

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

December 16, 1998

The Regular Meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:00 A.M., Wednesday, December 16, 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; Ms. Becky Allen-Bouska, Director, Bureau of Finance; Mr. Randy Duncan, Director, Emergency Management; Ms. Deborah Donaldson, Director, Division of Human Services; Mr. Doug Russell, Director, Division of Human Resources; Ms. Louanna Honeycutt Burress, Economic Development Specialist, Department of Housing and Economic Development; Mr. Dave Yearout, Senior Planner, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. Joe L. Norton, Bond Counsel, Gilmore & Bell, P.C.; Ms. Susan Erlenwein, Director, Environmental Resources; Ms. Jan Kennedy, County Treasurer; Mr. Phil Rippee, Risk Manager; Mr. Mark Masterson, Director, Department of Corrections; Mr. Richard Vogt, Project Leader, Information Services; Mr. Kenneth W. Arnold, Director, Capital Projects Department; Mr. Bob Lamkey, Director, Division of Public Safety; Mr. David C. Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Marci Hess, Director, Intergovernmental Relations; and Ms. Lisa Davis, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

Mr. Dan Carney, former member, Physical and Developmental Disabilities Advisory Board.

Mr. Max Field, 501 E. 56th St. S., Wichita, KS.

Mr. Jim Gregory, Director of Corporate Affairs, Raytheon Aircraft Corporation.

Ms. Carlene Hill, Director, Center for Economic Development and Business Research, Wichita State University.

Mr. Karl Peterjohn, Executive Director, Kansas Taxpayers Network.

Mr. Thomas Garnatz, 425 W. Grenoble, Grand Prairie, TX.

Ms. Ernestine Ruhl, 7229 S. Chautauqua, Wichita, KS, 67216.

Mr. Terry W. DeCou, 7245 S. Chautauqua, Wichita, KS, 67216.

INVOCATION

The Invocation was given by Reverend Charles Claycomb of Woodland United Methodist Church.

FLAG SALUTE

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

ROLL CALL

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

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting, November 25, 1998.

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of November 25, 1998.

Chairman Schroeder said, "Commissioners, you received the Minutes of the meeting, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to adopt the Minutes of November 25, 1998.

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

CERTIFICATION AS TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

Ms. Becky Allen-Bouska, Finance Director, greeted the Commissioners and said, "You have previously received the certification of funds for expenditures on today's Regular Agenda. I am available for questions if there are any."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I see no questions, Becky. Thank you. Before we go on to the next item, Bill Buchanan would like to make an introduction."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager, said, "I'm really going to turn it over to Bob Lamkey, because it's his announcement."

Mr. Robert J. Lamkey, Director, Public Safety, greeted the Commissioners and said, "It is my pleasure today to introduce to you and the community Randy Duncan who will be joining us as John Coslett's replacement as our Director of Emergency Management. Randy is a certified emergency manager. He comes to us from Cowley County. He has fifteen years experience and has been the past president of the International Association of Emergency Managers. As we are sad to see John leave, we are very pleased and proud to have conducted a rigorous selection process and are fortunate enough to have hired Randy to join us as part of our Sedgwick County team. If you wouldn't mind, I'll give Randy a moment to say hello."

Mr. Randy Duncan, Director, Emergency Management, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you for the opportunity to come to work for this organization and I look forward to becoming a member of the team and contributing to Sedgwick County's contribution to all the people of the County. Thank you."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Randy."

Chairman Pro Tem Hancock said, "Thank you. Madame Clerk, next item please."

AWARD PRESENTATION

A. PRESENTATION OF THE 1998 CHAIRMAN'S AWARD.

Chairman Schroeder said, "Commissioners, it is my pleasure today to bring to you the recipient of the 1998 Chairman's Award for Sedgwick County. In the past you've known that we have presented this award to many distinguished people and organizations that, in our minds, have done an extra-ordinary service to their community and this year, with your approval, we have selected Mr. Dan Carney as this year's recipient. Dan, come on up."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“Dan has given many, many years to the Mental Retardation Board. Since its inception in 1973 and its first budget in ‘74, Dan was a part of this Board. He has given a lot of hours to this community. I had the opportunity, the other day, to speak to a group of entrepreneurs, young kids that were beginning their college careers, and Dan and I were both there. I made the point to them, as business people, they need to contribute to their community. One of those ways to contribute to their community was through volunteering, like Dan had. Dan was a prime example of what a good business leader can do for his or her community and he has done that. I had the opportunity to serve with Dan. 1979, Everett Patrick appointed me to the Mental Retardation and Governing Board and in ‘86, when I won the seat as Commissioner I was promptly removed from that Board, which was correct. I had quite a few years of great experience working with Dan and others who have brought their business experience and leadership to the County and to this Board in particular.

“The Board has gone through many, many changes over the last few years. Originally, it was a governing board and now it is an advisory board. It’s gone through numerous name changes in the last few years but it’s still the same board. It still provides the same service to those clients in this community who desperately need those services and they still get good advice and expert advice from folks like Dan Carney. Today, we want to honor Dan Carney for his service to Sedgwick County. Thank you, Dan. Congratulations.”

Mr. Dan Carney, former member, Physical and Developmental Disabilities Advisory Board, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I want to thank you and all the Commissioners for this recognition. It really is a great service, the Advisory Board, as far as both to the County and to the handicapped. Thank you, very much.”

Mr. Max Field, 501 E. 56th St. S., greeted the Commissioners and said, “Well, I think most of you know me, after about twenty-eight and a half years here. Back in 1973, the legislature of Kansas passed a law allowing taxation for mental retardation. I was asked to try to find a board, because the Chairman was wanting to do something about that. I didn’t know where to start, so I asked Lucy Shipton if she could tell me a person who would do a great job and she said, ‘Well, I think Dan Carney would but I don’t think you can get him to serve’. So, I talked to Sister Vernice and he served. I think that gives you a feeling of character for Dan. I’ll just say that I’ve had an honor, talking with Commissioners and through my mental health work, meeting many outstanding people and Carl Menninger is one of those. But the most perceptive person that I’ve met, who seem to get on top of it right away, is a gentleman I like to think of as my friend, Dan Carney. I’m proud of him and all those members who have been serving the public for many, many years. Thank you, very much.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Commissioners, thank you. Dan is one of those jewels, if you will, in our community who has absolutely been a wonderful asset to Sedgwick County and to the over 400,000 citizens of our County. We want to thank Dan, again, for that. Thank you, Commissioners. Madam Clerk, next item."

DONATIONS

B. DONATIONS.

- 1. DONATION OF \$1,000.00 BY CHERYL RUNYAN TO COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY CARE'S (COMCARE) SUPPORTED EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP FUND.**

Ms. Deborah Donaldson, Director, Division of Human Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This first item is a donation from Cheryl Runyan, who I might add, is an employee of Sedgwick County but who feels very strongly about individuals who have a very serious mental illness having the opportunity to further their education. These funds are used for that purpose. I would recommend you accept the donation."

MOTION

Commissioner Miller moved to accept the donation and authorize the Chairman to sign a letter of appreciation.

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 Pro Tem Hancock, said, "Next item please."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

- 2. DONATION OF A WASHBORN ELECTRIC BASS GUITAR VALUED AT \$359.50 BY JIM STARKEY TO COMCARE'S COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES PARTIAL HOSPITAL, TO BE USED IN THE MUSICAL PROGRAM.**

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, again, this is a donation that we really appreciate and one that is very beneficial to our program. I would recommend that you accept the donation."

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to accept the donation and authorize the Chairman to sign a letter of appreciation.

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 Pro Tem Hancock said, "Thank you. Thank you, Debbie."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Bill. Appreciate your help. Next item please, Madam Clerk."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

RETIREMENTS

C. RETIREMENTS.

**1. PRESENTATION OF RETIREMENT CLOCK TO CLIFFORD LEITZEL,
BUILDING MAINTENANCE WORKER, FACILITIES MANAGEMENT.**

Mr. Doug Russell, Director, Division of Human Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Cliff's here and I don't know how the building is running, with all these guys here. I was looking at this deal and I'm not longer young, unfortunately, but I was just getting out of high school when Cliff came to Sedgwick County, in 1967. He's held a lot of things together for 31 years, is what it amounts to.

"I'm told, he doesn't like getting up in public. Is that right, Cliff? They say that people would rather drown or be hit by lightning than come in front of people in public. Cliff, you just have to be here in public.

"Clifford plans to spend his time with his grandkids, now that he's retired. He likes to fish and work around the house. He's worked maintenance on all floors of the Courthouse. That's an absolute. I've seen him everywhere. He describes his time with Sedgwick County as having good people to work around, having good bosses and supervisors to work under, and in HR we love to hear that, because that not what we hear all the time. It's good when we do."

"Clifford, here's a token to appreciate 31 years with Sedgwick County."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I think all of you recognize Cliff. He is the guy that has constantly, as Doug said, moved around this Courthouse for years. Whenever something needed to be done in my office and Cliff would come in and help me with it or do something in my office, he always did a good job very quite and got in and got out, did an excellent job. Made my life easier and made a lot of people's lives easier in this Courthouse. He's been a great employee and he's helped so many of us. He's one of those quite people that just works behind the scenes and makes this place tick. Cliff, we appreciate all that you've done for us and for the citizens of Sedgwick County. We want to wish you the best in your retirement. Congratulations and thank you, very much."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Mr. Clifford Leitzel, Building Maintenance Worker, Facilities Management, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I just want to thank the County for what they've done for me for the last 31 years. Like they said, I'm just going to go out and let somebody else have it. Let somebody else younger have it. That's about all I can say. Thank you for everything."

Chairman Pro Tem Hancock said, "Thank you, Clifford. Next item please."

2. PRESENTATION OF RETIREMENT CLOCK TO MACK SPENCER, SENIOR CUSTODIAN, FACILITIES MANAGEMENT.

Mr. Russell, said, "Mack, I don't believe, was going to be here this morning but no one has been around here that hasn't seen Mack. If you've walked into the Courthouse, ever, he's been there cleaning the glass doors, talking to people, patting you on the back, doing the job and trying to make this place look like it's the high quality place that it is. Mack is one of the reasons. The only thing I can say is, Mack's been here 20 years. We'll make sure he gets his clock and his award. Be sure and pat him on the back between now and Friday because I'm sure he'll be in and out."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Doug. Thank you to our recipients. We're going to miss both of them. They're icons to this community and to this County, specifically, and we're really going to miss those folks. Okay, Commissioners, next item please. Well, let's see, I have been asked that we take a five minute break so we can set up for a presentation. I know it's early in the meeting, but we've been requested. Do we want to do . . . Hold on a minute. We want to do a Thunder Item first please. Commissioners, can we take an Off Agenda Item."

OFF AGENDA ITEM

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin moved to take an Off Agenda Proclamation.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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."

Mr. John Nath, Director, Kansas Coliseum, greeted the Commissioners and said, "No smoke, no mirrors this time. We have Mr. Chen's signature on the contract. We have a new agreement with the Thunder. It's a two year deal with three one-year options. It's a good agreement for both parties. It certainly is consistent with what's going on in the Central Hockey League this year. We've restructured some things and made them a lot simpler. We're looking forward to a good relationship for the next five years. We recommend approval."

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

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Agreement Contract with Wichita Thunder.

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, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "John, thank you. Gary, job well done. We want to extend our thanks to the manager and to the owner of the Thunder and we wish them the best in the upcoming years. Thank you. Great job. Next item please."

DEFERRED ITEM

D. RESOLUTION ADOPTING REVISED INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BOND AND TAX EXEMPTION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to defer Item H indefinitely.

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."

PUBLIC HEARING

E. PUBLIC HEARING AND RESOLUTIONS (2).

- 1. PUBLIC HEARING AND RESOLUTION OF INTENT BY SEDGWICK COUNTY TO ISSUE APPROXIMATELY \$1,000,000,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS OF THE COUNTY, ON BEHALF OF RAYTHEON AIRCRAFT CORPORATION, OVER A TEN-YEAR PERIOD FOR THE PURPOSE OF FINANCING THE COST OF IMPROVING AND EQUIPPING AN EXISTING MANUFACTURING FACILITY.**

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Ms. Louanna Honeycutt Burress, Economic Development Specialist, Department of Housing and Economic Development, greeted the Commissioners and said, “This morning we have with us Mr. Jim Gregory, who is Director of Corporate Affairs at Raytheon Aircraft. He would like to make a presentation to you at this time, regarding the resolution of intent and activities of Raytheon. I would also like to introduce a few other people who are here and may be speaking to you. We have Carlene Hill, who is the Director of Economic Development and Business Research at Wichita State University. We also have Raytheon’s bond counsel, Mr. Winton Hinkle. At this time, I will turn things over to Mr. Gregory.”

