 2013
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 3,630,030

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design	486,407						486,407
Construct	2,597,355		547,067				3,144,422
Cost of Bonding			8,206				8,206
Total	3,083,762	-	555,273	-	-	-	3,639,035



CIP Project: Replace Parking Lots on County Property

Requestor/Title/Department: Marty Sigwing, Facilities Manager, Division of Information and Operations

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

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

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

5) **Briefly describe impact on the Operating Budget:**

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2013

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 397,445

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		129,431	248,062		471,112	70,323	918,928
Total	-	129,431	248,062	-	471,112	70,323	918,928



CIP Project: Repair Soldiers and Sailors Civil War Monument

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

Project Description

1) **Location:** 510 North Main, (directly South of Historic Courthouse)

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

Mortar(s) Analysis, Mortar(s) replacement, base caulking and waterproofing of stone and mortar(s).
Repair/reconditioning of historic light fixture.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The "Friends of the Soldiers and Sailors Monument" as well as the conservator the County has used for recent maintenance and reporting has directed our attention to deterioration patterns in the stone and mortar that has led to several leaks within the exterior envelope. The long term preservation of the monument is heavily dependent on the condition of the mortar. The expected useful life of this kind of mortar is thirty years and the mortar in the monument is estimated to be over 50 years old.

The interior light fixture has deteriorated and has extensive corrosion activity in large part due to moisture that has passed through the exterior mortared stone envelope. The entire fixture will require extensive recondition. Note: Under current state law this project will qualify for the 25 percent "Kansas State Rehabilitation Tax Credit".

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

Water leaks have caused internal damage to structure. Through temporary caulking efforts and regular annual and tri-annual maintenance, the leaks have been minimized however, the mortar of the structure has significantly deteriorated and needs complete analysis and replacement. Delaying this project will jeopardize the integrity of the monument and the interior finishes. The original light fixture is inoperable and has extensive corrosion. In addition, the interior wiring is faulty and must be replaced.

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): Watch List
If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP:

7) **Cost Estimate/Proposed Funding:** Estimate Source: Preservation Consultant

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design		10,933					10,933
Construct		132,242					132,242
Total	-	143,175	-	-	-	-	143,175



CIP Project: Evaluate Work Release Master Control Systems

Requestor/Title/Department: Richard Powell, Chief Deputy, Sedgwick County Sheriff

Project Description

1) **Location:** Sedgwick County Work Release Facility. 701 W. Harry, Wichita, Kansas

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

Address the Master Control systems for Sedgwick County Work Release. Perform a system wide assessment to determine systems needs and security requirements. Overall objectives and requirements shall include, full system assessment to identify deficiencies/requirements, Develop recommendations for upgrade/replacement, provide a budgetary analysis for a recommended upgrade and/or new system.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

Current system is aged and has recently shown a significant increase in ongoing maintenance and repair, thus resulting in the system being down on multiple occasions. Replacement parts have proven to be very difficult to obtain due to the age of the system. On several occasions the system or parts of the system have been down for weeks at a time. The current operating system is no longer produced.

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

Without a proper functioning Master Control system, the facility is unsecure thus placing officers at a increased security risk. In addition to security reduction, increased maintenance costs will occur. Long term consequences are a complete failure of the system with no option of repair.

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated for this planning phase.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** (X) New
 () Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s):
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP:

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan		37,784					37,784
Design							-
Construct							-
Total	-	37,784	-	-	-	-	37,784



CIP Project: Replace Carpet - Sedgwick County Extension

Requestor/Title/Department: Marty Sigwing, 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) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

Potential tripping hazards if conditions are not monitored closely and repaired promptly.
The condition of the carpet is unattractive, having an unkempt appearance.

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): Watch List
If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP:

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct		63,724					63,724
Total	-	63,724	-	-	-	-	63,724



CIP Project: Replace Shelter #3, Lake Afton Park

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

Project Description

1) **Location:** Lake Afton Park

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

Not being able to satisfy customer demand.

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

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

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Revenue					15,000	15,000
Personnel						-
Contractuals					(1,500)	(1,500)
Commodities					(500)	(500)
Total	-	-	-	-	13,000	13,000

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2014

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 446,039

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

Estimate Source: Facility Project Services

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design				7,419			7,419
Construct				438,620			438,620
Total	-	-	-	446,039	-	-	446,039



CIP Project: Replace Movable Wall, Sedgwick County Extension

Requestor/Title/Department: Marty Sigwing, 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) **Briefly, what are the consequences of delaying or not doing the project?**

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

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

- 6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): Watch List in 2011-15 CIP
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP:

Phase	Estimate Source: Vendor						
	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design			8,651				8,651
Construct			101,814				101,814
Total	-	-	110,466	-	-	-	110,466



CIP Project: Heartland Preparedness Center: Law Addition

Requestor/Title/Department: Robert Hinshaw, Sedgwick County Sheriff

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The current Law Enforcement Training Center does not adequately meet the needs of Wichita Police and Sedgwick County Sheriff Departments. It is housed in a former USD 259 elementary school. 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. The costs are based on an Architect-Engineer's estimate provided in Dec 2008.

