

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

MARCH 11, 1998

The Regular Meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:00 A.M., Wednesday, March 11, 1998, in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Mark F. Schroeder; with the following present: Chairman Pro Tem Paul W. Hancock; Commissioner Betsy Gwin; Commissioner Thomas G. Winters; Commissioner Melody C. Miller; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Mr. Jarold D. Harrison, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Daryl Gardner, County Controller; Mr. David C. Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Services; Mr. Darren Muci, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Irene Hart, Director, Bureau of Community Development; Mr. Kenneth W. Arnold, Director, Capital Projects Department; Ms. Deborah Donaldson, Director, COMCARE; Ms. Nola Foulston, District Attorney; Mr. Robert Lamkey, Director, Central Motor Pool; Mr. Fred Ervin, Director, Public Relations; and Ms. Linda M. Leggett, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

Mr. Allen Bell, Economic Development Director, City of Wichita
Mr. Mark Dick, Allen, Gibbs and Houlik
Mr. Tom Smith, City of Wichita

INVOCATION

The Commission stood for a moment of silence.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

The Clerk reported, after calling roll, that Commissioner Miller was absent.

CERTIFICATION AS TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

Mr. Daryl Gardner, County Controller, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I certify that there are funds available for those items that we have identified on today's Agenda requiring the expenditure of funds. A listing of these items has been provided to you previously and if you have any questions I'd be glad to answer them."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you Daryl. I see no questions. Thank you. Next item please."

ADOPT A HIGHWAY

- A. APPLICATION BY GARDEN PLAIN NATIONAL HONOR SOCIETY FOR THE SEDGWICK COUNTY ADOPT A HIGHWAY PROGRAM ON 295TH STREET WEST FROM OLD U.S. 54 TO 23RD STREET SOUTH AND ON OLD U.S. 54 FROM 279TH STREET WEST TO 311TH STREET WEST. DISTRICT #3.**

Mr. David C. Spears, P.E., Director/County Engineer, Bureau of Public Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Item A is a renewal agreement with the Garden Plain National Honor Society organization regarding our Adopt A Highway litter pick up program. They will be responsible for old U.S. 54 Highway from 279th Street West to 311th Street West, and also 295th Street West between old U.S. 54 and 23rd Street South, about three miles. I recommend you approve the Agreement and authorize the Chairman to sign. Elizabeth Alexander was contacted and asked to be here today but she is a teacher and couldn't leave class."

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to approve the Application and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, David. Before we go on to the next item I wanted to make an announcement that under Deferred Item C, Case Number CU-462, which was a Planning case, that case has been withdrawn. So if there is anybody here today that is interested in that case, Case Number CU-462, that case has been withdrawn. So we will not be taking that up today. Madam Clerk, next item."

AWARD PRESENTATION

B. PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR EXCELLENCE IN FINANCIAL REPORTING.

Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "It is my pleasure this morning to present to you a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting from the Government Finance Officer's Association. You need to know that for 16 years Sedgwick County has participated in this program and has received this award. The award is the highest form of recognition in governmental accounting for financial reporting. It is voted on by other finance directors, budget directions, CPAs and others who are in the business of preparing budgets and putting them in forms so that public can read them. Sedgwick County won this award and it is a significant accomplishment for government and the Finance Bureau. We received this award because it was published in easily readable, it was reduced in size, and an efficiently organized report. For that we are thankful for those people in the Bureau of Finance. Daryl Gardner is going to give me the award so I can hand it back to him and thank him and his staff for all their excellent work. You'll see later in the meeting what kind of excellent work Daryl and the Finance Department do. Thank you."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Congratulations. Good job. Our staff always does an excellent job on our behalf and the citizens of the County. Thank you. Congratulations again. Daryl, are you up for the next item? Madam Clerk."

DEFERRED ITEM

C. CASE NUMBER CU-462 - REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW SALT WATER MINING ON PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF 111TH STREET SOUTH AND EAST OF 231ST STREET WEST.

Item C, Case Number CU-462, was withdrawn.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

NEW BUSINESS

D. PRESENTATION OF THE 1997 SEDGWICK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT AND APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION TO THE GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION (GFOA) FOR ITS CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR EXCELLENCE IN FINANCIAL REPORTING.

Mr. Gardner said, "I am here today to present to you the 1997 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Along with me today, Mark Dick, from Allen, Gibbs, and Houlik, the County's external auditors, will also report based upon his findings and results of the audit. This document is a summary of operations and financial position for the 1997 fiscal year for Sedgwick County. The document has an introductory section, the general purpose financial statements with the auditor's opinion in it, individual fund statements, and a statistical section as well as a trend monitoring report section in it. I have a few graphs and slides to present.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

"We'll review these graphs. They are a result of financial operations of the County during the fiscal year. They will show the trends and revenues and different sources of income and expenditures that we have. The first graph shows 1997 operating revenues for the County. It shows the taxes, which is a major portion of County revenue, which includes ad valorem, motor vehicle, retail sales, and special assessment revenue. Other governments are also a major part of the County revenue and the other section includes investments and reimbursements the County has received during the year.

"The next graph shows these same revenue sources compared to the last five or six years. The increase in tax revenue shows a steady growth in assessed valuation and retail sales tax revenue. We also show an increase in grant revenue from other government sources. The fees have not increased as much as other sources of revenue during this period of time.

"On the expenditure side of things, there are three major areas the County spends their money on, public safety, health and welfare and general government. General government is made up of administrative, judicial, and information services departments throughout the County. Public safety is a major part and it includes law enforcement, corrections, fire protection, and EMS services. Most of the health and welfare section is provided for by grants and other programs from COMCARE and Aging. The expenditures over the last six years show a continuing growth in public safety.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“It remains the largest emphasis of the County. The general government section of the graph declined dramatically during 1997. This is due to the collapsing of the Information Services budget from a special revenue fund into the general fund and thus not charging all the other funds for their services. The general government has also declined somewhat based upon budgetary restraints and other reductions of expenditures.

“Operating fund balances, it shows a small increase over 1996. The different sections of fund balance include the designated portion, which is the budgeted amount for the following fiscal year. Reserved includes all the encumbrances which are commitments to vendors for specific items and then a reserve for debt service. Balances remain healthy and are higher than normal standards for local governments.

“Operations. Revenues during 1997 exceeded expenditures by just a small amount and was a change from 1996 where we showed a planned draw down of cash. But over the five or six-year period, we show a normal trend of revenues exceeding expenditures to do conservative projections for revenues and expenditures.

“The County’s debt. Due to an increase in assessed valuation over the last few years, the percentage of the County debt policy, the County policy is 5% of the assessed valuation, we’re not to exceed that amount in total debt issued. The percentage goes down as the assessed valuation goes up because the debt limit increases and the County debt has remained pretty stable over the last few years. The statutory debt limit keeps going down even farther because much of the County’s debt is exempt from statutory limitations.

“Overlapping debt. This constitutes all the debt issued by all the governmental entities within Sedgwick County. As you can see, the largest portion of the debt is from all the cities of Sedgwick County. The County’s debt remains constant over the last five years whereas the cities and the schools have risen somewhat during the last five years. In the other section, starting in 1995, this includes all the public building commission debt from both the City of Wichita Public Building Commission and the Sedgwick County Public Building Commission.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“This graph shows the increase in assessed valuation over the last few years. This includes motor vehicle valuation and it shows an 11.3% increase over the last two years. Special assessment collections has been of interest to all of us for the past few years. Ten years ago we were collecting around 50% of the special assessments that were levied. This year it has stabilized right at 93% as it was last year. It has been on a dramatic increase over the last few years due to our debt policy and issuance of special assessments. With delinquent special assessment, this is just for current assessment collections. With delinquency collections we have exceeded 100% of what was assessed for each year.

“Next, Mark Dick, from Allen, Gibbs, and Houlik, the County’s external auditor will provide some information concerning his report on the audit.”