Mr. Jim Gregory, Director of Corporate Affairs, Raytheon Aircraft Company, greeted the Commissioners and said, “We’re here today to respectfully request a letter of intent from Sedgwick County to issue up to a \$1,000,000,000 in Industrial Revenue Bonds to cover facility and machinery improvements to our facilities over the next ten years. Additionally, we would like to ask the County Commission to issue Bonds in the amount of approximately \$117,000,000 to cover expenditures for 1998.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

“The \$1,000,000,000 is based on our view of the future in terms of our expansion and upgrade plans, forecast of worldwide market growth for the businesses we’re in, general aviation, business aviation, special mission aircraft, and of course increased market share. One billion dollars breaks down, over the next ten years, in approximately \$600,000,000 for new programs, machinery and equipment; \$300,000,000 in buildings and improvements; and 100,000,000 in contingency, which is fairly consistent with the way we’ve done our bonds in the past. About 10% of what we’ve requested from the County, over the years, has been for contingency.

“Those contingencies have all been expended over the years. This is just a little history of success, in terms of our letters of intent that we’ve asked Sedgwick County to issue, over the years. 1982 we first came to the County and requested \$40,000,000 in Industrial Revenue Bond Authority and in 1984 we came back for \$100,000,000, in 1986 we came back for \$175,000,000, and in 1990 we came back for \$400,000,000, which is the letter of intent that we’re currently using today.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“That’s translated into, if the County approves the \$117,000,000 requested today, approximately \$719,000,000 since 1980 in investment in the community, primarily to handle machinery and equipment for our new airplane program, for existing airplane programs, and also facility improvements over the years. You’ll note that in some of the years, when employment was down, the company was still investing sizable amounts in the community, in terms of facilities and machinery and equipment. Improvements to finance and to request the 100% tax abatement for significant investments that resulted, over the years, in increasing employment.

“We began, in 1982, the Industrial Revenue Bond Program with the County, we had approximately 4,500 people on the payroll. Today we have 8,710. There’s been years when we’ve been up and there’s been year’s that we’ve been down. Frankly, general aviation, and aviation in general, is a cyclic industry. We are up dramatically, at the current time. We’ve added 1,250 new jobs to the payroll, so far this year, and the year isn’t over yet. We still have, approximately, open requisitions for about 500 people. We do expect a fairly stable employment next year.

“Of the \$400,000,000 in original 1990 authority, we’ve expended \$360,000,000 to date. That mean that we have \$39,200,000 remaining today. What we’d like to ask the County to do is take that \$39,200,000 and apply that to the \$114,800,000 that we spent in the County and then also request the County to issue \$1,000,000,000, which would cover the next ten years. We would draw down from the \$1,000,000,000, about \$60,000,000, to cover expenditures here.

“As you’ll note, there are some expenditures for Butler County and Saline County under the interlocal cooperation agreement, which Sedgwick County and the City of Wichita, City of Salina and City of Andover entered into. The County is authorized to issued Industrial Revenue Bonds on behalf of those communities when those communities and where those communities have signed their own letter of intent.

“In terms of where we’re going in the future, Raytheon currently has three new airplanes under development. Some of you have been out to the factory and toured some of these areas to see these new airplanes. The one on the top left is the Hawker Horizon, which is a \$14,600,000 super-midsized business jet. This puts us, really, into a new category, a much bigger category. We have a number of risk-sharing suppliers on this program. The thing that distinguishes this airplane from others in its category is the composite fuselage that requires the technology to build a composite fuselage versus a metal fuselage airplane is very significant.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“The airplane at the top right is the Raytheon Premier One, which is a \$4,100,000 entry-level light jet. It also has the composite technology. We’re on the verge of flying this airplane for the first time this year.

“The airplane at the bottom is the T68, Texan Two, which is the joint primary aircraft trainer airplane for the Air Force and the Navy. The company was a successful winner of a seven to nine billion dollar program that will last over the next twenty years, to manufacture this airplane.

“ The thing that is significant about this chart is that there are really three new airplanes under development simultaneously at Raytheon Aircraft. That’s very significant in our industry. I can’t think of another time in Raytheon’s and, prior to that, Beech’s history where we had three airplanes under development. Usually we develop one about every decade or two. We have three under way right now and that is very significant for us.

“Some of the recent major expenditures that the company has undertaken include a new 8,000 foot runway and of course we worked very closely with the County to reorient Central and to build a tunnel that goes underneath this new 8,000 foot runway. This really opens a lot of possibilities for us in the future as we develop and potentially acquire larger airplanes in the future. In 1997 we opened the trainer-systems division manufacturing facility for the JPATS airplane. We first flew that airplane this year and we’ll deliver the first one next year. We also purchased the Corporate Hills Research and Development Center, which is at the corner of Douglas and Webb Road and the Industrial Revenue Bonds that we are talking about here and in the previous years have financed the improvements to that facility. Of course we left the building on the tax rolls. A lot of Premier One equipment, associated with the entry level light jet, and a number of workstations for the Hawker Horizon located over in the Corporate Hills Research and Development Center where we do the R and D for that airplane. A number of computer-numerically controlled milling machines and Hawker assembly equipment and empennage riveter. Of course the Hawker assembly equipment is important in that we actually move the assembly of the Hawker 800 XP program from England to Wichita. So, we really generated a lot of jobs there.

“1998 has been another great year for us. Again, we had the roll out and the first flight of the T68 Texan Two. The roll out and the first flight, soon, of the Raytheon Premier One. Of course, we were honored to have the Raytheon Company shareholder meeting here in May.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“With that, I would be happy to stand for any questions. Carlene is here to answer questions about the cost-benefit analysis. Again, let me say, it has been a real pleasure dealing with the County on these issues. I know you’ve asked all the tough questions. I hope I’ve answered them appropriately.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Jim. Appreciate the presentation. Carlene, do you have anything that you wanted to present today?”

Ms. Carlene Hill, Director, Center for Economic Development and Business Research, Wichita State University, said, “Chairman, do you wish to hear the cost/ benefit analysis?”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Yes. That’s great. I was going to ask you that before we put away our equipment here.”

Ms. Hill greeted the Commissioners and said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I would just like to, briefly, go over a summary of the cost/ benefit analysis that we performed on this project.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

“We analyzed the cost and benefits of granting a tax abatement on the proposed \$1,000,000,000 investment by Raytheon, using a model adopted by the Kansas League of Municipalities. It is our estimation that, giving the assumptions used in the model, that for each of the proposed projects will result in benefits that exceed costs to the County. The earnings of the new employees and the resultant spending that occurs in the community is the primary source of the majority of the benefits to be gained.

“This chart, which is not real clear, I apologize, but show the longer bar chart as showing the County benefits compared to the yellow, showing the County costs. Benefits range, for each of the projects, in the range of ten to fourteen million compared to cost, in the range of six to eight million. The total net benefit, over the twenty year horizon, is estimated to be 46,000,000 for Sedgwick County. A benefit ratio of 1.6. These amounts are net of the cost of the property taxes estimated to be abated.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“Net benefits include things like increased revenue from retail sales and property taxes. It’s important to state that each of these estimates is for the duration of the tax abatement period only. After the ten year time period, the new property will be added to the tax rolls. We treated each year’s planned investment as a discrete project, with a ten year analysis period. Ten projects rolling over ten years, for a total of twenty years analysis.

“We worked closely with the company officials to gather estimates of employees to be added, increased sales, revenues generated to the company, as well as the staffs of the budget offices of each of the taxing entities. We’ve made every attempt to give you good estimates, based on rational and conservative inputs. However, we recognize and caution that the further into the future we project, the less confidence we can express. One important positive factor that was not included in this analysis, in this model, is the impact of retained jobs at Raytheon. In order to keep our estimates as conservative as possible, we did not include the benefits of retained employment or the benefits of visitors to the community, for example, Raytheon has a lot of visitors as they come in and look at new product.

“The model also provides you with a present value analysis. In other words, we discount the net benefits back to effect for the time value of money. We took that analysis one step further and discounted each of the projects back to the 1998 dollars to give you some added measure of confidence.

“The results show a \$26,800,000 net present value in 1998 dollars for Sedgwick County. This is net of the estimated value of taxes abated and does not include taxes collected in years ‘11 and forward. Finally, the model used some standard multipliers to estimate a total economic impact figure. We used standard multipliers. This results in an estimation of over \$10,500 new jobs in the County over the twenty year period, as a result of these investments and \$1,800,000,000 in increased local retail sales.

“As you know, you asked us to estimate the value of the impact on the State as well. As is typical, when using property tax abatements as a business growth incentive, the State gains a larger share than the local governments because the State is able to capture not only sales tax, and personal income tax, they are also able to capture corporate income tax. So, the benefit to the state, the ratio of the benefits to cost for the State is over 3 for each of the projects.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“In conclusion, let me say that while we hope this analysis is more than just a check off on a administrative process that you must go through, we hope it is truly helpful to you as you make this decision today. We do always stress that cost/ benefit analysis is merely one item for you to take into consideration as you make your decision. They are not intended, nor should they, replace your own best judgment on how to best invest the economic development incentives at your disposal in order to create the best business environment for Sedgwick County. I’d be glad to try to answer any questions.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Carlene. I see no questions at this time. Commissioner Miller, I’m sorry.”

Commissioner Miller said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Carlene, thank you for that detailed overview. I do have a question and maybe you approached it but I didn’t really quite follow. When it comes to the number of potential jobs that Raytheon is going to project that they will actually bring on board over the ten year span of the IRBs, how do we factor in the cyclical nature of the aircraft industry and the possibilities of it going for a down turn and not actually meeting those original projections.”

Ms. Hill said, “That’s a very important question, Commissioner Miller, and I’d like to answer it in two parts. First of all, as to how the numbers were estimated. The strategic planning department of Raytheon worked with us very closely and they based their rationale on estimates of increased revenues due to increased sales of these product introductions that Jim just mentioned. They estimated new employees as a proportion of those revenues. In other words, how many employees does it take to generate those amount of revenues. Again, those are their best estimates. I feel they were very conservative. The other part of this is, they did try to consider some time factors in there in estimating how employment would flow.

“The other thing that I think is a broader question, that your question brings up, is how do we deal with the cyclical nature of these industries. I think there it’s very important to keep in mind that these companies must invest over a horizon that’s longer than the economic cycle. The companies that invest during a period of even a downturn employment are actually the companies that are able, then, the take advantage of the upturn in the next economic cycle. So, it will not always flow smoothly, as you saw in the charts Jim showed, the employment is cyclical but over time their share of a very growing and high-tech, high-paying industry probably will continue to grow.”

Commissioner Miller said, “We’re talking a ten year bond issue. You mentioned twenty years for ten projects over ten years. Explain that please.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Ms. Hill said, "The request is for a resolution for bonds that would be issued over a ten year period. Each . . . annually, the investments made in that year, the taxes would be abated, if the project is approved, the taxes would be abated for a ten year period. So in other words, your resolution would cover years through 2007, at that time then there would be an abatement for an additional ten year on that final project."

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Other questions or comments? Thank you, Carlene. Appreciate your presentation. Louanna."

Ms. Burress said, "Commissioners, before you can take action on the Resolution, you must conduct a hearing to allow the public to address the issue."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Very good. Do we have anymore presentations? At this time we'll open the meeting to public hearing. Anybody who would like to be heard on this item, you're welcome to come forward. Please state your name for the record and you're limited to five minutes."

Mr. Karl Peterjohn, Executive Director, Kansas Taxpayers Network, greeted the Commissioners and said, "It's a privilege to be able to speak to you this morning, because the Kansas Taxpayers Network and myself have both been strong supporters of economic growth and certainly Raytheon Company, and of course originally as Beech Aircraft, has played a long and distinguished role in this community and in that sense deserves a great level of commendation. The need for this type of tax exemption is, I think, a vivid indication that Kansas and also this community suffers from a high tax burden.

"In the last four years the Kansas Taxpayers Network and myself have worked hard and even achieved some success in generating some tax reductions. This included two type of reductions, LP and the business personal property tax. We take credit for having some of the publicity that Kansas had some of the highest unemployment taxes in the entire country.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“We’ve continued to support broad based tax relief. Benefits for all, business and individual taxpayers. In 1997 Kansas Taxpayers Networks strongly worked to prevent a 7.3 mill property tax increase from going into effect in the community. This would have been an 18% increase in school property taxes. Raytheon Corporation took the public position by making a large financial donation, that taxes on property, on homeowners and on businesses, needed to go up, and supported that tax hike. That’s their right and their privilege, however, the voters disagreed and decided otherwise and supported keeping the taxes at a lower level and preventing this increase from going into effect.