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

Preliminary estimate of the County share of construction and owner's cost, including contingencies, is as reflected below. 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 Law Enforcement requirements resulted in additional City-County joint planning/cost estimating in 2008.

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

The operating cost of this larger facility is expected to increase over the existing leased former school. As the design is developed and refined, estimates will be updated. Cost will be shared between the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2013-2014
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 14,789,739

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan	20,000						20,000
Design			1,049,034				1,049,034
Construct				13,720,705			13,720,705
Cost of bonding			15,736	205,811			221,546
Total	20,000	-	1,064,770	13,926,516	-	-	15,011,285



CIP Project: Relocate Fire Station 36

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

Project Description

1) **Location:** 6400 South Rock Road Derby, KS 67037

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

Relocation of Fire Station 36. The relocation of this station has been previously approved in an earlier CIP but the timing of the project has been adjusted to 2012 due to budget constraints.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

In 2004, a study was conducted by MGT of America that identified the need to move certain Fire District 1 fire stations to better serve the community. The Fire District is building these new fire stations to better align them with the population growth, changing boundaries to the Fire District and to improve response time. These relocations directly benefits citizens in improved insurance ratings and the resulting lower cost of insurance. This project is the fifth of these station relocations.

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

The consequences of delaying the project will result in higher construction costs.

5) **Impact on Operating Budget:**

Preliminary estimates indicate that a new Fire Station 36 facility will have similar overall operational costs to the current facility.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 2,240,519

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan		3,879					3,879
Land		241,300					241,300
Construct		1,995,340					1,995,340
Cost of bonding		33,608					33,608
Total	-	2,274,127	-	-	-	-	2,274,127



CIP Project: Remodel Fire 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:**

Station 34 will be remodeled to bring that station up to current building standards in regards to the new fire stations that are being built. The additional funds and space will be used to: bring the building up to ADA standards; add a fitness room for employees; storage area for gear and hoses; a specialty repair room for fire equipment; a decontamination room; and a general station work/repair room. The remodel project will also include remodeling of the existing kitchen, men's shower, the restrooms, and the exterior of the building.

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

The Fire District is building five new fire stations in the Fire District to better align them with population growth, changing boundaries to the fire district and to improve response time. The remaining fire stations, including Station 34, will be brought up to the standards of the new buildings. Station 34 was completed in 1980.

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

By delaying the project, the material cost of the project will continue to increase annually. Standards have been set for the fire stations, and the remodel will bring this building into compliance with those standards.

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

There is no significant impact on the operating budget anticipated.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

(X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2012

If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 1,103,078

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design		76,373					76,373
Construct		1,026,705					1,026,705
Cost of bonding		16,546					16,546
Total*	-	1,119,624	-	-	-	-	1,119,624

*On November 2, 2011, the Board of County Commissioners amended the Capital Improvement Program to Relocate rather than Remodel Fire Station 34. Estimated cost is \$2,033,732.



CIP Project: Compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) - Fire District 1

Requestor/Title/Department: Lindsey Mahoney, ADA Coordinator

Project Description

1) **Location:** Fire District 1 buildings located throughout the county.

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

In 2006 and 2007, the County contracted with an ADA consultant to provide a "Self-Evaluation" of the County's current compliance with the ADA. The Transition Plan was the result of an exhaustive inspection of all facilities for ADA variances, and identification of structural modifications necessary for the removal of barriers to program accessibility. This plan identifies ADA variances, recommends corrective action for each item, and indicates a conceptual cost for removal of the barrier. Eight fire stations were inspected with 81 individually listed variances. These variances were listed by 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 ADA and the recommendations of the County's adopted Transition Plan. The following timeline is anticipated for removal of barriers at Fire Stations:

§ 2012 - Primarily consists of ADA improvements at Fire Station #38

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

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

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

Correction of these ADA variances should not have any impact on the operating budget.

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel 41000						-
Contractual 42000						-
Commodity 45000						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

6) **Project Status:**

() New
 (x) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2011-2012
 If previously approved, project cost in 2011-2015 CIP: 127,800

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

Estimate Source: Staff, A&E and ADA Consultant

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan		-					-
Design	4,384	4,630					9,014
Construct	43,863	45,171					89,034
Total	48,247	49,801	-	-	-	-	98,048

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

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

Project Description

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

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

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

3) **Project Need/Justification:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Personnel						-
Contractual						-
Commodities						-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

- 6) **Project Status:** () New
 (X) Previously Approved in 2011-2015 CIP for year(s): 2012, 2014, 2015
 If previously approved, project cost in 2010-2014 CIP: 1,500,000

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

Phase	Prior year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Plan							-
Design							-
Construct			500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000
Total	-	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	2,000,000