Mr. Mark Dick, Allen Gibbs, and Houlik, greeted the Commissioners and said, “It is a pleasure to be here this morning and report to you on the annual audit of Sedgwick County. We completed our audit in mid February, issued our opinion, which is included in the annual report, which you have a copy of. It is dated February 13, and as I recall, I think that is the earliest that the audit has ever been completed for Sedgwick County and I want to commend your staff for a job well done in a very short time frame.

“What I would like to do this morning is to just briefly go through the audit results and then at the end of this presentation we have also gathered some data that compares Sedgwick County to about 80 other counties of comparable size in the nation to get a feel for your financial strength. We’ll go through those results at the end of this also.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

“The first thing you have to remember is what is the objective of an audit. We issue a lot of opinions. They are written in accounting type language, very often difficult to understand. I like to put it into three very simple questions and that is what we’re trying to achieve here. Were the financial statements free of material misstatement? That is the first thing we try to answer. Number two, are there effective internal controls in place throughout the County as it relates to your financial systems and do those controls work? Number three, did the County comply in all material respects with the finance related laws and regulations of both the State of Kansas and the federal government because you do receive quite a bit of federal funding.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“Now our responsibilities as auditors are fairly simply. We must conform and preform the audit in accordance with our standards as well as government audit standards, which are created by the GAO of the federal government. They are a little bit more stringent than the normal ones. Our objective is to provide reasonable but not absolute assurance that the financial statements are free of material misstatement and then last, but not least, we also issue reports on the internal control structure and compliance with all the laws and regulations.

“The scope of the audit, it is important that you understand what is included in that audit. We included all the funds and account groups of Sedgwick County which include the Sewer District, which is a separate tax entity, the Fire District, which is a separate tax entity, and the Sedgwick County Public Building Commission, which was created about three years ago. There were no scope restrictions. We were not told that we couldn't look at any records or that type of thing. So there were no scope restrictions at all.

“The other thing that is recommended that we report to you if we find them, and I like to report if we don't find any also and make it a positive, errors and irregularities. Those are what we classify as intentional errors and irregularities that would be on the books that would require correction. We noted none of those types of things in 1997. Illegal acts that could have a material impact on the financial statements. We noted none in 1997. However, in our management letter, and you have a copy of that, we did note two violations of Kansas Statutes, none of which have a material impact upon the financial statement.

“The third thing. The significant accounting policies that the County follows did not change. The significance of that is that means that we recognize revenue and expenses consistently from one year to the next and didn't change the way we did that so that the financial statements are comparable from year to year. Last, but not least, we had full cooperation from the staff and the Bureau of Finance. We had full access to the books and records of the County.

“The results of our reports, and there are about four or five different audit reports we issue, the financial audit is unqualified, which is the highest level that you can get. It states that the financial statements are free of material misstatements. The compliance audit report, which goes along with the federal funds that the County received, tells you that you complied with all the federal requirements which could have a material impact upon the financial statements. There were no significant violations there. You also complied with the Kansas Cash Basis and Budget Laws, which are extremely important.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“Last, but not least, we issued an internal control report. In that report, we noted that there were no material weaknesses in the system. However, there were two instances of what we term reportable conditions which are included in those reports and in our management letter. Management has responded to those and is in the process of correcting those minor internal control deficiencies.

“In summary, on that, if we go back to the three basic questions, the answer is yes. The financial statements are free of material misstatement. Yes, the County does have effective internal controls in place and they do work. Third, and not least, yes the County complied in all material respects with the finance related laws and regulations that could have a significant impact on the financial statements.

“Now, I mentioned a little bit earlier, we compared Sedgwick County to about 80 other counties nation wide on ten basic indicators of financial strength. I am pleased to present the results to you today. They are very positive. I’m not going to spend a lot of time on all ten indicators. We’ll run through them very briefly and then have a summary at the end. The first indicator is how do you compare as it relates to total revenues to the population of the County. As you can see, we’ve got four, these are bar charts and they are always going to have four of them on each of the bar charts, the average of the 80 counties is shown there in the below average, the average, and above average. Those are the 80 county composites. Sedgwick County is compared to that. So you can see as your revenues compare to total population you’re about average, which suggests that you have adequate annual resources. There is no problem there at all.

“The next indicator, what about total general fund revenues from your own sources. Are you dependent on the federal government for grants or on some other outside source of revenue? Again, you can see Sedgwick County is in the above average category there, which indicates that you are not dependent upon external resources which is a positive. How does the general fund receive its money and are we dependent there on some other internal money? Is the general fund receiving money from other funds continually and transferring money in? In this case no, you want to have a very low ratio there and as you can see, the County is above average in that category because you’re not transferring a lot of money from other sources into the general fund and using it for operations. That is a positive.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“Operating expenses compared to total expenditures. This one is rather subtle. What we’re trying to measure here is how well the County is taking care of infrastructure, the buildings, the roads, the bridges, that type of thing. So it is an inverse relationship and those capital type expenditures are not included in the operating expenditures. So the more you spend on operating expenditures, the less you have available to take care of your infrastructure. In this case again Sedgwick County is in a very positive position. In fact, you’re above average compared to those 80 other counties nation wide.

“Total revenues to total expenditures. This is kind of, in the private sector, this is the net income, bottom line. In government, quite frankly, that should approach zero or be a slightly positive figure just because of the budgeting process. This year, when we take all the funds combined including your capital project funds, you spent a little bit more than you took in. But this was a planned action. It followed your budget and is not a negative indicator whatsoever of any operations in the County. It was a planned draw down of cash. So that is a positive.

“How do we look as it relates to what happens if we have a temporary short fall of revenue as an example and how can we weather the storm. This measures that. It is the unreserved general fund balance compared to the total general fund revenues. As you can see, the County is above average in this area, which indicates that if we did have a short fall of revenue you could weather the storm without a great deal of difficulty.

“How does the general fund cash and investments compare to the liabilities at year end? This is a measurement of, are you able to pay your current bills timely. As you can see, Sedgwick County is in a very healthy position here and well above average. Total general fund liabilities compared to the total general fund revenues. Again, this is a measure of how can you finance the short term obligations from normal revenues coming in, not just from existing reserves. Again, the County is well above average in that area compared to the remainder.

“Our general long term debt compared to the population. As you are well aware, the County is in a position where they have to continue to issue general long term debt for the infrastructure. That is rising a bit. But as you can see, as compared to the 80 other counties, you are above average in the long term debt compared to population of the County. So we’re well in a safety range there.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“How is our debt service compared to our total revenues? What we are measuring here is how much of our current revenues are we using to make debt service payments? That is an indicator of your ability to make those payments. Now this graph requires a little bit more explanation. As you can see, the County spends about 8% of your total revenue for debt service, which is below average for the 80 some counties nationwide. But two things to remember. Number one, Sedgwick County historically has issued a lot of ten year debt where in the industry 20 year debt is very common. So you’re paying your debt off much quicker than normal and that causes that ratio to go up. Secondly, the bond rating agencies do look at this. Their industry norm that they like to look at is 10%. The County is at 8%. You are below that and they don’t get concerned until that ratio gets to about 20%. Then there could be a potential problem. So although the County might be below average in this category compared to other counties, industry wise, you are in a very safe and secure position there.

“So if we put all of that together, how does Sedgwick County rank with those other 80 counties? You rank in about the 90% percentile nationwide for financial health of counties of comparable size, which is remarkable. I think we really need to commend your staff and your Bureau of Finance for properly managing the County fiscally and that is the results you get. Be happy to respond to any questions any of you might have.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Mark. Does anybody else need to see any of these slides? Do you have a further slide presentation of any kind? Okay, then bring up the lights. Any questions for Mark? I see none Mark. Good presentation. I appreciate the hard work that you and your staff have done on educating us on how well we’re doing and again thank you to our staff for a job well done. It looks as though we are progressing very well. We should be proud of that. It looks as though the citizens should be happy with what was shown today, I know I am. I hope we continue on that same path. Thank you again Mark, Daryl, for the presentation. I see no questions. Mr. Manager, is there anything you would like to add to this item?”