“Today, Raytheon is requesting \$1,117,000,000 over ten years, in what’s called property tax abatements. I like to use the word exemptions so it’s clear. They are seeking an exemption and from the data that you’ve presented here and by my off the cuff calculations we’re looking at about a \$2,800,000 exemption in property taxes for 1998, which is a very significant part. I’m not sure how that’s split up between the County. Of course, I don’t believe most of their property is inside the City limits, so I don’t think the City would be effected and the School District.

“So, I am here to speak in opposition to what I view as the hypocrisy of seeking a property tax abatement while, at the same time, seeking higher property taxes on everyone else. Property tax abatements of the type that you’re considering today are something that homeowners and farmers can’t received and frankly, only a very small percentage of Wichita businesses can hope to receive and I’m not aware of other businesses receiving exemptions at the level, we’re talking about \$1,000,000,000. At the same time business and homeowners are also suffering from soaring property tax appraisals, so that even if the mill levy remains flat for them, their property tax bills are growing. This corporate hypocrisy, seeking a ten year property tax exemption reminds me of a similar situation in a major industry in New York. There, Leona Helmsley, who’s the owner of a major chain of hotels, infamously said ‘only the little people pay taxes’ and that was thoroughly rejected there and I think nationally. I urge you to reject special property tax exemption today.

“Since I’m not sure, today, from looking at the presentation, how much of the abatement would occur how quickly and over a period of time, I would urge this County Commission, if you’re inclined to pass this exemption, to delay this implementation perhaps after the Christmas and New Year’s holidays so that we can get an exact breakdown of what the fiscal impact would be by year, as it’s currently projected and revisit this issue early in 1999, at you first meeting after the New Year’s holiday is over. I think more information is needed. I appreciate the opportunity to testify in front of you today and I’m willing to stand for any questions. Thank you.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you, Karl. I see no questions at this time. Thanks, very much. Next speaker. Seeing no one else, we will close the public hearing portion of this item and discussion will be limited to staff and the bench. Commissioners, comments? Louanna, do you have anything else you'd like to add? Commissioner Miller."

Commissioner Miller said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I need to be able to say that I am going to be supportive of the request of Raytheon. I think that the cost/ benefit analysis clearly shows that the benefits outweigh the cost in the long term, in terms of its economic positive effects and impacts on Sedgwick County as a community. I also, in the same breath, coming from the Commissioner of the fourth District, which happens to have a very large number of small business owners in it along with every other Commission District, I know, in our County and as wearing the hat of a Commissioner leaving the bench and getting ready to go full term as a business owner in our community, need to be able to recognize and publicly put on the table and on the plate for we, as Commissioners, what it's going to take for us to truly look at how we dole out or partition out these types of incentives to keep businesses here. Corporate businesses, we seem to have a very elaborate and detailed and effective plan to do that. I don't have a problem with that. I've been supportive and I continue to be supportive. But just as Mr. Peterjohn has mentioned, and many other times we have mentioned, including myself and I believe Commissioner Hancock, small business owners need to have a method of tax incentives or incentives that keep them intact in our community. As of today, and to date, we don't have that.

"I would really like to look at, as a County and as a Board, how it is that we can look into our community at the small business owners and that's 70% of what our taxing structure is based on, is those small business that employ ten or less employees, how we can indeed keep them health, strong and intact working and able to continue the businesses that they are doing currently and hopefully thrive and even grow as business owners. I don't know what the plan itself would look like but surely when we are able to sit here and basically write off for a ten year period of time \$1,000,000,000 in improvement and x number of dollars in actually tax valuations we should be able to look at the smaller business owner out there, particularly a retailer, because yes there are some benefits for manufacturing businesses but the retailers nothing to keep them thriving in our communities. So, that's simply a commentary that I felt was appropriate to give at this time. I will be supportive of the request of Raytheon. Thank you."

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, in the headline of the paper, I think the headline was 'Raytheon asks the County to Okay \$1,000,000,000 in Revenue Bonds' and that's clearly descriptive of what we're doing today. I really think the story is a lot deeper than that when we really consider what we're doing. If I was going to write the headline story for tomorrow it would say something like 'Raytheon Announces Its Intentions to Spending \$1,000,000,000 of Their Dollars in Wichita and Sedgwick County Over the Next Ten Years' and then I'd write the second sentence, the one that's not quite as big as the headline to say something like 'unlike many other of our large businesses that have been sold to national companies and their new owners have chosen to move them out of Wichita, Raytheon again makes their intentions known to build brick and mortar and buy machinery in Wichita and Sedgwick County.'

"I really think that's part of what the key issue here is. That in this global economy that we've got, companies can decide to be any place they want to be. In the realm of aircraft manufacture, which I'm not an expert, but I know there are a lot of cities that had major aircraft manufacturing facilities that are no longer in existence. Their companies are gone, their out of business. It's kind of come down to a couple of big ones; MacDonal-d-Douglas, Boeing joined up. But there are many cities that are losing aircraft employees that would be delighted to have a new manufacturer move into their town and continue to build, or start to build airplanes once again.

"So, I'm supportive of this approach and appreciate the fact that Raytheon continues to make a commitment in the community that the Beechs started this company in, years ago. As long as Federal Legislation allows this kind of tax incentive to be used, we're going to be in constant competition with every county and every city in the nation as they try to strive to do their economic development opportunities and whether it's attracting new or supporting their existing. I agree with Commissioner Miller. I think much does need to be done to consider the efforts of small businesses and we have and I think, perhaps just very soon we'll look at another small manufacturer who will be talking about this same kind of program. I know that it is difficult to figure out how to make something as fair as possible to everyone. I know there are just cities all over this country that tomorrow would love to have the headline that should read something like here in Sedgwick County, is that 'Sedgwick County and Raytheon Have Formed a Partnership to Allow Raytheon to Spend \$1,000,000,000 of Their Money in our Community Over the Next Ten Years'. I think that's just a testament to the kind of place that Sedgwick County and Wichita and Kansas are to do business in. And if we weren't this kind of a community, this kind of County, this kind of City and State our options here would be we would just be trying to find more corporate clients like Raytheon. I'm going to be very supportive of this and I hope those three new planes work out better than anybody's expectations. I'll be pleased to see those building go up and the machinery and equipment go in them. Mr. Chairman, that's all I have. I'm certainly going to be supportive."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

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

Commissioner Hancock said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last winter . . . first of all, I want to say I certainly agree with what the other Commissioners have said, Melody and Tom. I won't cover that ground again, although you did steal my thunder. Thanks a lot.

"I do want to cover some new ground. Last winter we had the opportunity to be made aware of the thinking of Raytheon Corporation. They came to the Commissioners and outlined what they thought the future held for them and what they thought they might do in the year 1998 as far as this kind of thing is concerned, the issues of these Industrial Revenue Bonds. We weren't surprised at all when we got notice from Raytheon that they were prepared and had everything ready to go and their plans for the future were in order. They had worked with WSU to perform a cost/ benefit analysis for the County. We got it. We received it. So, we weren't surprised. I know this hasn't been on the public front burner for very long, but I suppose we should make it clear that it was on our burner for some time. We were aware of it and knew it was coming and had been in contact with Raytheon a number of months, in preparation for it.

"I've always looked at these kind of things as an investment in the future, for our community, and that's exactly what they are. In private business, as Melody alluded to, we also do borrow money and then we make investments in our futures also. It's not easy. In a way, by paying interest, we do pay taxes also. Once the pipeline is full, businesses and industry and jobs and tax revenue that you may have missed, some time in the future, is there. It's guaranteed and it will be coming to us soon. Karl Peterjohn is also correct in that we've had tremendous growth here in this County in the last few years and that has caused, for one thing, appraisals to go up on property but on the other hand, for the year 1999, we've managed to reduce our mill levy by just over half a mill, about 5.560 mills and I hope in the future we'll be able to do more of that. So as the growth continues our mill levy can go down. Hopefully, the ideal would be to match those increased values and those properties. I certainly know where Karl is coming from on that and I understand that perfectly. It's something that, I know, worries the Commissioners and every year we try to address that.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“The day before yesterday, or was it yesterday, in the paper I had the opportunity to talk to Bill Bartel about this, and he got the story absolutely right and I was absolutely wrong. We had talked about a change in policy that we were going to consider at this meeting and as you know we deferred that item indefinitely. The only worry I had, in conjunction with this issuance, was the future of our Fire District. While I’m alluding to the Fire District, Mr. Bartel is talking about bonds, and we’re not on the same page. I do have difficulty with the results and the future of our Fire District and hoped that the industry would participate in securing its future and making it a little less expensive for everyone and in visiting with Raytheon and other companies they’ve made it clear that they want to sit down and work out those difficulties with us. So, I was very pleased to hear them come forward, just like the good citizens that they have been in the past, they made it clear to the Commissioners that they wanted to talk about the Fire District and how that might be addressed in the future.

“So, with that cleared up, or made as clear as mud probably by me, I’d just like to say that we’re very happy to do these things. I just have to say what Commissioner Winters has said, there are so many communities out there in the United States who would just climb over high walls and swim through deep rivers and anything to do what we’re doing today. I’m so happy that companies the size of Raytheon chose Wichita, Kansas and Sedgwick County to do business here and have chosen to stay here. That’s our mainstay. This is our foundation of our employment and as we’ve been able to see for the last few years and as we look into the future, it looks like that foundation is going to remain firm and uncracked and we’re going to go forward. I’m going to be supportive of this. I know the public out there thinks that we’re going to do all \$1,000,000,000 today. Well, we’re going to authorize it, but we’re not going to issue it. I think we should be aware that as we do this exemption, no one year has \$1,000,000,000 exemption on it. I think we should emphasize that. It may be, this year we’re getting ready to approve \$117,000,000. That’s only a part of it. We need to be aware that there isn’t \$1,000,000,000 worth of infrastructure out there that’s going to be tax exempt this year. It’s only going to be a part of it, and this is going to go on for twenty years.

“Anyway, I want to say congratulations to Raytheon. I appreciate the comments we had today. I’m going to be supportive and I look forward to a great future in Sedgwick County. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you. Commissioner Gwin.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Commissioner Gwin said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Hancock's right. I don't want to duplicate what my colleagues have said but I certainly agree with those statements. Since I'm the senior member of the Commission by age, I'm going to take you back to when we first moved here I was five years old and the first house we lived in was directly across the street from Beech Aircraft and so over these decades, since then, I've watched what was a successful locally-owned company, Beech Aircraft, grow and prosper and building built and people commute to and from that facility. Then, of course, as time will have it, all things change, the Beechs no longer owned it and Raytheon did. As my colleagues have pointed out, it seem to be a trend, in corporate buy-outs, over the last several years that when the big companies buy, they pack up the boxes and load up the people, and take them out of town. We've seen it over and over again. Luckily, Raytheon has made the decision to stay here and to build planes here and to invest in this community. I've met, recently, as I'm sure any number of you have, a lot of our new neighbors who have come because Raytheon has made those decisions. People with English accents, people with accents from other parts of the country who, prior to their move, had no idea where Wichita, Kansas or Sedgwick County or even Kansas itself were but who have come to love this place and have adopted it as their new home.

"I'm going to, certainly, be supportive of this request. We've seen the growth that the last issuances have brought out there. You have three new planes in the projects and I know that you have some employees out there who are anxious to get started. We've been very lucky, with Raytheon, because Sedgwick County and Raytheon have forged a very good working relationship. You don't reroute a major commute street just for the fun of it. You don't rebuild roadway and infrastructure around plants just for the fun of it but you do that to create the infrastructure, ingress and egress to successful businesses. You also try to continue an environment in which businesses can prosper and grow. I think that's what previous Commissions have done. I certainly believe that's what this Commission is doing and what we expect to do in the future. I'm very anxious for the growth and good things to continue to happen in my old neighborhood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Commissioner Hancock and I were reminiscing the other day about when we did the \$400,000,000 IRB and I kind of thought to myself, well that will last forever. Considering the dramatic growth of Raytheon and its production line and hiring I shouldn't have thought that it would last forever.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“I have to say, over the years, we’ve probably made some mistakes in things that we have done when it comes to economic development, growth of our community. I have to say, this one is a very positive move, I believe. It’s a little bit bittersweet because yes, there are citizens that are worried or concerned that we’re not handling their affairs like they think we should. In the long run, I think it’s the right thing to do, especially as times change, as the economy changes, and jobs become difficult and people begin to get laid off in one area, then they can look to others for employment and one of them may be Raytheon. As they build planes, as they employ people they grow stronger, so do we.