Mr. Buchanan said, “No sir.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Okay. Daryl, anything else?”

Mr. Gardner said, “If there are no questions, I would recommend you receive and file the report and authorize the Controller to submit the 1997 financial statements to GFOA for review.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Okay, thank you, Daryl.”

For the record, Commissioner Miller arrived at 9:10 a.m.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to receive and file the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and authorize the County Controller to submit the application to GFOA.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Daryl. Thank you, Mark. Next item please."

E. BUREAU OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

1. PRESENTATION REGARDING CITY OF WICHITA'S PROPOSED NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM.

Ms. Irene Hart, Director, Bureau of Community Development, greeted the Commissioners and said, "As you have known, for several years we've had community wide efforts to revitalize our neighborhoods. The City of Wichita is taking advantage now of a state neighborhood revitalization program by creatively combining it with their federal community development block grant and home funds. The results are a targeted and comprehensive neighborhood revitalization program plan. The presentation today is for your information and for your advice. If this program is approved by the City Council, the issue will be returned to you later for some formal action. Presentation today will be given by Tom Smith of the City of Wichita. Also, accompanying him are Allen Bell and Brad Boswell of the City Finance Department. Tom, if you would like to proceed."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Tom Smith, greeted the Commissioners and said, “It is a pleasure to be here this morning to make a short presentation to you regarding the City’s proposed Neighborhood Revitalization Program. We’ll provide a brief slide presentation and then I’m going to ask Allen Bell to come up and answer some specific questions and direct comments. This is a proposed program that the City Council will consider next Tuesday. It is based on State legislation that was passed in 1994. The State legislation passed what we called the Neighborhood Revitalization Act. Simply put, the act permits municipalities and cities to provide tax rebates to owners of properties where they improve the property. It permits a rebate for the improved value to be rebated directly back to the home owner or the business owner in a designated area called a Neighborhood Revitalization Area.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

“In 1996, the legislature further amended the act to permit the cities to address individual blighted properties outside of a designated neighborhood revitalization area on a case by case basis. So once an area is established, if you have individual blighted properties, those also could be addressed on an individual case by case basis. Almost simultaneously with that, the federal government under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development implemented new regulations for the Community Development Block Grant and the Home Investment Partnership Grant program that are provided to metropolitan cities that permit cities to designate areas called remarkably neighborhood revitalization strategy areas, which while it does not provide additional funding to cities, it does provide a way to focus grant resources for revitalizing distressed neighborhoods. It also provides regulatory flexibility to cities to address businesses and residences in ways that in the past that we have not been able to do.

“Let me start out with a little definition here. What are we talking about? Well, there are three levels to the proposed plan that we are presenting to the Council. We have a State Neighborhood Revitalization Area. This is based upon the State Neighborhood Revitalization Act. It is an area that has a substantial number of deteriorated structures and meets the state statutory definitions for a revitalization area. On top of that, we are layering a HUD neighborhood revitalization strategy area, which is the federal definition. It is primarily an area that is residential and contains a high proportion of low and moderate income households. In addition to that, we are proposing what we call local investment areas. These are a locally defined area that are a smaller subset or smaller geographic area within the neighborhood revitalization areas set up under the state and federal programs. That permits the governing body to focus grant resources that we receive for community development block grants and home investment partnership programs to have a significant visual impact on selected neighborhoods.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“Why would we consider doing this? There are a number of reasons to consider this for the governing body. One is that the City Council has approved the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Wichita. In that, it includes several areas that had been designated for revitalization and reestablishment. Later in the presentation we’ll show you a map of that plan. The act also encourages redevelopment in areas that are traditionally not well served. For example, many of the cities revitalization programs do not currently offer a tax rebate and some of the regulatory flexibility that is available under the federal and the state programs. The State Neighborhood Revitalization Act addressed single family residential and small business, which is not traditionally served by our larger programs, such as Industrial Revenue Bond financing. It also encourages inter city redevelopment that might not otherwise occur, by providing incentives or removing disincentives to investing in areas that are suffering from decline.

“Additional reasons we would consider this is it eliminates disincentives of increased tax payments through the tax rebate program. It is possible to rebate a portion of the improved value back to the homeowner or the business as an incentive to improve the property. It takes advantage of redevelopment tools that both the State and the federal government have provided to cities that have little cost to implement but potentially could have significant positive impacts upon the community.

“Last, but not least, these tools are being used by other cities in the State of Kansas. Right now, the cities of Topeka, Leavenworth, Parsons, El Dorado, Salina, and Ottawa, have currently implemented the Neighborhood Revitalization Act Programs. Topeka, for example, has had these programs in operation now for two full years and are entering their third year with the programs.

“The tax rebate summary, under the State Neighborhood Revitalization Program, we’re proposing that single family residential in selected areas receive a rebate of 95% of the improved value for five years with no limit on the improved value. For multi-family downtown, that would include new construction and rehabilitation, the rebate would be 95% for five years. It would be capped at \$500,000 on the building permit value. Multi-family outside of downtown would be limited to rehab only. It would be 75% for five years. It would have a cap of \$250,000 on the building permit. Commercial Industrial would be 75% for five years with a \$250,000 cap. Historic would be the same as single family, 95%, five years, with no limit.

“If that is implemented, what is the actual impact on the owner? For residential, depending on the level of investment, the tax rebate on the improved value ranges from \$116 a year to about \$578 a year. For commercial it runs from about \$200 a year to about \$5,000 per year. For multi-family about \$116 to \$5,700 per year based on current projections.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“There are a number of exclusions that we are suggesting the Council consider for this program based upon research with other cities who are currently operating the Tax Rebate program. Surface parking lots would be excluded. Multi-family housing except as defined in the program would be excluded. Railroads and utilities would be excluded from the rebate program. Swimming pools, gazebos, outbuildings, et cetera, would not be eligible for the tax rebate. Mini-warehouses, mobile homes, as well as all property in a tax increment financing district, as you are aware, we have several TIF districts in the City of Wichita. By State law they are not permitted to receive a tax rebate. Conversion of single family to multi-family would not be eligible. Any property located outside of school district 259 would not be eligible. Any property which has or will receive City IRB financing or a tax abatement would not be permitted to participate in the Tax Rebate program. There would be exceptions as I stated earlier. The Council would have the option to review properties located outside of the neighborhood revitalization area on a case by case basis and also looking at properties within the neighborhood revitalization area on a case by case basis. It would require an application fee of \$25, a tax rebate application, a finding of dilapidation, and a cost benefit analysis for properties that are not single family. A cost benefit analysis would not be required for a single family home owner.

“Layered on top of this are the local investment areas. We are proposing that our governing body consider layering the Federal Community Development Block Grant and the Home Investment Partnership programs inside of smaller areas inside of the neighborhood revitalization area. We have a number of housing programs and capital improvement programs that are funded by the federal grants and we’re proposing that we focus our home ownership 80, in-fill housing, paint grant, deferred and direct housing loan, home study or rehabilitation and investment, the Community Housing Development projects, CDBG, street, curb, sidewalk, and improvement, into those areas. What does that mean? That means we put about \$2,000,000 per year plus additional \$700,000 per year in federal grant resources into these local investment areas. That is about \$2,700,000 per year. It would be our recommendation to our Council that they do that for five continuous years to have a significant visual impact on the local investment areas. This table is basically the same information, I’m going to skip over that.

“This is the menu of services. We basically have several layers of services. We’re attempting to get a synergistic impact of the State Tax Rebate program, federal revitalization strategy areas, as well as the federal grant programs that the City receives to address these revitalization areas. So in the revitalization areas we would have a State and a HUD area that are one in the same. Inside of that we would provide local tax in-fill housing incentives through the City of Wichita. For example, that could include providing a waiver of a building permit fees, for in-fill housing development in the revitalization areas. It could include a waiver of the water tap fees which are currently about \$1,700 per lot as an incentive to take a vacant lot and provide in-fill housing in the revitalization area.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“We’re also proposing a new component that we’ve never tried before. We want to apply for an economic development loan from the federal government to work with the Section 108 loan guarantee authority that the City has under the block grant program to provide a loan pool for small and minority business loans to stimulate programs and business within the revitalization area. We also would use the State Tax Rebate program that we’ve been talking about as well as providing neighborhood assistance through local tax funds to assist neighborhood organizations to plan, development, and implement programs that effect their quality of life in their areas. Inside of the larger neighborhood revitalization areas we would have the smaller local investment areas. They would have the same four programs that I just talked about. In addition, they would have about \$2,700,000 per year in federal community development and home funding targeted to the local investment areas.

“This is the Comprehensive Plan that I referred to earlier. You see these areas in fuchsia and purple, these are the areas that have been identified by the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, and approved by the Council and the Comprehensive Plan as being areas appropriate for revitalization and reestablishment. Interestingly enough, the areas that we are proposing are very similar. Let me explain the map. The red areas that you see are the State and federal neighborhood revitalization areas. There are four of them proposed. One is in the central area. One is in the Hilltop area. One is in the Plain view area. The one out west is in an area called the Orchard Breeze area. So we’re proposing the Council consider four State and federal neighborhood revitalization areas. Within those, we’re also suggesting they consider four local investment areas. There is one in the midtown north area, one in the northeast, one in Plainview, and one in Orchard Breeze, for concentrated focusing of federal resources to improve those areas. The areas that you see on the map that are blue, these are the tax increment finance districts that currently exist. A tax rebate by State law cannot be provided in those areas. That in summary is the proposal. We have been meeting with various entities to present this concept. We felt it appropriate to bring it to this governing body to provide you with the information. It will be on the Council agenda for next Tuesday and they will consider it at that time. That concludes the prepared remarks. I’d like to have Allen Bell, our Economic Development Director, come forward and answer any questions you might have.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Commissioner Miller, you had you light on, would you like to wait until Allen is done with his presentation?”

Commissioner Miller said, “Certainly.”

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Allen Bell, Economic Development Director, City of Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The only thing I wanted to add to Tom’s presentation is that what we are proposing is a program which if it is instituted will become something that citizens can apply for and if they qualify under the guidelines these benefits are afforded to them automatically or administratively by City staff and in the case of the tax rebates, working closely with County staff that would be required for determining the amount of the rebates and that sort of thing. We’ve had several meetings over the last month or so with County staff including the Finance Department and Community Development Department staff to work out administrative details of this program. The policy also will allow for the City Council to, on a case by case basis, make exceptions. Those exceptions can be made anywhere in the City if a finding of dilapidation is made. If the City Council makes an official finding that the structure on a property is dilapidated under the statutory definition then they can make an exception and provide these benefits to that property or within the district it can make an exception to the guidelines, the monetary limitations that we have placed on building permits and the percentages. So it provides a tool that we can use on a regular basis for in-fill housing and in-fill development. In Wichita, for special projects it adds another element to tax abatements, tax exemptions, industrial revenue bonds. Now we have another arrow in our quiver for economic development purposes. With that, I stand to answer any questions that you might have.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Okay, thank you, Allen. Commissioner Miller.”

Commissioner Miller said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Allen, in conversations that I’ve had with Council Member Cole, those that have districts that encompass the core areas in particular are very excited about having another quiver in the hat. I mean that is basically what it is, it is just another opportunity to give to constituents and to give to residents to improve and revitalize their community. So I am indeed excited about this opportunity. I do have some questions and I’ll start with the exception. When you mention exceptions, does that also incorporate . . . I remember looking at the slides and they were referring to districts or this would not be available outside of USD 259. So is there an exception to that rule?”

Mr. Bell said, “Exceptions can be made, however, in order for us to be able to make a rebate of school district, the increment of school district tax revenue to someone who is not in 259, we would also have to have an inter-local agreement with that other school district. This time we’re proposing and I think it was mentioned in the beginning that we would be back to you for official action at a later date. That official action would be approval of an inter-local agreement so that the taxes rebated would include the increment of City tax, County tax, and school district tax. The school board would approve a similar or the same interlocal agreement, be a three way. We are not proposing at this time to go outside.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“One of the things that we’re trying to address in this program is the out migration from school district 259 to the outside school districts. That is one of the reasons we feel that they will be enthusiastic about this program as well.”

Commissioner Miller said, “Okay, I needed to clarify that. Also, when it comes to smaller cities and this might have been incorporated in the answer that you’ve given already, but smaller cities outside of the larger City of Wichita in terms of receiving these benefits. How about that exception to the rule.”

Mr. Bell said, “I think under the State law it wouldn’t be possible for the City to rebate taxes that it doesn’t levy. However, once this program is up and running, I think we could provide an easily replicated model.”

Commissioner Miller said, “Okay. Let me clarify or let me rephrase that, not smaller cities so much as unincorporated areas that are outside of the City of Wichita but are incorporated within the boundaries of Sedgwick County but not in a city.”

Mr. Bell said, “I don’t think I can answer. I think it is a legal question whether an ordinance by the City Council would apply to areas outside of its corporate limits. Again, I think once it is set up and the County, because the County is the only taxing authority for those unincorporated areas, could easily use this same system and all the apparatus that we’ve put into place to implement that themselves.”

Commissioner Miller said, “Okay. I’m familiar with the \$2,700,000, that is available in funding. Can you give me . . . and you are saying that that’s the total, that that is the total estimated amount of funding or resources available. Can you give me what is currently passed down to the City in terms of CDBG funding and what’s new, what’s additional that is going to be provided to the public in this program?”

Mr. Bell said, “I will ask Tom to answer that question.”

Mr. Smith said, “If I understood the question, it is how much is our total funding and how much are we committing of it to this program?”

Commissioner Miller said, “How much do you currently already have access to in terms of CDBG funding and I know that these are overlays of programs that already exist or opportunities that already exist to improve, what is additional in terms of funding?”

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Smith said, "Fundamentally, there is not additional funding. What we are doing is refocusing the funding up to this point particularly with CDBG and home funding, it has been available City wide to any low and moderate income household. What this program is suggesting is that we take the \$3,700,000 in community development block grant, a portion of that and a portion of the \$1,700,000 in home dollars and focus those in these areas. There are not, under this program, specific new programs that are being suggested. It is more of a refocusing and putting them at the availability of the residents of those areas. The one new component that you see in the menu of services is the EDI business, small and minority business loan. That is a brand new program. We have yet to apply for that, but it could potentially be about a \$3,000,000 program."

Commissioner Miller said, "So that would be additional funding if secured by the City. That's indeed long overdue and definitely exciting. Another question that I would have would be the overlapping of the service area and what services are being provided and earmarked and targeted there. And another exception, if indeed within a TIF zone let's say that there is an opportunity for an individual to improve their home to the tune of \$20,000 by adding on another addition, because they are still included within the TIF zone does that automatically exempt them, is that one of those exceptions that could be allowed."

Mr. Bell said, "Well, all of the items on the menu of service, all of the programs that are in place or may be put in place with conjunction with this program would be available to a property owner in the TIF zone that happened to be within a neighborhood revitalization area or a local initiative area or investment area. The only exception to that is the rebate. That is a significant exception, that's a big one, but the reason for that is we've looked at it hard and specifically in the case of the New Horizon shopping center at 21st and Grove, which is in need of some additional assistance to kind of get off the dime and we thought that perhaps this would work. We had outside attorneys research this and look hard at it. The problem is that under tax increment financing neither the City, the County, nor the School District receive, technically receive, the increment of new taxes generated by the improvement of the property. That money is diverted administratively as soon as it arrives and put into a special tax increment financing fund. So we don't have it to rebate. In order for it to be rebated, it has to hit our books, the City, the County, the School District. Since that doesn't happen in a TIF district, there is no increment to rebate and that was the problem that we ran into. Maybe we could address it legislatively but the way the law reads now our hands are tied."