“Commissioner Winters was absolutely right about these companies who move on, who move away from their roots, as we seen in the last few years, and one that we’ve tried to work with is Coleman Company. We’ve had some good and bad experiences with that gyration of moving in and out. This one, I think, is very important. I find it so ironic that today we honored an individual, Dan Carney, who is a co-founder of Pizza Hut and about the only thing left of Pizza Hut in our community are the restaurants themselves. I just find it so ironic that we’re sitting here discussing the growth of another home-grown business and whether they are going to continue in a positive growth cycle.

“I think history has been upon us today. As we sit here, I think we are making history, in the fact that we will allow this company to be the best that it can possibly be to this community and to the entire world as they sell their planes and jets. I’m very happy to be a part of it. I think it’s a wonderful time for our County. We have the lowest employment rate that you can possibly imagine compared to other communities of our size and larger. A lot of that has to do with how government effects those companies. This is one time we have a chance to do that.

“I had a conversation with an individual a while back who said ‘government has nothing to do with the economy’ and that just incensed me to the point that it just made no sense that someone could even comprehend that government has nothing to do with the economy. As we watch the headlines today and how the stock market is effected by the President’s problems. That has a direct relationship with the economy of our country. I can’t imagine what this will do to the local economy here, when and if we approve this today, and I think we will and I’m going to be very supportive, and I just hope that the leaders of Raytheon will do their best to spend that money in the wisest way possible, which I have seen them do in the past, and they have experimented, they’ve been successful, some not so successful but that’s what makes a business strong is the ability to take risks and they have taken risks and they are doing very well. I have to say, we wouldn’t have built that 8,000 foot runway, or we would have moved Central Street for that 8,000 foot runway if we didn’t think they were going to be a success. They absolutely are.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“I’m going to be very supportive of this. I will support the Motion today to approve and I’m looking forward to good things. Jim, Winton, I appreciate your hard work. I know it’s a tough task, from time to time, but we’re here to help and we’ll do all that we can to see that we can become part of that success story that you are. We appreciate you being here today. Commissioners, I don’t know if you have any particular questions but I do have one of Jim, if you don’t mind coming back up just for a second, Jim.”

“When we talk about investment in machinery, and bricks and mortar etcetera, that obviously is one that comes in time with you planning. I know you’re spread out, throughout the State, you have different facilities, such as Salina, ecetera, do you have an idea or do you have any kind of a target of how much of this investment will be spent in Sedgwick County itself?”

Mr. Gregory said, “Yes, we do. The billion dollars that we’re talking about here today is all going to be invested in Sedgwick County. The City of Salina has just extended Industrial Revenue Bonds for us in the amount of about \$12,000,000 and the City of Andover, a number of years ago, I believe, approved a letter of intent for about \$20,000,000. So, you can tell the difference between 1,000,000,000 and 12,000,000 and 20,000,000 but the billion dollars will all be here. What we’re going to be spending in the other communities will be the relative amount that they’ve approved in their letters of intent.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Well, thank you again and I appreciate the presentation today. Thank you. Okay, Commissioners, further discussion on this item? Louanna, do you have anything to add?”

Ms. Burress said, “No.”

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Winters seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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."

- 2. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SEDGWICK COUNTY, ON BEHALF OF RAYTHEON AIRCRAFT CORPORATION, TO ISSUE TAXABLE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 1998, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF APPROXIMATELY \$117,000,000 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PURCHASING, ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING AND INSTALLING AN INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL FACILITY.**

Ms. Burress said, "The previous item was planning for the future. However, Raytheon has invested over the past year in this community and this item is dealing with the \$117,000,000 that they have invested in Sedgwick County and the State of Kansas. At this time I would recommend that you adopt the Resolution and authorize the Chairman to sign."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Louanna. 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.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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, Louanna. Jim, thank you. Winton, thank you for being here. Good luck to you. Next item please."

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

- F. CASE NUMBER SCZ-0774 - ZONE CHANGE FROM "SF-20" SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO "MH" MANUFACTURED HOUSING, LOCATED SOUTH OF 71ST STREET SOUTH ON THE WEST SIDE OF CHAUTAUQUA AND IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO THE WICHITA-VALLEY CENTER FLOOD CONTROL DITCH.**

Mr. Dave Yearout, Senior Planner, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The request before you today is a request to rezone a single lot in the Applewood Subdivision located south of 71st Street, immediately adjacent to the flood control ditch. We are west of Chautauqua Street, which is all so just east of Hydraulic. This request is for a single lot, under the amendments that were made in the zoning regulations in 1997, we provided for, in the County, individuals to place manufactured homes on individual lots that do not meet the residential design standards, by requesting a rezone to the MH district. That was a change in what had been the practice in the past, but the feeling at that time was that this would be more in tune with the reality of what was actually occurring. As you will recall, the rules changed, and the ability to place manufactured homes on individual lots had changed through the years from the time when it was permitted by right until now it takes a zoning action in order to do that.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“This is a request from an individual who owned a lot and initially, when it was first developed, had placed a single-wide manufactured home on that property. They lived there a number of years. Conditions changed, they moved to Texas, retained the lot but it became vacant and remained so for a period over two years, in which it lost the right for another manufactured home to go onto the property. They have subsequently decided to sell the land. The individual purchasing it is wishing to place a double-wide manufactured home on the property. It is our understanding from the Code Enforcement Office that if they were to place this on a permanent foundation, we would not be here. However, the economic situation with the buyers is such that they are not in the position to put a permanent foundation, today, underneath it. They do want to purchase the land and they are putting a new double-wide home on the property but in order to do that, we need to go through the rezone.

“This case is in Haysville’s jurisdiction or area of influence and it was taken to the Haysville Planning Commission on November 12th. The Planning Commission did vote on a split vote, five to four, to recommend denial because of concerns from neighbors that the rezoning would open the property up to more intensive use in the future, if and when public utilities were extended, for more manufactured homes on this one property. The Planning Commission, on the 19th of November, passed a motion to recommend approval, adding on a protective overlay to address the concerns raised at the hearing in Haysville by stipulating that it’s for a single unit only, and that the setbacks that are in place for the SF-20 zoning district also apply to this property, even though the zoning category would change and the MH district does carry some differences in the setback requirements. Staff also recommended approval and it comes to you today with that recommendation of approval. However, because of the recommendation of denial from Haysville, and the provision of the unified zoning code, it will take a unanimous vote of the County Commission in order to overturn the Haysville recommendation. The other option, of course, is to return this to Planning Commission for further consideration, if you feel other issues need to be done. If I may, I can go through these slides real quick.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

“This shows the property. We’re south of 71st Street and the big white stripe cutting across diagonally is the Big Ditch. The property in question is outlined in black. This is an aerial photo of the property, and I can’t tell from this angle, it may be old enough that you can see where the home was if there’s not one there now. You can see, also, a lot of the other lots in this particular area are already developed and the arial does show a number are occupied by manufactured homes including some single-wides on these individual lots.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“The series of photos, please pay no attention to the arrows. They’re not quite right. I didn’t do those. This is the property in question, as it exists today. You can see that it’s undeveloped. There are some trees that have been planted previously, that have grown to maturity but the lot itself is vacant. This is a photograph of the house that sits immediately, kind of if you will to the southeast or the next lot south of the lot in question. A photograph taken of Chautauqua, as you would be looking essentially south and east. It parallels the Ditch in this location. So, it’s going not on a cardinal direction, but on an angle.

“This is a photo of the home across the street from the property in question. Again, panning to the north, to accomplish the same thing. Here we’re looking back Chautauqua with 71st Street in the background and you see, as the road curves, it begins to go to a true north direction at that point. This is a photograph of the property that is immediately north of the lot in question and the home that occupies that. Again, the arial photo. I would be happy to answer any questions that the Board may have.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Okay, thanks, Dave. Questions at this time? If there are no questions, Commissioners . . .”

Commissioner Hancock said, “Dave, in the area down there on south side of 71st. That’s where this is. There’s an area north of 71st. Are many of the homes manufactured homes?”

Mr. Yearout said, “Yes, a number of them are. It’s a mixture of single and double-wides. Some on permanent foundations, others not. Most of those were placed there at a time when the regulations allow that by right. That has obviously changed. I would say, the majority are manufactured homes of one form or another.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “What were the main objects from the Haysville Planning Commission?”

Mr. Yearout said, “I think they followed somewhat the same issues that were raised by the neighbors that spoke at the Planning Commission meeting. A feeling that the expectation was this area, they felt, should be developed more out into permanent homes. The law sets up that if this was placed on a permanent foundation, they could be there by right and they really felt that should be what the standard should be. As I noted, it was a split vote. There was initially, a motion made to recommend approval that failed, four to five. The subsequent motion of denial passed, five to four. Nobody changed their votes. That seemed to be the primary basis of the concern.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “Okay, thank you, David. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Any other questions or comments? At this time, we do not have a public hearing portion to this item, but we will allow anyone in the audience that would like to speak to this item to come forward, state your name and your limited to five minutes. Please come on up."

Mr. Thomas Garnatz, 425 W. Grenoble, Grand Prairie, Texas, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm the present owner of this property. I've been displaced there by a job loss in the aircraft industry. I'm here to, hopefully, get you all to approve this rezoning thing. The buyers, a young company, a realty agency, my wife and I, we closed on a contract in September of this year. As he mentioned, the couple's intentions were to move their double-wide onto the property and reside there. They couldn't move their home, because of this rezoning and subsequently, the contract was canceled but their still in favor of buying this property, pending the outcome of this meeting."

"I believe the concern for everyone, where everyone including yourselves, the buyers, the community and myself is how the property is going to be used. It is going to be used as a residence, to reside on by a single family. I'd like to echo a few points from the staff report from the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. I won't do the ones that he just mentioned, but on page two, paragraph three, the case history it states the zoning rules previously in effect permitted lots in this development to be occupied with mobile homes and a number of the properties have developed accordingly. On page three, item two, the stability of the property for the uses to which it has been restricted, supports rezoning by confirming that the proposed development will be consistent with a number of properties in the neighborhood. On page three, item three it supports rezoning first, by stating there will be no effect on nearby properties, as many of them are manufactured homes and it's reaffirmed by item two, stating that it will be consistent with the neighborhood and also see where this Commission will probably see more of these applications, as any new property that going to have a mobile home on it is going to have to come before you to be rezoned, it that's their desire."

"Just let me end this by just agreeing with item five on page three, the general welfare of the community. As I stated early, this couple just wants a chance to move back into their house. The only impact the rezoning will have will be to have the property reoccupied and taken care of again, on a permanent basis. Right now, all we do is, we have a running contract with Al's Mowing Service to come out and take care of our weed problems. Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, I'll try to answer them."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Appreciate you being here. I see no questions. Anybody else today who would like to speak this item, please come forward."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Ms. Ernestine Ruhl, 7229 S. Chautauqua, Wichita, KS., greeted the Commissioners and said, "I petitioned my neighborhood, which was sent out to us. I went to everybody. Everybody signed to deny this, and I'm hoping that you have those petitions, because I did turn them all in. I got everyone but one person. He's a truck driver and I just never could catch up with him. He has a nephew that lives there and I just never did get a hold of him.

"The changes that they say they want made to this mobile home rezoning was to a . . . the setbacks and just the one single home. My main thing, that I spoke at at the Zoning Commission was that the depreciation of our property value. My son lives in Haysville. They had a Realtor that testified to a zoning commission there that if the MH listing or zoning was allowed to happen that it could depreciate their property up to 25%. I know a lot of us out there do have mobile homes. I have pictures of some of them, just like that, but the property that is next to us has never been maintained. If it's allowed to be MH he can just rent, if these people don't buy, because he said in the last meeting that he did give their money back. He lives in Texas. It's never been maintained. Even though he does have a permanent service come in and suppose to mow this, we have to call every summer and then he comes out and finally mows. It's never been taken care of.

"The cost of putting a permanent foundation versus what they will have to do, is put down the pads, they will have to have to have the cinder blocks, it will have the have the skirting, isn't going to be that much more. All we're asking, this is the only MH listing that will be in that area. Just to have it left SF-20 like the rest of us are out there. Just because he moved and left it vacant, we don't feel that we should have to suffer for that. I'm speaking for a lot of people that work, that have children in school and have other commitments, but I don't know if any of the other gentlemen that are here today would like to speak or not, but I would ask that the Commission deny this."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, very much. Next speaker, please come up."