Commissioner Miller said, "Okay, I think I understand that, but are you saying that those individuals, or is it still being researched that individuals that reside within this district, the TIF district, would be eligible or not."

Mr. Bell said, "They would not be eligible for the rebate."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Commissioner Miller said, "Okay, that's what I need to know. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Commissioner Gwin."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Allen, I don't know if this is your question or Tom's. I want to go back again, are these types of programs that we're talking about today available only to municipalities generally or are you aware of whether or not they would be available to counties if we wanted to implement such a thing in the unincorporated area."

Mr. Bell said, "The rebate program is available to any local government taxing jurisdiction, City, County, School District. I don't know if a Cemetery District or a Fire District would be eligible, that would probably have to be researched. But certainly the major local government taxing jurisdictions can under State law, if they follow these steps, rebate the incremental increase in taxes attributable to improvement in properties in these areas. The other programs that we're layering really have to do more with the City of Wichita being an entitlement city under the community development block grant program. So I think the State probably would have some powers here as the conduit of CDBG benefits to non-entitlement communities."

Commissioner Gwin said, "I appreciate that because as I am sitting here, I'm thinking of areas in the unincorporated parts of this County that could use a lift if you will or could use some encouragement. Let's go back and talk a little bit about if I remember my reading correctly, let's go back and talk about the minimum investment that a property owner has to make. Is that a \$10,000 amount?"

Mr. Bell said, "Yes Ma'am. That is really based on arithmetic. Tom had a slide up that showed if the investment for residential, for example was \$10,000 then the amount of the rebate from all three of the taxing jurisdictions would be \$116 a year. It was really kind of an analysis of what would be effective. What would be an effective incentive? What would be likely to encourage or influence a person's decision of whether to make improvements to my existing property or purchase some property inside this area and improve it versus moving outside of the area. We just felt that kind of a threshold amount would be \$10,000. I would like to point out that \$10,000 is the building permit valuation, when a property owner pulls a building permit, the building inspector, for the City it is Office of Central Inspection, assigns a permit valuation. Now that may or may not turn into the increase in value. That is something then that the County Appraiser receives the information on the building permit and will determine how much to increase if any the property value as a result. The actual amount of the rebate will not be based on the permit valuation but on the actual increase in assessed valuation."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Commissioner Gwin said, "I'm glad you got to that, because that was my next thought that the key to this rebate is increased valuation of a property. So if I am a landlord or if I am a property owner and I want to make improvements, I better be sure that those improvements will in fact increase the valuation so that I can be the beneficiary of the rebate difference."

Mr. Bell said, "Of course we can't make any guarantees about that. There is a strict separation of power between administration and the Appraisers Office in terms of placing value on a property. But we can advise them to perhaps if they have access to trade men and so on and if they are experienced in this area to . . . if you're going to paint your house, is that going to improve your value? If you replace the roof, it may cost \$15,000 to replace your roof but it may only add \$5,000 to your value. The fact that the valuation, the permit valuation is above \$10,000 would qualify you administratively for the program. We wouldn't go back and say the actual valuation increase was less than \$10,000 so we're pulling you out of the program. Once you're in, once you qualify up front you're good. You may not get as much as you expected but you are still in. The use of the permit valuation is kind of a substitute or a surrogate for actual change in valuation. We needed something like that up front that we could base qualification for the program on."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Okay. The area that caught my eye within the City is the Hilltop neighborhood for instance. Most all of those residences are multi-family duplexes or so. A lot of them are rental units. Landlords in Hilltop for instance, you have a duplex, does that \$10,000 have to be on each living unit, on each half of that duplex, or for instance if they own a duplex is the \$10,000 the total investment on that duplex?"

Mr. Bell said, "The way we've got it set up, I think it is per building permit. So if they could figure out a way with the Office of Central Inspection to get a separate permit for each unit I suppose that would be a way to do that. Generally it would be for the whole permit."

Commissioner Gwin said, "As I said, anyone who is familiar with that neighborhood can see some real need I think in improving what is there and the living standards of people who live there. So I am really interested in getting the word out or how you plan to get the word out I guess to people throughout the community. How are you going to let them know this is available?"

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Bell said, "Last night we held a town hall meeting. We mailed 5,000 notices to all non-residential addresses within the geographic boundary. That was in response to a HUD requirement for community consultation. In addition to that, for residential we are working through the CPOs and the Wichita Independent Neighborhood and have had meetings with them. But that is just consultation prior to the adoption of the program. Once it is approved then we need to shift seriously into a marketing mode. We really haven't made any firm determinations of how that is going to be. There obviously will be materials that we will have available and put out through the CPOs and independent neighborhoods and every kind of organization that we can think of for dissemination. We'll also hope to be able to get media attention both through print and broadcast media, ask City Hall, to the extent that people watch that will be another obvious way to go."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Okay. I appreciate that. I certainly hope that the word is carried to all people who have the ability and the desire to make an improvement both in their neighborhood and their individual dwellings. I think it is very positive. Mr. Chairman, I'd like the County to look into what we may be able to do for some of the areas in the unincorporated areas because I think they could use a boost too. Thank you."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Allen, I'm not sure if this question is for you or Tom, but Topeka was mentioned as a city that is now using this program, is that correct? Did I hear you right?"

Mr. Bell said, "Yes."

Chairman Schroeder said, "What kind of total amounts, if you will, has a city like that in any given year rebated in the way of taxes? Do you have numbers for something like that?"

Mr. Bell said, "We do have numbers and I thought I had them with me. The City of Topeka. . . we learned a pretty good lesson from Topeka in how not to do it. Forty one percent of the land area of Topeka is included in their district."

Mr. Smith said, "This proposal is about 13% of our area."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Bell said, "They have no limits, no monetary limits on the permitted value of improvements. So that tends to distort the numbers. They had, in 1997, I'm remembering this, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$24,000,000 to \$25,000,000 of new valuation that was subject to the rebate. Well \$22,500,000 of that was for their new convention hotel they're building next to Expo Center. Then there was a \$7,500,000 insurance building downtown. There was just a variety of large projects that we would not under our policy approve. We would approve the first \$250,000 of that but unless an exception were made, because we were trying to provide substantial incentives to a developer to do something that we wanted to participate in, otherwise we wouldn't approve that. I've done a calculation, some research, it is a work in progress but for next week's Council meeting of what we anticipate as a financial impact of this program and this is based on the 1996 and 1997 actual permitted value of improvements. The Office of Central Inspection and laboriously pulled out for 1996 and 1997 all of the building permits, or the valuation of all the building permits issued for property inside these areas. The total permitted value for 1996 was \$8,400,000, for 1997 was \$6,400,000. The rebate, using our policy, that would have been approved had this program been in place that year, was \$153,000 for 1996 and \$121,000 for 1997. That breaks down for 1997 for example between the City, County, and School District just based on our relative mill levies, \$35,000 for the City, \$34,000 for the County, and \$50,000 for the School District. That would be the hit, the financial impact of this program. This is not money that is coming out of what you are already getting, this is money that you wouldn't be getting . . . an opportunity cost in a sense of this program."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Very good. Go ahead Tom."

Mr. Smith said, "Maybe to answer your question, it is difficult to compare the Wichita program with Topeka because of the mill levy differences and because we have exclusions and they don't. I can tell you that based upon the valuation, Topeka runs about \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 worth of valuation and ours runs about \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 based upon that value. But the actual amount of the rebate typically is pretty low and the larger the community obviously the lower the impact that has. Topeka would like to reconsider. They have looked at this proposal that you have before you. In fact, they are studying certain aspects of it to revise their program. In all fairness to Topeka, they were the first ones to implement this so somebody had to kind of run the gauntlet so to speak. So there were a lot of lessons learned. Frankly, Wichita and Sedgwick County probably benefited by letting those other cities go first to find out what does work and what doesn't work before entering this kind of program."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you, Tom. Allen, do you have anything else you would like to add?"

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Bell said, "No, just that we'll be back. We anticipate that the City Council will approve this program in substantially the form that you've seen it next Tuesday. Then we'll be working through our mutual law departments to develop an interlocal agreement to bring back for your consideration."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Let me follow up on just one last question on the issue of the unincorporated areas. Are there any communities or counties that have expanded this kind of program into the unincorporated areas or is it a possibility or would it work?"

Mr. Smith said, "I don't know of any. We'd have to research it to determine whether it is possible. I know one County designated the entire county as a neighborhood revitalization area and the State Attorney General promptly ruled the plan illegal."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Yes, I would imagine."

Mr. Smith said, "We'd have to research further on the unincorporated issue."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Would you mind doing that?"

Mr. Smith said, "We would certainly be glad to do that."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I think that does deserve a little bit of consideration. I do agree that this is an interesting concept and we need to give it further consideration. When do you plan or what is your estimated time to bring it back to the Board of County Commissioners and or the City Council?"

Mr. Smith said, "The interlocal agreement would probably come back to you in another 60 days. It would take time for us, if the Council approves this on Tuesday, to work through the legal agreements, finalize the administrative process, but sometime during probably April or May."

Chairman Schroeder said, "So the Council will not do what we are doing today. We're just receiving and filing this but the Council will approve the concept."

Mr. Smith said, "Until the City Council takes action next Tuesday we don't have a program or a reason to enter into an interlocal agreement."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you. Appreciate it. Further questions or comments?"

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Miller moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Allen. Thank you, Tom. Appreciate your presentation today."

Ms. Hart said, "We have worked closely with the City in developing this program and letting them do some of the work so that we can take that and see how we can apply it out in the unincorporated areas of the County. We unlike the City, don't receive federal funds directly. We need to put in applications to the State Department of Commerce and Housing and compete with other jurisdictions statewide. That cycle will be coming up in late summer and we were hoping to have the information together that we could layer a request for State funds on top of it similar as they have done here. We too find it intriguing and it is helpful to have them do a lot of the leg work so we can take it and see how it works in the County."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you, Irene. Appreciate it. Next item please."

2. RESOLUTION ADJUSTING INCOME LIMITS FOR FAMILIES RECEIVING CERTAIN FEDERAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE.

Ms. Hart said, "This is for our Sedgwick County Housing Authority. Each year we receive new funding, new income limits from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“They send it to us each year adjusting our area median income and we ask you to adopt the adjustments so that we can determine eligibility for the Housing Authority. This year they have indicated that they have established a median income for a four member family of \$49,000 per year, which is a 6.5% increase from last year. Since the Housing Authority serves the very low income residents of the County, the income limit is at 50% of that \$49,000. So a family of four could make up to \$24,500 annual income to be eligible for the Housing Authority assistance. So I would ask that you approve this and we can use it from now on.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Okay, thank you. Discussion on this item?”

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Irene. Next item please.”

F. AGREEMENT WITH MID AMERICAN CREDIT UNION FOR USE OF OFFICE SPACE IN THE COURTHOUSE.

Mr. Kenneth W. Arnold, Director, Capital Projects Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’m pleased to present to you this morning an Agreement with the credit union who is the County’s authorized credit union to provide office space in the lobby off of the jury room for five years. The credit union will be paying the vast majority of the cost of this particular project. The County’s expense would be up to not exceeding \$9,500 for some of the improvements.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“Mr. Lowell Richardson, who is the President of the Mid American Credit Union is here to answer questions. We have coordinated this with the courts as well since it is off a corner of the jury room and they are supportive of the program. Be happy to answer any questions.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Ken. Questions on this item? If not, what’s the will of the Board?”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Ken. Thank you for being here today, appreciate it. Next item please.”

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

G. BUREAU OF COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY CARE.

- 1. AGREEMENT WITH KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES/COMMISSION OF MENTAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES FOR GRANT FUNDING OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY ORGANIZATION SELF-DETERMINATION PROJECT.**

Ms. Deborah Donaldson, Executive Director, COMCARE, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This first item involves the self determination project which has been an exciting program that really takes people's ability to determine what kinds of services and needs they have to remain in the community and really puts that in their control with a circle of friends who make those decisions. These are the continued funds so that we can work with that project and these are funds that we receive through the State but they're from Robert Wood Johnson. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Questions on this item?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

2. CONTRACT WITH FAMILY CONSULTATION SERVICE TO PROVIDE THERAPEUTIC SERVICES FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this particular contract is a new one. You are going to find similar contracts on the agenda in terms of numbers 2, 4, and 5. All of these relate to the new children's mental health waiver, which allows children with a serious emotional disturbance to have access to a wide range of services that they would normally not have access to. In fact, four that are not even included in the Medicaid package plus eligibility for a Medicaid card. These children do not have to meet the income guidelines that are normally imposed on a family but simply are determined eligible by virtue of their own income. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Questions on this item? If not, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item please."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

3. CONTRACT WITH MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH CENTRAL KANSAS TO PROVIDE ATTENDANT CARE SERVICES FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this is also a new contract. The Mental Health Association has not been an attendant care provider prior to this but have provided respite care services that are quite similar. This is funded through Mental Health Reform and they will begin providing the services for children."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Discussion on this item?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item."

4. CONTRACT WITH MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH CENTRAL KANSAS TO PROVIDE THERAPEUTIC SERVICES FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, as I mentioned previously, this is again a new contract and this is with the Mental Health Association to provide services for us through the waiver."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you. Discussion?"

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Commissioner Miller said, “Briefly, Mr. Chairman. Debbie when you say provide services through a waiver form, the actual association of Mental Health is a large, is an umbrella, isn’t it or do they actually provide the service?”

Ms. Donaldson said, “They actually provide certain services that are part of the waiver and with the approval of this contract the Mental Health Association provides attendant care, respite care, family support, and case management services for children.”

Commissioner Miller said, “So they actually provide the service.”

Ms. Donaldson said, “Yes, they do.”

Commissioner Miller said, “Okay. Thank you.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you. Further discussion? If not, what’s the will of the Board?”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you. Next item please.”

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

5. CONTRACT WITH BREAKTHROUGH CLUB TO PROVIDE THERAPEUTIC SERVICES FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, again this is a new contract in relationship to the children's waiver. A good example of what they would be providing would be independent living services, which is a service that is not now currently covered by Medicaid, but would be paid for through the waiver. Be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Discussion on this item? Commissioner Hancock."

Commissioner Hancock said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Debbie, the contracts that we're working on today, one through nine, primarily are those contracts that are approved for the 1998 budget and we're just now getting to approve the contracts with those entities?"

Ms. Donaldson said, "Some are, with the waiver, the waiver just started for example January 1st, but in terms of its implementation, we're in the process of. So there is a good possibility in terms of providers for like the children's mental health waiver that you may well see new providers like you do on the DD side all year long depending on how that network evolves and develops and the number of providers that we have. Because on the waiver we may in fact have an individual that may contract with us to provide a certain service."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I was just looking through our back up and of course you are aware, we have a contract notebook that we keep and it familiarizes us with these contracts when they are so redundant and I didn't see much backup so I was assuming that most of these were renewals of past contracts."

Ms. Donaldson said, "Actually this time there are a number of new contracts, although you will find that the one on the children's waiver looks the same for anyone who is a contractor except for the name of the organization. So those will all be the same and that there are a couple of new ones here."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I see those. Thank you, Debbie. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Schroeder said, "You bet, thank you."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

MOTION

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

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item."

6. CONTRACT WITH WICHITA CHILD GUIDANCE CENTER TO PROVIDE ATTENDANT CARE SERVICES FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this is a renewal of an ongoing contract that we've had with the Wichita Child Guidance Center to provide attendant care services and these are funded through Mental Health Reform."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Discussion on this item?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item."