Mr. Terry W. DeCou, 7245 S. Chautauqua, Wichita, KS., greeted the Commissioners and said, "The area we're talking about is a pretty nice area down in there. There's only three houses down there that aren't sitting on foundations, trailer houses. I've got some pictures I'd like have you guys look at. We're all working pretty hard trying to clean up the area down there, make it nice and liveable. If you guys approve this and let him bring in a trailer and they can bring in riff-raff and move anytime they want to. Left the way it was, the area would be pretty nice. Like Ernestine said, we walked the petition and we got everybody but one that don't want the lot changed. That's all I had to say. I just don't want it changed."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay. Commissioners, any questions for the speaker? I don't see any. Thank you, Terry. We'll get your pictures back around this side, if you want to pick them up. Other speakers? Anyone else like to speak? If not, we'll close public comment and limit discussion to bench and staff. Dave, do you have anything else that you would like to add at this point? Okay. Commissioner Hancock."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I just want to ask Dave one more time, even with the overlay, what's allowed specifically on this particular lot?"

Mr. Yearout said, "With the overlay would be one single home, it could be manufactured home, and they would have to honor the same setbacks that are in place in the SF-20 district."

Commissioner Hancock said, "Now, for me, manufactured homes denote a specific category and that's 22 feet wide, 60 feet long, 2/12 pitch. That's for me . . . are you talking about any other kind of home besides that?"

Mr. Yearout said, "Under the term of the manufactured home it can be a single or a double-wide. It does have to be build new enough that it meets the HUD construction codes."

Commissioner Hancock said, "The reason that I'm asking Dave, a few years ago the manufactured home industry went to the state legislature and got passed that a category, the category name at that time was manufactured homes, could be placed on lots by right."

Mr. Yearout said, "And that's what's called the residential design manufactured home. The only distinction is, and it's our understanding that the people that are buying this lot, their unit would meet that standard, save for one criteria and that is the permanent foundation. What constitutes a permanent foundation is, as it's established under the building code department of what that has to be versus just block and skirting. It has to do with how it's set on the property. That there is a masonry curtain wall around the perimeter to give the appearance of a site built home. Some things of that nature that have to be done. That is, we've been told, and we hear this a lot, that it's beyond the initial financial means of these people that are buying, to do that today. There's a lot not far from this property that's just outside of the Applewood development, it's at Grove and 71st Street on the west side of Grove there was a double-wide that was setting on a block situation that had been there a number of year and it just recently, is now going through the process that they're putting a basement and are going to move the house onto the basement."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“What we have heard repeatedly, what we’ve heard from a lot of people in the development in the neighborhood, that they bought, moved manufactured homes in, single and double-wide, because that’s what they could initially afford. Once they got a few years down the road, they put additions on they put permanent foundations under, they build basements but it was something that was done progressively, over time, as their economic situation allowed them to do that versus just being able to say we were going to jump in and meet that higher standard today because in most cases it’s just beyond their financial means. It has a lot to do with the financing. The financing of these units by themselves is different, in the financial community, than it is if it’s a permanent foundation and treated differently. I don’t no all the peculiars but there are differences in financing.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “Sure, I guess I understand. So, let me try it one more time. I’m pretty dense. Just put it to me in real simple terms. What can you put on this lot, and can’t, in terms of size?”

Mr. Yearout said, “The way the recommendation of the Planning Commission reads it would be a single or a double-wide, it does not have to be on a permanent foundation but it does have to meet the HUD code requirements as far as the type of unit.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “That occurred back in about ‘74?”

Mr. Yearout said, “The HUD code went into effect in ‘76.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “We’re going to have to work on our terminology because this is really confusing. The Legislature specifically said manufactured housing and that was the term that they used, as I recall.”

Mr. Yearout said, “Actually, there’s three categories in the statutes. The only one they said by right that you have to accept is what they call the residential design which is the double-wide on permanent foundations.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “Well, we’re going to have to work on that just a little bit. It’s not your fault. It’s my fault because I don’t get this enough to be clear on the terminology.”

Mr. Yearout said, “It took me a long time, too.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “Okay, thank you, Dave. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Any other questions or comments at this time. If not, I'd entertain a motion."

Commissioner Hancock said, "Is it the applicants intention to put a single or a double-wide on it at this time?"

Mr. Yearout said, "Double-wide as I understand."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Commissioner Miller."

Commissioner Miller said, "My question is, and it sounds like it's in the terminology, also, is the permanent foundation. It doesn't have to be on one. Is that what I'm hearing?"

Mr. Yearout said, "Correct. The MH zoning would allow it to be placed without a permanent foundation."

Commissioner Miller said, "But I did hear a request of one of the residence in the area that that's what they'd like to see. Is that correct?"

Ms. Ruhl said, "We just want it left SF-20."

Commissioner Miller said, "I understand that but . . . But I thought you said that's what you wanted was a permanent foundation. In the findings, the findings of MAPD and MAPC are saying that they would recommend the change in zoning, period, and it isn't contingent upon a permanent foundation."

Mr. Yearout said, "No, and that's because there are homes in the neighborhood now that do not have permanent foundations. There's consistency in the neighborhood. The changes that were done in August of last year, in the zoning code are what is bring this forward today. What was in effect then, in all likelihood we wouldn't be here. The double-wide would have been put in, not on a permanent foundation, there wouldn't have been a rezoning, they would have done exactly what they're proposing to do, it's just that we would not have gone through this process."

Commissioner Miller said, "Thank you."

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Commissioner Hancock said, “Dave, one more question. I’m sorry. On a non-permanent foundation, do they have to put down a concrete slab or do the support blocks go on the ground?”

Mr. Yearout said, “No, there has to be some support underneath them. There’s standards both in State law and there’s also, I believe, the standards is wish Mr. Witse was here or someone from the code office that could address that better than I can, but my understanding is there is some structural support underneath that unit it’s just they do not go down to frost lines with footings, they do not put the masonry curtain wall around the perimeter to give the appearance of a site-built home. That’s the big difference.”

Commissioner Hancock said, “Thank you.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Any other questions or comments?”

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to deny the finding of facts of the Metropolitan Planning and deny the zone change.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I believe the options available to you, under these circumstances would be to return this to the planning commission for further consideration. Under the circumstances of a motion to deny with a recommendation of approval of the Planning Commission I would recommend that you add to that motion that you return it to the Planning Commission for further consideration.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “With the Motion to deny?”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Commissioner Hancock said, "It's my understanding, the only difference between what we're talking about is a foundation or not a foundation. We've boiled it all the way down to that. If this thing is 22 feet wide and 60 feet long, that's 164 perimeter feet, at about 10 bucks a foot you're talking about \$2,640 to put a foundation down. I don't think that's unreasonable. That's the way I'm thinking about. Finances, if it boils down to finances on this thing versus the community and the quality of the community, this is not an unreasonable amount to invest in the property. If that's all we're talking about Dave, is just the foundation, nothing else? If I'm missing something let me know. That's just kind of the way I'm looking at this thing. I don't know why we would return it, based upon that question."

Chairman Schroeder said, "We do have a Motion, if you want to leave it like it is or amend it you're welcome to do that."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I don't want to amend it."

Commissioner Winters said, "My only question was going to be to Rich. Based on Mr. Hancock's explanation, I don't think I'm in favor of voting for approval of this, whether it comes back, whether we do it now or when it comes back later. If Mr. Hancock, as he knows the neighborhood, believes that this needs to stay as it is now, what's the purpose of sending it back to MAPC?"

Mr. Euson said, "If you're going to have a unanimous vote to deny, you may not have to send it back. I was thinking back to one of the last cases we had, where you have three requirements in the statute, and one of them is to send it back, one of them is to return it to the MAPC if there's not going to be a unanimous vote."

Mr. Winters said, "Well, it does get very confusing, when we have to have a unanimous vote."

Mr. Euson said, "It is, and it's confusing when you're going against the recommendation of the Planning Commission. Perhaps what you need to do is go ahead and take a vote and see where that leaves you and then if you don't have the sufficient votes then make a motion and go ahead and return it them."

Chairman Schroeder said, "We do have a Motion on the floor. Any further discussion. If not, Clerk call the vote."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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, Dave."

NEW BUSINESS

G. RESOLUTION REGARDING FINANCING OF BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS IN SEDGWICK COUNTY.

Mr. Joe L. Norton, Bond Counsel, Gilmore & Bell, P.C., greeted the Commissioners and said, "We're here today to consider a resolution would implement financing for certain bridge improvements recommended by the County Engineer. It's a resolution which would authorize those improvements to be made and authorize the financing thereof, in part, by the issuance of General Obligation Bonds of the County.

SLIDE PRESENTATION

"On the screen before you is an estimate of the seventeen bridges which Mr. Spears has recommended be improved. They're all in the Capital Improvement Program previously approved by the Board of County Commissioners. The total estimated cost of these seventeen bridges is \$2,285, 500 to make the improvements.

"The Resolution would limit the amount of bonds to be issued for these improvements to not more that \$2,000,000, with the balance to be paid by available sales tax funds dedicated by the budget to pay those particular costs. That basically the sum and substance of the Resolution. The action is solely by the Board of County Commissioners. There's no requirement for Public Hearing, although you may wish to receive public comment prior to taking your motion into consideration."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you, Joe. At this time we'll open up the meeting to public comment. Anybody who would like to be heard on this Item, you're welcome to come forward. Seeing no one, we will close public comment and limit discussion to Bench and Staff. Joe, anything else?"

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Mr. Norton said, "If you want to implement this program, we'd recommend you adopt the Resolution."

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin 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, Joe. Commissioners, at the first of the Meeting I wanted to take a break. This is the place where we need to take a break. About five minutes."

The Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners recessed at 10:35 a.m. and returned at 10:45 a.m.

Chairman Schroeder said, "We're back in session. Next item please, Madam Clerk."

H. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES.

1. PRESENTATION OF THE WASTE STREAM ANALYSIS AT BROOKS LANDFILL.

Ms. Susan Erlenwein, Director, Environmental Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The solid waste management plan for Sedgwick County included a recommendation to perform a waste analysis now and then another one in five and ten years."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

SLIDE PRESENTATION

“The purpose of the waste analysis is to determine the composition of what we throw away. This information will give us an opportunity to develop markets for this material, to recycle it, as well as it gives us a base line of what we’re currently throwing away and how recycling and volume based programs and bans in future will effect what goes through the transfer station.

“The waste stream analysis was performed at Brooks Landfill and it was done over a year’s time. We were out there every other month for this year, performing this waste analysis. We were out there the whole time the landfill was open for one straight week, every other month, 6 A.M. to 6 P.M. on weekdays and 7 A.M. to 5 on weekends.

“You can see here, there’s a line of trucks entering the landfill and over on the left side of this picture is the scale-house. We had many jobs out at the landfill during the waste analysis. One included a staff person stationed at the scale-house. As the trucks rolled onto the scales, they wrote the the weights of all of the trucks entering and also they took note of the type of the truck. Was it a packer truck that you might have come by your house to pick up your trash or was it a roll-off truck from industry or commercial business or a car or van. So, we recorded all of that information.

“The driver’s were also surveyed, to determined if it was residential trash that they were hauling to the landfill or commercial or industrial trash. The survey also included information as to what area of the community the trash was generated. And you can see in this picture, Kristi Zukovich, from the Manager’s office had volunteered to help in the waste analysis and I’d like to thank everyone in the County who had volunteered to help at this waste analysis throughout the year. As you know, I have a small department so we couldn’t do all of the jobs. Even County Commissioners came out and actually helped pick through trash. I really appreciate you volunteering, as well as other members. I want to give special thanks to Joe Renfro, who helped head this whole effort and coordinate the program.

“After the trucks went through the scale-house, they went up the hill at Brooks Landfill, to deposit the trash at what we call the working face of the landfill. We also had someone stationed at the working face to take notes of what was being deposited.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“We picked, at random, eight trucks a day. Some of the trucks were commercial trucks, as you see here. Some of the trucks were residential trucks. You see what’s coming out of this truck. Remember that we had to pick through this garbage. Once the garbage was deposited on the ground, we went through it and took 200 pounds that represented the load. This material was put into the back of a pickup truck and then it was taken down to the sorting area. Now, the sorting area was away from the working face. This is because the area of the working face changed from one day to another, and this also provided safety for our workers, to keep them away from the large trucks. You can see we had a covered area to do the sorting.

“The material was taken out of the back of the pickup truck. If it was a large item, it could be placed directly into the appropriate container. Bags of trash were taken and it was from this area taken over to the tables for sorting. The tables, we had several tables lined up so we could all work at the same time, sorting through the garbage. The approximate time to sort through 200 pounds was one hour. You can see why we did eight trucks a day. There was eight hours of work involved in going through this. Also, we shifted the times through the year, from starting first thing in the morning, at 6 A.M. when it opened, in the wintertime it was later because it was dark then. We tried to get representative samples throughout the time that the landfill was open.

“Each bag was opened carefully to remove items. If anything hazardous was seen, such as we did find syringes, or medical material, the sorters were instructed to stop working through that bag and hand it over to Joe, who had to go through a series of hepatitis shots and tetanus shots to do this. Again, thanks to Joe Renfro.

“Each bag, as I said, was sorted through. We had 52 categories to put the material into. We went through every single piece of paper in the bag. You can see at the bottom of the picture there’s a screen we were sorting over. Even the fine material, cigarette butts or coffee grounds, that might fall through the screen were brushed up and weighed at the end.

“Here’s an idea of some of the buckets we were putting material in. We had small buckets and larger buckets, depending on the size of the material. Cardboard is very bulky. We had a large container to hold that. Some small containers were used for other items, such as disposal diapers and sludges. Here’s a picture of some of the material that’s typical of sludges, which included containers full of liquids or paste. For example, in this picture there’s hydrogen peroxide that happens to be full, a Listerine bottle that was half full and other bottles that were full of material. Toothpaste, that sort of thing would go into sludges.

Commissioner Gwin said, “I thought liquids weren’t allowed?”

Ms. Erlenwein said, “Technically, liquids are not allowed at the landfill and that, really you could stop companies that would have septic tank cleanouts that were liquid that were coming in but small containers like this, there’s no way to stop that from going into the landfill.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“Once a container is full, the next step is to weigh the material. We had it on a scale, and we’d write down the weight. There’s Caroline on the right and you can see this was wintertime. Since this was a year-long study, every other month, when we were out there, sometimes it was a 100 degrees and in this case it was a wind chill of 20 below when we were out there sorting through it. We also noted the volume in the containers, so we could get weight measurements and volume measurements of the trash. Once the weight was done, the material was put back in the pick-up truck and then it was carried back up to the working face and deposited again and waited for the next truck to pick through the trash. We also had someone stationed up at the working face to note items that were unique that were being deposited, whether it was a unique load as, I’m not sure how well you can make it out in this picture, but in the center of the picture those are drums. They were empty drums, but there was a company that came out and just deposited drums. This pictures, I’m not sure how well you can see it through this system, but there’s quite a bit of color there. That was a load full of plastics from a local manufacturer. Here, you can make out brush in the bottom of the picture that was dumped and then just wood that was being deposited. A solid load of wood. Here’s Styrofoam blocks that were deposited by one company and the whole load was Styrofoam blocks. Here’s a load of cardboard, corrugated cardboard and as you know this can be recycled in this community. In fact, through out study, corrugated cardboard was the number one single component being thrown away in the landfill.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “In loads like this, or just throughout the pit?”

Ms. Erlenwein said, “There were some loads that were 100 percent corrugated cardboard, there were some that were 80 percent but throughout the whole pit.”

“I’d like to review the results for you of what we discovered through the pit. And I think the first conclusion that we came to, rather early was that picking through trash is for the birds. If you went out there right now, you’d have a lot of birds migrating coming there. The second conclusion is ‘don’t look up.’

“Something else that we determined from the pick is that the daily average, while we were out there, was just over 1,400 tons per day. Of that 1,400 tons per day, the weekday average, Monday through Friday, was 1,851 tons per day. So you can see, most of the trash is being delivered Monday through Friday. Weekends was just over 300 tons per day.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Is it a different kind of garbage that you get on the weekends? Are these the homeowners?”

Ms. Erlenwein said, “That’s correct. You have more homeowners coming out during the weekends, with residential trash, more commercial/ industrial during the weekdays which is something you would expect but at any rate, that’s a small tonnage going in on the weekends.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Do you find more of the weekday or weekend deposits that are the caustic items, the polluting items? Did you do any discovery on that?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Weekdays."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Weekdays you have more of that. Okay."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "The total municipal solid waste, is the polite term for the trash, that goes in by weight is 39 percent. From the information we received at the scale-house and surveying the drivers as to the type of material they were carrying, by weight, residential is 39 percent. Commercial/ industrial is 61 percent, by weight. However, if you look at the vehicles and the number of vehicles that go in, it's almost half and half. Residential 49 percent of the vehicles going in, commercial/industrial 51. So obviously, if someone's going in with a car and a trailer, they don't have as much weight on them as a commercial load would have. Number of vehicles is half and half, but by weight you have much more, 61 percent commercial.

"Also, we took note as to the number of vehicles entering the landfill. Monday had the most number of vehicles, 19.5 percent. In fact, we looked at the timing of that, and during the weekdays the peak hours between 2 and 3 o'clock when you had the most vehicles coming into the landfill. Sunday's, 1 percent of the material going into the landfill was delivered. Again, you can look at that and, we won't, the County is not going to be building a transfer station, but other companies are and some of this information may be useful to them in planning on their hours of operations, designing it for peak loads and days of the week. I think this will help."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Susan, it brings an obvious question to mind. When we do the private transfer stations, are they required to be open seven days a week?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "We do not have that requirement in the regulations."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I think that's something we need to look at."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "I'll be talking about that next."

"One of the questions we asked drivers coming into the landfill was 'where was the waste generated. Where was your route or your home, what part of the community?' We discovered that most of it was coming from the west side of Wichita and just out into the County. That does not include Goddard or Cheney or small towns because we had a different category for small cities. The most was from the west side, with 14.2 percent. The least amount was from out of County. Out of County we had surrounding counties bringing trash to Brooks landfill as well as we had out-of-state trash coming to Brooks landfill. So this includes out-of-state as well.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“I think one of the main results that people are interested in is the final breakdown of what was in the trash, from going through the sorting. As you see here, paper composes 30 percent of our waste stream. Yard waste was the second highest amount at 12 ½ percent, followed by construction and demolition wood at 12 percent, plastic 11 percent, metal 8 percent other construction and demolition, that would shingles and wallboard, bricks that sort of material, textiles, rubber and leather, at 6 ½ and food waste at 6 percent. Then other included things such as disposable diapers or medical waste or material that didn’t fit into these other categories. So those are the larger breakdown of the report and in your report this would be page 25.

“We also then looked at it by single categories. Just to give you an idea, as I mentioned earlier, the largest single category by weight, corrugated cardboard, 12.7 percent, wood 12.1 percent.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Susan, is that in your report.”

Ms. Erlenwein said, “This particular page is not broken down but in you appendix you have a breakdown through category in your appendix. F-5. So you can see how the single categories were also broken into the larger categories. This gives you an idea of the sort of material we’re throwing away in our community. As I said at the start of this, this will help us determining markets for the material, such as corrugated cardboard. There are markets for it and of course that fluctuates with the market throughout the year. Wood we have a market for right now that it could go to the compost center cheaper than to the landfill. Other paper, a lot of that was contaminated, so there may not be as good a market for that. Yard waste, there certainly a market for that right now. Textiles and rubbers we’d have to work on markets for. I do know there are many companies that take clothing and then they use that to make rags. So, there are markets out there.

“We also looked at it by volume. Paper doesn’t weigh a lot, so even though it was the highest in weight at 30 percent it was also the highest in volume at 43 percent. Then plastic 21 percent, because it doesn’t weigh a lot but depending on how you get it, in milk jugs or two liter bottles, it takes up more space. Of course, once you crush it under the machinery at the landfill, you have a different number but this was during the weighing.

“I think the study was important to do because it gave us information on what we’re throwing away as a community. It will help us to look at markets for recyclables and, as I mentioned earlier, have a good base line for when we implement some of our recycling programs. We can go back in five years and do this again. Not looking forward to that. It was important to do this seasonally. That’s one thing that we did determine. This study was done a Brooks landfill about eight years ago but it was only done for four days in the heat of the summer. You’re going to definitely get a different number than if you do it throughout the year and get seasonal variations and then group that together. I’d like to thank you for listening to this report and I’d be happy to answer any questions.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Chairman Schroeder said, "Okay, thank you, Susan. Discussion on this item? If not, what's the will of the Board?"

Commissioner Hancock said, " Mr. Chairman, I just have one comment. I just want to tell Susan thanks. This is one heck of a report. I know it seemed simple at first to go out and sort through the garbage and see what is there but hey, this is great. I appreciate the information. You've brought sorting through garbage to a new high. I know it was a tough job and I appreciate the volunteers that went out there, everyone that went out and especially you for organizing it and reporting it in this way. It's very valuable. Thank you."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "I'd like to mention that this was done through a grant through Kansas Department of Health and Environment. This report will be sent on to the State."

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

Commissioner Gwin said, "Susan, I guess my next question is 'now what?' Now what do we do with this information. Do we have a plan on contacting prospective businesses or others and letting them know what materials we have available here that can be recycled and can be reused?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Yes, absolutely. I'll be meeting with that manager of Warehouse to review this information. This will be useful for future curbside recycling programs to see what materials would be beneficial to pick up because we know how much is out there and can we expand our current curbside recycling, which is something we heard through our community discussions is that people want, not only curbside recycling, but expansion of what they can put out. I think this will be very helpful, working with recyclers in our area."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Well, I would think so and if there are entrepreneurs out there who are thinking that there might be a way to start a business and to be the beneficiary of the way we're going to change the way we handle municipal solid waste, they can contact you and get copies, are there copies available to the public, so they can look at it and see what areas might be right for their business startup?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Yes, they just need to call Environmental Resources Department, 721-9418 and we'll give them a copy."

Commissioner Gwin said, "Alright, thanks, Susan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Other questions or comments? If not, what's the will of the Board?"

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin moved to receive and file.

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, “Good job, Susan. Thank you. Next item please.”

2. RESOLUTION ADOPTING MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE TRANSFER STATION REGULATIONS AND ADDING OF THESE REGULATIONS TO THE SEDGWICK COUNTY CODE.

Ms. Erlenwein said, “Four weeks ago I presented the draft of the transfer station regulations to you. Three weeks ago we held a public hearing on the draft regulations. We did receive comments from the public. In addition to that I have presented the draft regulations to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. It’s been on our department website and I’ve personally met with companies that have indicated their desire to build a transfer station in our community, as well as with the waste haulers in our community, to receive their input. After receiving input from those groups, as well as the solid waste management committee, Jennifer Magana from Legal Department met with outside counsel and reviewed the comments we received and compared it to the draft we had and developed the new regulations that you have before you.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“How they differ from the regulations I presented four weeks ago is minor in most cases. There are some word smithing done to help clarify some of the definitions and regulations and also to help make some of them more enforceable. The major change in a copy that you have now from what was given to you four weeks is in the licensing of the transfer stations. What was presented four weeks ago had a license fee of \$37,500. We received comments on that as to finding a better way to recoup the County’s investment and the time spent by staff to go out and inspect the stations and do the regulations and to help balance that between the large transfer stations and the smaller ones. What we’ve developed is a different fee structure of \$8,500 annual fee plus 32 cents per ton that goes into the transfer station. This will balance it out between the large stations and the small stations and yet allow the County to recoup our investment of staff time and efforts in inspecting the stations. I have reviewed these prices with the companies that intend to build a transfer station and I have had positive feedback from them.

“That’s the major change and I’d be happy to answer any questions you might have and Jennifer’s here who can also answer questions.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Okay, thank you, Susan. I do want to get back to that issue of hours of operation. Is that not discussed anywhere in the plan?”

Ms. Erlenwein said, “No it is not. The days of the week, nor the hours of operation, since it was a private companies doing this, we thought that it might be site specific, as to whether they’re out in the County with no one around them the hours of operation might be different than a industrial area or if they were near a neighborhood. We felt that might be better taken up with a conditional use permit. That has to be done with every transfer station that is developed.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “I understand that but I think, you know, with the way society is today, people working different shifts, different times, different days of the week, though only one percent was going into the landfill at that time, that’s still quite a few tons a day out of the 1,500 tons that you get per day. I mean, even though that’s a small amount, somebody is obviously using the facility.”

Ms. Erlenwein said, “Joe, do you remember, on Sunday, I think, it was 150 tons a day. That was a weekend average with the 304. Sunday’s was much less than Saturday.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Well, I just think that we ought to have some requirement that there are hours of operations every day of the week, as we’ve done in the past. I can see people driving all over town, trying to find one or two of these people open on Sunday and then it ends up in a ditch somewhere. They don’t want to keep it in their pick-up until the next day. I just think it’s going to be a real educational nightmare . . .”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Something like that could be added to the regulations if the Board desires."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I'm not dictating how many hours in a given day, I'm just saying they need to be open every day, whether it's four hours in the afternoon, from one to five, or whatever the case may be. I think you need to have the service available. I'm sorry. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you. Susan, did the Solid Waste Management Committee talk about hours of operation at all, in their discussions on these regulations?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Not to my recollection. I think it may have come up once but they never voted on any recommendation."