7. AGREEMENT WITH INTER-FAITH MINISTRIES PROVIDING A ONE-TIME GRANT FOR OPERATION OF THE EMERGENCY OVERFLOW HOMELESS SHELTER.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this is the funds that the Commission has given in terms of helping fund the overflow shelter. This particular year they are coming out of the Access Grant and these are the funds that supported that. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Discussion on this item?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Winters seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

8. AGREEMENT WITH RES-CARE KANSAS, INC., LIFE CHOICES TO PROVIDE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY COMMUNITY SERVICE PROVIDER STATUS.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this is the kind of final agreement with this organization to become a service provider for folks with developmental disabilities. They were previously approved as a registered provider and they kept that status until they could get their license and are fully qualified to become a service provider. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Discussion on this item? Commissioner Miller."

Commissioner Miller said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Debbie, understanding some of the background to what brings us to this point with Res-Care, are we going to monitor them any differently than we would bringing on another provider understanding the background?"

Ms. Donaldson said, "I would hope that we do a good job of monitoring all providers and of course we do take special care if we note any particular difficulties or problems. I know that sometimes providers will have problems perhaps in one area that are more prevalent than they might in ours, while we may watch that, we'll try to be very careful to make sure we do not run into any quality concerns and if so, we would act on those."

Commissioner Miller said, "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Further discussion on this item?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Next item please."

9. PREVENTION FUND AGREEMENTS (TWO) PROVIDING COMMUNITY-BASED PREVENTION/EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES FOR YOUTH AND THEIR FAMILIES.

- **BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF SOUTH CENTRAL KANSAS, INC.**
- **KANSAS CHILDREN'S SERVICE LEAGUE**

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, these are two of the prevention fund contracts that we have been discussing. The Boys and Girls Club did a very nice job of providing activities for youth where they are involved in productive activities and not just involved in things that may happen on the street in areas that they get in trouble on. We felt like this was a very positive program in terms of trying to reach the goal of keeping youth out of the correctional system. The Kansas Children's Service League program is a program that will really actively work with youth who have gotten in trouble and would typically perhaps go to more expensive and more intensive levels of care in evaluating them to see if in fact there may be a relative that may be appropriate for their placement and their monitoring and a positive kind of working back toward the family if that is feasible. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Discussion on this item?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Commissioner Hancock said, "Just one question. Debbie, do we have any more contracts for prevention funding to approve or are these the last ones? I can't remember. I'm sorry. Maybe you can't either."

Ms. Donaldson said, "I was just trying to count up in my head because I knew someone might ask me that. I think that this is it or we're very close."

Commissioner Hancock said, "Okay, thank you, Debbie. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Other questions? If not, Clerk call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie, appreciate it. Next item please."

H. GRANT APPLICATION TO KANSAS ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR CRIME VICTIMS' ASSISTANCE FUNDING.

Ms. Nola Foulston, District Attorney, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'll be presenting the Grant Application. This grant is an annual solicitation through the Attorney General's Office for crime victims' enhancement of programming. The District Attorney's Office has applied for a restitution coordinator. That would be a person who would contact the victims and to determine what if any monies they had lost as a result of the crime and then make sure that all the documentation, paperwork and everything would be in one package so that it could be presented to the court. We used to have a part time restitution coordinator for the whole office back in about 1989 or 1990. But that position had to be given up because we had other things that needed to be incorporated into our Victim Witness program so we lost a full time person. Now we do have an opportunity for a part time person, no benefit, hourly, but someone who would be dedicated to that position."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

“This grant, by the Attorney General’s Office, if we were successful in obtaining it, requires a 25% grant match. The funds are available through our asset forfeiture fund that we have here and that permits us by law to use it for any legitimate ‘criminal justice purpose’ and this would be one of the purposes. This is a one year grant. It does not require the County to assume the position at the conclusion of the grant although it is a position that is probably one that needs to be considered and we would look forward to additional grants if there were the ability to have that solicitation in the future. I would ask that you approve this for our office and allow us to submit the grant to the Kansas Attorney General’s Office.”

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Grant Application and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Nola.

Ms. Foulston said, “Thank you.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Next item please.”

**I. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' MARCH 5, 1998
REGULAR MEETING.**

Mr. Darren Muci, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “You have Minutes from the March 5th Meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts. There are ten items for your consideration this morning.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

(1) MICROFILM EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE - DISTRICT COURT
FUNDING: DISTRICT COURT

“Item one is microfilm equipment maintenance for the District Court. It was recommended to accept the only bid received of Bell & Howell Corporation. This is an annual contract for \$17,641.

(2) GRADING & SURFACING - BUREAU/PUBLIC SERVICES
FUNDING: LOCAL SALES TAX

“Item two is grading and surfacing for the Bureau of Public Services. This is project number 618-34 on Central Road between Greenwich and 127th Street East. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Central Paving, Inc., in the amount of \$2,580,205.06.

(3) FORKLIFT - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

“Item three is a forklift for the Central Motor Pool. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Sisco Equipment. That amount is \$14,856. That includes trade-in.

(4) TRACTOR WITH MOWER DECK - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

“Item four is a tractor with mower deck for the Central Motor Pool and the Kansas Coliseum. It was recommended to accept the only bid received from Excel Sales, in the amount of \$15,986. That also includes a trade-in.

(5) UTILITY VEHICLE - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

“Item five is a utility vehicle for the Central Motor Pool and the Bureau of Public Services. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Frye Chevrolet. That amount is \$32,125. It does not include a trade-in, it is an outright purchase.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

(6) ½ TON PICKUP TRUCKS - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

“Item six are ½ ton pickup trucks for the Central Motor Pool and Bureau of Public Services. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Mel Hambelton Ford. That amount is \$18,563. That is for two vehicles with trade-in and optional manuals.

(7) WALK-IN COOLER/FREEZER - JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY
FUNDING: CAPITAL PROJECTS

“Item seven is a walk-in cooler/freezer for the juvenile detention facility and Capital Projects. It was recommended to accept the low bid of John’s Refrigeration. That amount is \$15,750.54.

(8) ROUTERS & HARDWARE - COMCARE
FUNDING: COMCARE

“Item eight, various routers and hardware for COMCARE and their network. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Cisco Systems, that amount is \$12,080.

(9) PERSONAL COMPUTER HARDWARE & SOFTWARE - DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FUNDING: COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

“Item nine, personal computer hardware and software for the Department of Corrections. It was recommended to accept the low total bid of Computerland East for the hardware and software only, that amount is \$13,193.94

(10) UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK COMPLIANCE - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

“Item ten is a contract modification for the underground storage tank compliance by Central Motor Pool. This project will be decreased by an amount of \$773.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

(11) PNEUMATIC ROLLERS - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

“Item eleven, pneumatic rollers for the Central Motor Pool. It was recommended to accept the bids of Foley Tractor for one pneumatic roller, with trade-in and optional seat and the amount is \$35,544, and an additional bid of Victor L. Phillips for an additional pneumatic roller, with trade-in, and that amount is \$39,390. Both of those machine prices includes trade-in. There are two pages of tabulation and recommendation provided by Robert Lamkey, Central Motor Pool Director, attached.

ITEMS NOT REQUIRING BOCC ACTION

(12) TRACTOR - MOTOR POOL
FUNDING: MOTOR POOL

(13) CUSTODIAL SERVICES - AUTO LICENSE
FUNDING: AUTO LICENSE

“There are two items which do not require action at this particular time. One is a tractor for the Central Motor Pool and the Kansas Coliseum, those bids are being reviewed. Custodial services for Auto License for the Sedgwick County Treasurer. Those proposals are being reviewed. There is a complete tabulation attached. I’d be happy to take questions and would recommend approval of the recommendations provided by the Board of Bids and Contracts.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Darren.”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

Commissioner Gwin said, “Darren, on Item 11, if you’re going to buy two pneumatic rollers, why wouldn’t you buy two at the lesser price?”

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Mr. Muci said, "Commissioner, in this particular instance, Mr. Lamkey and members of the Central Motor Pool and the staff members of the Bureau of Public Services tested all the pieces of equipment that were provided. You will note on the tabulation and in the matrix, they look for such things as wheel well design, maintainability, cost, delivery time, warranty, et cetera. What we are presenting to you is the best value purchase using this particular method. There are lower prices. Those machines by Berry Tractor and VanKeppel did not meet some of those desired requirements including the wheel well design that allows for us to facilitate work uses out on the road."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Bob, can you answer the question? My question was if you are buying a pneumatic roller, I don't know if they are the same piece of equipment or not, but why couldn't we just buy two at the \$35,000 range?"

Mr. Bob Lamkey said, "Well, quite frankly we normally would but if you look under the tabulation, you will note that the Foley Tractor delivery time is 16 weeks, which puts us in the middle of July. Given the condition of our rubber tire roller fleet and consulting with the Superintendent of Public Services, we really can't afford to wait 16 weeks for both based on the amount of work that we need to do. We need to get one before the work period starts. We can afford to wait on the second one for 16 weeks so we could take advantage of the lower price."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Okay, that's a fair explanation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Mr. Spears said, "Bob, you might want to mention about the fenders and the cold mix."

Mr. Lamkey said, "The two lowest bidders were a Hyster product and a Bomag product which are built by the same company. We did not choose them. One of the challenges that we have as we do our work out on the roads is that we almost exclusively use cold mix asphalt in laying our roads. That has a tendency to accumulate in the wheel wells. In fact, the two machines that we're trading, we're trading prematurely because of the damaging conditions and the problem of accumulations of asphalt in the wheel wells which tends to damage the tires and the machine. So the two lowest bidders had basically the same wheel well configuration so that placed them fairly low in the overall evaluation process. The Foley product was the next least expensive and had they had a better delivery time we would have purchased two of those. But given the work required in consultation with David's folks, it was important we had at least one available because one of the ones we're trading in is in very bad shape."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Bob. Commissioner Hancock."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Commissioner Hancock said, "Bob, some time ago I visited with somebody, maybe it was David Spears about mowers and mower decks and so forth. I noticed that we finally bought one and it has been my fault I should have gotten down to noxious week and visited with them before now. But I know that in the future they are going to be replacing those that we have and I've always had a philosophy that it doesn't make sense to mow ditches in the ditches when we have perfectly service drive on right next door. For years we've done the same thing, we drove a tractor in a ditch and pulled a mower behind it and I can't think of anything that you have to service that takes such a beating as those things between flat tires and broken power take off shafts and mower blades and what have you. Every day there is something with that crew. I could only imagine. A ditch is no place for it to be. But there are ways to park on the road and mow ditches. I think that probably we need to begin and I'll certainly work with the Commissioners to look at that kind of equipment."

Mr. Lamkey said, "Actually, we have one piece of equipment that we can use for ditches and the folks do use for ditches. Kevin Nash and the Public Works folks have a very good training program for summer hires on what to do and what not to do out in the field so we don't basically ask folks to go into ditches where there would be some potential for damage or tipping. We do have one machine. Unfortunately it is a fairly high maintenance machine because it articulates at an angle and the mower deck goes in different directions. So we are exploring that with David and his folks and we're sensitive to the fact that we don't want to put folks in danger or put equipment in danger."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I just don't think it makes any sense at all any more for any of them to be in any ditch unless it is a pretty wide one with a general slope and a wide bottom would make sense. It just seems to me that mowing the old style county roads that we have now it doesn't make any sense to drive them in there any more when we can buy equipment that can mow that inside slope and the bottom and the outside slope. If there is anything out there, I don't know what is out there for sure, but I know I've seen it around."

Mr. Lamkey said, "There are some things quite frankly and we have explored them. We have one piece of machinery that permits us to do that. We'll explore with Mr. Spears and the folks there as we move in that direction and have some opportunities to make some trades. We'll look at that equipment and see if it is of value to us to do what we need to do."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I appreciate that, thank you."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Any other questions of Bob? I guess not. Thank you Bob. Further discussion? If not, Clerk call the vote."

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you. Next item. Thanks, Darren. Next item please.”

CONSENT AGENDA

J. CONSENT AGENDA.

1. Right-of-Way Easements.

The following tracts of land have been granted by Easement for Right-of-Way at no cost to the County. These Easements were requested by the Director, Bureau of Public Services, as a condition of receiving a Platting Exemption on an unplatted tract.

- a. Road Number 797-U, Owners: Terry L. Schupbach and John E. Dugan, located in the Northwest Quarter of Section 16, Township 28 South, Range 2 West, more specifically located on the south side of 39th Street South and east of 183rd Street West. Illinois Township. District #3.
- b. Road Number 618-11, Owners: Kenneth R. Clupny and Jennifer J. Clupny, located in the Southwest Quarter of Section 14, Township 27 South, Range 3 West, more specifically located on the north side of 4th Street North and east of 247th Street West. Garden Plain Township. District #3.

2. Right-of-Way Agreement.

One Temporary Construction Easement for Sedgwick County Project No. 644-23-1136; Bridge on 103rd Street South between Hoover Road and West Street. CIP #B-375. District #2.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

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

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Old Amount</u>	<u>New Amount</u>
C97031	\$261.00	\$250.00
V861001	\$214.00	\$224.00
V62007	\$245.00	\$325.00
V96062	\$343.00	\$337.00
V97054	\$380.00	\$000.00
C95037	\$202.00	\$325.00
V94066	\$481.00	\$494.00
V96030	\$307.00	\$66.00

- 4. Agreement with Brandon Walsh to provide on-line access to Sedgwick County's electronic data.**
- 5. Letter canceling Agreement with Vertex Targeted Opportunities, Inc.**
- 6. Agreement with Independent Living Resource Center, Inc. to provide Developmental Disability Registered Community Service Provider status.**
- 7. Real Estate Purchase Contract with Lana K. King in the amount of \$24,356.80, less required deductions, under the FEMA buy-out program.**
- 8. Plats.**

Approved by the Bureau of Public Services. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes for the year 1997 and prior years are paid for the following plats:

Lindsay's Orchard Addition
Shelly's Orchard Addition

- 9. Order dated March 4, 1998 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 10. Consideration of the Check Register of March 6, 1998.**

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

11. Budget Adjustment Requests.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Type of Adjustment</u>
980107	Central Services Security	Transfer
980108	Finance General	Transfer
980109	Youth Services	Transfer
980110	Information Service	Transfer
980111	COMCARE Administration	Transfer
980112	Aging	Supplemental Appropriation
980113	Corrections	Transfer
980114	Capital Projects Operating Review	Supplemental Appropriation
980115	Capital Projects	Transfer
980116	Prosecutors Special Trust Fund	Supplemental Appropriation
980117	Various	Transfer

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

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. I will recess this meeting."

The Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners recessed to the Sewer District Meeting at 10:44 a.m. and returned at 10:49 a.m.

Chairman Schroeder said, "Call back to order the Regular Meeting of the Board of County Commissioners March 11, 1998. Other business Commissioners?"

K. OTHER

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved that the Board of County Commissioners recess into Executive Session for 45 minutes to consider consultation with Legal Counsel on matters privileged in the attorney client relationship relating to legal advice, personnel matters of non-elected personnel, and preliminary discussions relating to the acquisition of real property for public purposes and the Board of County Commissioners return from Executive Session no sooner than 11:30.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. We are in Executive Session."

The Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners recessed into Executive Session at 10:49 a.m. and returned at 11:46 a.m.

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "We're back in session. Let the record show there was no binding action taken in Executive Session. Mr. Manager? Mr. Counselor? We're adjourned."

L. ADJOURNMENT

Regular Meeting, March 11, 1998

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

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

MARK F. SCHROEDER, Chairman
Fifth District

PAUL W. HANCOCK, Chairman Pro Tem
Second District

BETSY GWIN, Commissioner
First District

THOMAS G. WINTERS, Commissioner
Third District

MELODY C. MILLER, Commissioner
Fourth District

ATTEST:

James Alford, County Clerk

APPROVED:

_____, 1998