Commissioner Winters said, "Just as a suggestion, I, and again this is just a suggestion, I'd like to proceed on with this Resolution as it is, and if we have questions about that, maybe that's a question we can send back to the solid waste management committee and ask for their input about hours of operation. I agree there's a concern there and I understand that. I just hate to have us make a quick decision, having just sat here and just started thinking about it five minutes ago, and add it in as an absolute have-to in this Resolution. So, that's why I'd like to have the input of the Solid Waste Management Committee."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Could we defer this for a week. Is there a time crunch to get this done?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "There's not a time crunch to get this done. I won't be here in a week."

Commissioner Winters said, "I don't think, in a week, I don't how you can get, there no regular Solid Waste Management Committee meeting scheduled until January."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "In fact, it's the last Monday in January when the next committee meeting is."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I'm really surprised that we passed up the whole idea of hours of operation. That just really surprises me. I think it's going to cause the County and the City some problems with trash and other things and I think it's going to cause some customers some problems. I know we have to go through the educational process but I'm just surprised that I didn't think of it, I never asked, we should have thought about hours of operation. When you turn it over to the private sector that's great, that's what business is all about but I don't think you just leave it up to them to decide when you can come and dump your trash and if they decide they're going to be closed Saturdays and Sundays, your phones are going to ring off the wall."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Yes, and as I mentioned earlier, we did consider it, but felt that it would be better taken up in the condition use permit."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Well, and see, if I was County Commission, I would approve a transfer station that couldn't be open at decent hours to allow everybody to dump their trash as they have in the past."

Commissioner Hancock said, "The only thing that we could do is set a minimum number of hours. We couldn't set the hours."

Chairman Schroeder said, "No, and that's what I said earlier. As long as they're open some time on Sunday."

Commissioner Hancock said, "If I might make a suggestion. I'd like to go ahead and approve these and then offer these up to the Planning Committee and bring back a recommendation. We can always go back and amend it. If that's okay, that would work for me."

Chairman Schroeder said, "That's great. Of course I won't be here. So there won't be anybody to argue the case."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I'll carry your . . ."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I'm serious though. I'll go ahead and approve it today, but I'm going to tell you, I think there's a greater than fifty/ fifty chance that it isn't going to happen that if, given time . . ."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I'd like to hear what those who are thinking about doing transfer stations, what they have to say about it and it may surprise us, but somebody's going to be open."

Chairman Schroeder said, "I would hope so. I just think we need to be careful. I'm not suggesting when, what hours they're open, I'm just suggesting that maybe we need to set a minimum number of hours somehow like Commissioner Hancock said, again."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "I can certainly take that to the Solid Waste Planning Committee and bring it back to you."

Commissioner Hancock said, "That would be good. I'd like to hear what everybody has to say there."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Any other discussion?"

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Winters seconded the Motion.

Commissioner Hancock said, "Susan, we had discussed, and I just wanted to make this clear, we had discussed, you and I, anybody who walks into my office and talks about these regulations, we discuss the size requirement of the various lots. It's the property that one is going to be sited on and one thing that was in there that I want to make perfectly clear to those out there listening who might decide in future they want to put one of these in their neighborhood. That size requirement is not chiseled in granite. It's not unchangeable. With a good plan, the Board of County Commissioners reserves the right to approve different sizes of lots and different kinds of operations."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "That's correct. We have a variant statement in the regulations that if they do not meet these requirements for size of lot or buffer setbacks they can come before the Board and show that their plan will work on a smaller acreage."

Commissioner Hancock said, "I think that makes good sense because if a plan comes in that makes good sense, that works on a small acreage with a different kind of a setback, we need to approve it. We shouldn't be so strident that we can't change and adapt. I appreciate that and I just wanted to make that clear to everyone that I did get my way on that, finally, thank you. It fits in with what Commissioner Schroeder is talking about and that's the consumer on the weekends and even the consumer during the week. In my neck of the woods the landfill is not very close so in some instances made our landfill along county roads and even I find it very difficult to load up stuff that I'd like to take to the trash dump on weekends that I don't ordinarily set out at my curb, but it's a long haul from where I live. I mean, a really long haul. So, it's been my vision that there may be instances where small ones are located. Maybe not, maybe it's the most ridiculous notion in the world, but at least I'd like to have the opportunity for them to be there."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Yes, and the current regulations would address that."

Commissioner Hancock said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all I had to say."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Fine, thank you. Any other questions or comments? If not, Clerk call the vote."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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, Susan. Good work. Thank you, Jennifer. Joe, good luck to you. Next item please.”

I. AGREEMENT WITH MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, INC. TO PROVIDE CONSULTING SERVICES.

Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Earlier in the day, you approved a letter of intent, which allows the decision-making process about when how much money will be spent is deferred. In this request, this is a similar process. We have entered into an agreement with Management Partners to provide consulting services in the past for specific projects. This contract doesn’t identify specific projects but allows us to spend units of \$2,500 or less with them for projects up to a total of \$50,000 before we’d have to come back to you for approval. We think, in this fashion it will give us the flexibility and ability to attack problems in a way that we haven’t been able to do before and is a way in which we’re experimenting, using consultants in this organization. You will be informed of the progress we are making and when we are using them through the reports that I submit to you. I would recommend that you would approve this agreement.”

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.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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."

J. SECOND AMENDMENT TO LEASE WITH MCNEIL REAL ESTATE FUND XXIV, L.P. FOR SPACE HOUSING THE TAG OFFICE LOCATED AT TOWNE CENTER SHOPPING CENTER, SUITE 14, DERBY, KANSAS.

Ms. Jan Kennedy, County Treasurer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We have renegotiated an additional five year lease at our current location in Derby. That's in front of you. They have asked for copies of the cash basis and budget laws to go along with the signed copy of the lease, when it goes to them, so they will have it in their file. I've already requested that from legal. I don't see that that will be a problem. They want us there. We want to stay there. I would recommend that you approve the lease."

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Amendment to Lease 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, Jan. Next item."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

K. DEPARTMENT OF RISK MANAGEMENT.

- 1. CONTRACT WITH PREFERRED PLUS OF KANSAS, INC. TO PROVIDE GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SEDGWICK COUNTY EMPLOYEES DURING THE PERIOD OF JANUARY 1, 1999 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1999.**

Mr. Phil Rippee, Risk Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The following agreements and contracts deal with renewal of our annual employee benefits for 1999. Item K-1 is a contract with Preferred Plus of Kansas to provide a coexisting health plan for our Sedgwick County employees along with our self-funded plan. I would recommend you approve the contract and authorize the Chairman to sign."

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin 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."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

- 2. AGREEMENT WITH BLUE CROSS/BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS TO PROVIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FOR SEDGWICK COUNTY'S SELF-FUNDED HEALTH, LIFE AND ACCIDENTAL DEATH AND DISMEMBERMENT INSURANCE COVERAGES FOR SEDGWICK COUNTY EMPLOYEES DURING THE PERIOD OF JANUARY 1, 1999 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1999.**

Mr. Rippee said, "Again, Commissioners, this is an agreement with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas to administer our self-funded health plan and to provide life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for our employees. I would recommend you approve the Agreement and authorize the Chairman to sign."

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."

- 3. TWO-YEAR GROUP VISION CARE POLICY, A PART OF THE FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN FOR SEDGWICK COUNTY EMPLOYEES, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1999 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2000.**

Mr. Rippee said, "Commissioners, this is the formal adoption of a second two-year period group vision care policy provided by Vision Services Plan, VSP, for those employees who voluntarily elect to participate in a vision plan. This policy entails no cost to Sedgwick County and my recommended action is to adopt the policy."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to adopt the Policy.

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. SECOND-YEAR RENEWAL OF A THREE-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH DELTA DENTAL PLAN OF KANSAS, INC. TO PROVIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FOR SEDGWICK COUNTY'S SELF-FUNDED DENTAL PLAN, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1999 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1999.**

Mr. Rippee said, "Item K-4 merely approves the second year renewal of a three year contract or agreement with Delta Dental to administer our self-funded dental plan. My recommendation is to approve the Agreement renewal."

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Agreement renewal.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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, "Bill, thank you. As always, great job. I don't think too many people realize how much money this man saves the taxpayers every year and what he does and I personally want to thank you for the great job that you do for the County and the employees and for the taxpayers. Appreciate it very much. Next item please."

L. DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES.

- 1. RESEARCH AGREEMENT WITH UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER RESEARCH INSTITUTE, INC. WHEREBY COMCARE WILL PROVIDE A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COGNITIVE ABILITIES, LEVEL OF AROUSAL AND FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE IN SCHIZOPHRENIA.**

Ms. Deborah Donaldson, Director, Division of Human Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This first Agreement you have before you is between COMCARE and KU Medical School. One of our values is to support and participate in research. In fact, we have a committee who reviews these types of proposals and we move forward with those whenever we can. I would recommend your approval."

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, December 16, 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."

2. CONTRACT WITH WICHITA CHILD GUIDANCE CENTER TO PROVIDE MEDICAID WAIVER HOME- AND COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED YOUTH.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this again, is a contract. I think you've probably seen one each of the last two weeks with different agencies with rights to provide services through the Children Mental Health Waiver. I would recommend your approval."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Discussion? 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."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

3. ADDENDUM TO PROVIDER AGREEMENT WITH MENTAL HEALTH CONSORTIUM, INC. OUTLINING SERVICES AND PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this particular item is the health wave program. That is the new health insurance program and we will be working with the Mental Health Consortium to provide behavior health, that means mental health and substance abuse services and managing those dollars for individuals who will participate in this program. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Debbie. Discussion?"

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the Addendum to Agreement 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."

4. DELETION OF ONE ADVANCED REGISTERED NURSE PRACTITIONER POSITION, RANGE 27, FROM, AND ADDITION OF ONE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF MENTAL HEALTH POSITION, RANGE 29, TO, THE COMCARE STAFFING TABLE.

Ms. Donaldson said, "Commissioners, this is the result of some reorganization that we had done internally within the COMCARE Community Health Center area and I would recommend your approval."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the adjustments to the COMCARE Staffing Table.

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, Debbie. Next item please."

5. GRANT PLAN FOR JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY INCENTIVE BLOCK GRANT.

Mr. Mark Masterson, Director, Department of Corrections, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Both Richard Vogt, our consultant to Corrections from Information Services and I will be speaking to you briefly about this Agenda Item. Two weeks ago we received word from the State Juvenile Justice Authority of the award of a federal block grant to local government for juvenile crime programs. This program, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant, will award \$287,461 to the City of Wichita and \$167,470 to Sedgwick County to be spent over two years, starting in March 1999.

"The block grant is one-time money intended to promote greater accountability in the juvenile justice system. Our task was to develop a plan for this award and present it to the State by December 18th. This part of the presentation is coming a little bit later.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“In organizing this project, the City and County agreed to combine funds under one plan. A local juvenile crime enforcement coalition was formed to examine system needs and develop a plan for the funds. The coalition was composed of 18 members representing law enforcement, district attorneys, juvenile court, court services, schools, COMCARE, prevention, both Commissioners Winters and Miller participated on the coalition, the City Manager’s office, it was a large group and Andy Bias represented the public, was a citizen representative. Many of the members on this coalition were individuals that worked on the juvenile justice community planning team and we relied heavily on that recent assessment of needs in developing our plan for these funds. As you may recall from that work, a common barrier in juvenile justice is a lack of a client information system linking agencies to provide accessibility of information and tracking of youth in the system.

“The plan we propose will enable Juvenile Justice system, schools, and social service providers to make better informed decisions at various points throughout the system. The project will involve a computer linkage of these various entities so at one station you can sit down, enter the individuals name, for example at Intake and Assessment, and it will query data bases at the various agencies and provide you with information so that you can make better decisions.

“The project will involve purchasing professional services to analysis, develop, implement and maintain this central server solution to address this need. It will position us to be ready for the State system that is presently being developed, to be able to interface with that. In order to receive this \$456,000 a local cash match of \$50,770 is required. We’ve identified those funds in the County budget and that was the agreement with the City. They would provide their share of the money to put this under one plan if we would provide the grant match. Since we’re in the juvenile justice business, we did agree to do that.

“I’d like Richard Vogt to put up a diagram and quickly show you how this would work.”

SLIDE PRESENTATION

Mr. Richard Vogt, EDP Project Leader, Information Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The diagram that you see before you is a representation of the configuration of the proposed regional interagency juvenile justice information system that the grant would fund. As Mark mentioned, the objective of this particular system would be to give every user of juvenile justice information in this region one place to go, one stop shopping for all the information they need. Perhaps the best way for me to describe the system would be for me to give you an example.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

“There’s an assistant District Attorney who is preparing sentencing recommendation on a particular case, in a post-adjudication situation. She needs to know all the information about a particular juvenile. Currently, she would either have to call or write all of the various agencies that you see represented or she would have to somehow get access to all of the software that all of these agencies data-bases, through which they get access and put them on her PC and get access in that direction. In either case it’s time consuming and a fairly cumbersome approach.

“With this process, what she would do is simply enter the juvenile’s name into a webpage on her browser that she already has on her PC. That name would be submitted to the central server. The central server would have the brains of the system. It would act as an electronic user, an electronic operator, literally signing on to all of the systems that you see represented there. As each system responds and send back information about that particular juvenile, it would collect that information into one report and return that report directly to the web browser. As you see, we are not asking any of the agencies to change their systems to accommodate this central server, neither are we asking the users to put specialized software on their PC to access. We’re asking them to used proven technology to get access to this information.

“The key there is the central server. That’s where the grant monies predominately would be spent. In terms of a specific up-front expenditure cost that the grant would pay for, primarily we’re talking about hardware and software costs for the central server. Probably about 20 percent of the cost will go to hardware, about 70 percent of the cost would go to developing the software to put the smarts on the central server and the rest would go to networking, go out and buying routers for . . . only three agencies there do not currently have access to the County’s backbone. But to use that money, the rest of that money to provide routers, switches, hubs, those types of networking equipment that’s necessary to bring them on-line. Another concern with the grant is what the ongoing costs are and those also come under four categories. One would be network maintenance which Information Services currently has the expertise to maintain so there wouldn’t be additional cost there. Product support, maintenance, that is hardware and software support for the central server. Again Information Services can supply some of that but we also intend to get grant money and use grant money for a long-term maintenance contract on the operating system and on the hardware. Telecommunication costs, there’d be a bit of an increase on telecommunication costs and ongoing costs there probably to the tune of about \$300 per month to bring the Wichita Children Home and schools and SRS in but hopefully we can share that among all of the agencies, all the participants. Finally, there would be software maintenance costs and software maintenance issues that we would try to work out the best deal we could with the vendor who is going to be supplying the software to provide ongoing software maintenance. Information Services can take on some of that responsibility as well. Questions?”

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

Commissioner Miller said, "No questions, Mr. Chairman, just a comment. Just a summarizing comment. It was a pleasure to be a part of the committee that reviewed this grant opportunity and it was a competitive situation. There were grant participants, programs and projects that were certainly worthy of, if not funding now, certainly worthy of looking at how it is that we as a County can fund them. One in particular would be the DA's diversion program and another would be a new, it's not necessarily new, but for us it would be a new system, therapeutically dealing with offenders and their families but when you think about the holistic picture here, we're talking about being able to communicate effectively amongst every partner that is within our County and I think that is the key to why it is that this funding request that is coming before us is definitely going to be the best route to go. It builds linkages that are intact but not linked together. So, it's a pleasure for me to say that, once again, Sedgwick County is ahead of the curve. We've been there when it comes to juvenile justice. We're going to be able to further ourselves with this grant awarding. Thank you."

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

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you. I just wanted to say I certainly appreciate Mark Masterson's work on this. When I was notified that Juvenile Justice was making this block grant award I called Debbie and Mark and said, 'it appears we need to move pretty quickly on this' and maybe moving under pressured time lines got us right along but there were a couple of real long meetings discussing these issues, and as Commissioner Miller said, there were many suggestions about how to use this money but I think we've really come up with a good plan of this interlinking system of communications and it's sure going take somebody with Richard's expertise to figure out how that works, so we appreciate his work on this, too. I think it's a good plan."

"The only question that I have right now is, does it appear that this amount of money will get us completed on this process or is that still kind of a toss-up, whether there's enough here to do this job?"

Mr. Vogt said, "That will certainly be part of the RFP. I believe that there is enough money. Just seeing the very brief explanation that we've had in the last week or so, I believe there is enough money in this grant proposal to do certainly for all of these agencies."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay, thank you. As we continue on with this Juvenile Justice process, this will be one of the real kind of foundations that we can use as we begin to put the other programs into act and as we try to strengthen the system with new kinds of procedures. This was really kind of a very fortunate grant award to us, to get this money to proceed on with this project. So, good job, both of you."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you. Great presentation. Appreciate it. Further discussion? If not, what's the will of the Board?"

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to approve the Grant Plan.

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."

M. CAPITAL PROJECTS DEPARTMENT.

1. AMENDMENT TO THE 1998 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS - YOUTH SERVICES. CIP #1998 PB-405.

Mr. Kenneth W. Arnold, Director, Capital Projects Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This item is on page 183 in your backup. It involves remodeling of an existing court hearing room in the Juvenile Detention Facility. It will house three personnel that have similar functions, work stations, carpeting, painting, electrical work. Sets aside the amount of \$10,000 for that particular project. It has been reviewed by the courts, as far as their not needing to use that room. I'd recommend that you approve the CIP and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to approve the CIP amendment.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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, Ken. Next item please."

2. FACILITY CIP PROJECTS MONTHLY UPDATE.

Mr. Arnold said, "Your backup pages 184 through 193 is your report and I would like to highlight just a couple of projects and then be happy to answer questions. Page 188, at the top of the page, the District Attorney's office remodel, as your aware, we're building a work room, remodeling a restroom, recarpeting and repainting. That project, the majority of it should be completed right after Christmas and the last of it right after the first of the year. So, it's moving ahead very well.

"On page 189, at the top of the page, the mechanical system changes in the Munger Building. That project, again, is moving on very well. It should be completed here shortly. We will follow that on then with some recarpeting, repainting and some wall coverings, as we need it to bring that building back up to speed.

"The last item is on page 190. It's the Kansas Coliseum, page 191. They're in the process today and tomorrow of doing some master planning at the Coliseum on what they're going to do with that facility and where they're going to go in the future. Of course, you're all invited to attend those if you're able to. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have."

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

MOTION

Commissioner Gwin moved to Receive and file.

Commissioner Miller seconded the Motion.

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

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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, "Thanks, Ken. Next item please."

N. WAIVER OF POLICY TO HIRE A DIRECTOR, FLEET MANAGEMENT AT RANGE 27, STEP 5.

Mr. Bob Lamkey, Director, Division of Public Safety, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Earlier this month we held a competitive selection process to choose a new fleet manager. The individual that the committee selected comes to us with 25 years of managerial experience, the last year and a half in the aviation industry. In reviewing the skills and experience that the individual brings to the table, it appears that it's most appropriate to compensate him at range 5 in the classification schedule, or step 5 and range 27, which is the classification schedule for the Fleet Manager. There is no impact to the Fleet Management budget by doing this."

Chairman Schroeder said, "Thank you, Bob. Discussion on this Item? If not, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Miller moved to approve the policy waiver.

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, "Thanks, Bob. Next item please."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

- O. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF A PORTION OF THE DIVISION OF HIGHWAY FUND MONIES TO THE SPECIAL ROAD AND BRIDGE BUILDING MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT AND BRIDGE BUILDING FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF K.S.A. 68-141G. ALL DISTRICTS.**

Mr. David C. Spears, Director/ County Engineer, Bureau of Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Item O is a resolution to transfer the balance of our budget from the Division of Highway Fund to the Special Road and Bridge Building Machinery, Equipment and Bridge Building Fund at the end of the calendar year in accordance with K.S.A. 68-141G. I'd recommend that you adopt the Resolution."

MOTION

Commissioner Hancock moved to Adopt the Resolution.

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, Dave. Next item please."

- P. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' DECEMBER 10, 1998 REGULAR MEETING.**

Mr. Darren Muci, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "You have Minutes from the December 10th meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts. There are seven items for your consideration."

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

(1) HOTMIX OVERLAYS- PUBLIC WORKS
FUNDING: PUBLIC WORKS

Item one, hotmix overlays for the Bureau of Public Works. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Cornejo and Sons. That amount, \$44,680.25.

(2) BORING/ TRENCHING FOR WATER LINE PLACEMENT- SEDGWICK COUNTY PARK
FUNDING: SEDGWICK COUNTY PARK

“Item two, boring and trenching for water line placement for Sedgwick County Park, Sedgwick County Zoo. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Phillips Southern Electric. That amount, \$10,973.93.

(3) CARPET TILE FOR AUTO LICENSE- CAPITAL PROJECTS
FUNDING: CAPITAL PROJECTS

“Item three, carpet tile and placement for the auto license division of the County Treasurer’s Office for Capital Projects. It was recommended to accept the only bid received of Scott Rice. That amount, \$9,608.20.

(4) NETWORK LASER PRINTERS- INFORMATION SERVICES
FUNDING: INFORMATION SERVICES

“Item four, network laser printers for Information Services. It was recommended to accept the low bid meeting specifications of R G Enterprises, Inc. That amount, \$58,800.00.

(5) LAWN TRACTORS- PUBLIC WORKS
FUNDING: PUBLIC WORKS

“Item five, various lawn tractors for Public Works. It was recommended to accept the low bid meeting specifications of Andale Equipment. That amount, \$11,480.00.

(6) PERSONAL COMPUTER HARDWARE & SOFTWARE- COMCARE
FUNDING: COMCARE

“Item six, personal computer hardware and software for COMCARE. It was recommended to accept the low bid of Americomp. With the exclusion of a couple of items, that total amount \$100,064.84. Two pages of complete tabulation follow.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

(7) I.V. SOLUTIONS CONTRACT RENEWAL- EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
FUNDING: EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

“Item seven, I.V. solutions contract renewal for Emergency Medical Services. It was recommended to accept the bid of General Medical Corporation. That amount for 1999, \$21,716.63.

“If there are any questions, I’ll be happy to take them and would recommend approval of the Minutes provided by the Board of Bids and Contracts.”

Chairman Schroeder said, “Thank you, Darren. Discussion on this item?”

MOTION

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

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, Darren. Next item please.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

CONSENT AGENDA

Q. CONSENT AGENDA.

1. Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment Contracts.

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Rent Subsidy</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Landlord</u>
V98048	\$351.00	5	Springcreek Apts.
V98058	\$405.00	5	Monte Helms
C98049	\$335.00	5	Cottage Grove
V98047	\$328.00		Leonard A. Smith
V98046	\$225.00	2	C-RAE Enterprises
V98061	\$324.00	5	Helms Rental Properties
V98060	\$269.00	5	Cottage Grove
C98056	\$341.00		Walnut River Apts.
V98055	\$375.00		Guys Rentals
C98054	\$445.00	5	Springcreek Apts.
V98053	\$293.00	5	Iva Helms
C98052	\$322.00	4	Curtis Whitted
C98051	\$205.00	3	Brentwood Apartments
V98050	\$456.00	2	Ron Weems
V98062	\$378.00	5	Cottage Grove

2. 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>
V95151	\$212.00	\$149.00
V97067	\$204.00	\$201.00
V97069	\$300.00	\$203.00
V94116	\$254.00	\$248.00
V96061	\$326.00	\$410.00

3. Donations (six) to COMCARE totaling \$110.00.

4. Order dated December 9, 1998 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

5. Consideration of the Check Register of December 11, 1998.

6. Budget Adjustment Requests.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Type of Adjustment</u>
980661	Kansas Coliseum	Transfer
980662	Kansas Coliseum	Appropriation Reduction
980675	Personnel	Transfer
980676	Emergency	
	Communications	Transfer
980677	Affirmative Action	Transfer
980678	Intergovernmental	
	Relations	Transfer
980679	District Attorney	Transfer
980680	Emergency	
	Communications	Transfer
980681	Emergency	
	Management	Transfer
980682	Capital Projects	Supplemental Appropriation
980683	Appraiser	Transfer
980684	Court Trustee	Transfer
980685	Detention	
	Facility Expansion	Supplemental Appropriation
980686	Stream Maintenance	Transfer
980687	Aging-Physical	
	Disabilities	Transfer
980688	Aging-Senior Care Act	Supplemental Appropriation
980689	Aging-Medicaid	
	Case Management	Supplemental Appropriation
980690	Aging	Transfer
980691	Purchasing	Transfer

Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “You have the Consent Agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it.”

Regular Meeting, December 16, 1998

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

Chairman Schroeder said, "Any other business to come before this Board. If not, we stand adjourned."

R. OTHER

S. ADJOURNMENT

Regular Meeting, December 16, 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

BILL 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:

_____, 1999