

## MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

### REGULAR MEETING

**June 19, 2002**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:00 A.M., on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Ben Sciortino; with the following present: Chair Pro Tem Betsy Gwin; Commissioner Tim R. Norton; Commissioner Thomas G. Winters, Commissioner Carolyn McGinn; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Marvin Krout, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. Andy Schlapp, Project Manager, County Manager's Office; Mr. Brad Snapp, Housing Director, Housing Office; Ms. Annette Graham, Director, Department on Aging; Ms. Marilyn Cook, Director, Comprehensive Community Care (COMCARE); Mr. Bob Lamkey, Public Safety Director; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Mr. Jerry Phipps, Purchasing Agent, Purchasing Department; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications and Ms. Lisa Davis, Deputy County Clerk.

### **GUESTS**

Ms. Lynn Wasinger, Outreach Specialist, Community Housing Services.  
Ms. Beth Oaks, Vice President of Community Planning and Resources, United Way of the Plains.  
Ms. Margarita Lafarel-Hunt, President, Multi-culture Celebration.  
Ms. Christa Blades, Catholic Charities.  
Mr. John Fenwick, Instructional Coordinator, KPTS.  
Reverend Tyrone Gordon, Pastor, St. Mark's United Methodist Church.  
Mr. Clarence J. Smith III, 2205 S. Crest, Wichita, Ks.  
Mr. Eldon L Beck, 1907 S. Ridgewood, Wichita, Ks.  
Mr. Robert Kandt, 2224 Clay Lane, Wichita, Ks.  
Mr. Leonard I. Christmore, 2246 S. Greenwich, Wichita, Ks.  
Mr. Mark Eggel, 2240 S. Crest, Wichita, Ks.

**INVOCATION:** The Invocation was led by Reverend Titus James of North Heights Christian Church, Wichita.

### **FLAG SALUTE**

### **ROLL CALL**

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

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:** Regular Meeting, May 29, 2002

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of May 29, 2002.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Commissioners, you’ve had a chance to review the Minutes of the May 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. What’s the will of the Board?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 29, 2002.

Commissioner McGinn seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Next item.”

**PROCLAMATION**

- A. PROCLAMATION DECLARING JUNE 17 – 22, 2002 AS “MULTICULTURAL CELEBRATION WEEK.”**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “I’d like to read into the record this proclamation. It says:

**PROCLAMATION**

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**WHEREAS**, the Sedgwick County community thrives because of the diversity of its residents, with endless opportunities to recognize and celebrate our different heritages and cultures. And, to capitalize on this diversity, we must work together in schools, places of work and in our neighborhoods to remove the barriers that keep some individuals from reaching their full potential; and,

**WHEREAS**, the purpose of the Multicultural Celebration and Education Association (MCEA) is to increase the awareness and education of the community toward the diverse racial, ethnic and cultural groups and to explore ways to create harmony, understanding and appreciation of the diversity within the community and the world; and,

**WHEREAS**, the major objective of the MCEA is to increase awareness of our diverse population, to initiate community involvement, and to promote the diverse values and cultures; and,

**WHEREAS**, we can all look for ways to share our heritage and participate in events that promote a better understanding of others;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that I Ben Sciortino, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim the week of June 17- 22, 2002 as

**“MULTICULTURAL CELEBRATION WEEK”**

in Sedgwick County and call upon others to benefit from the work of the Multicultural Celebration and Education Association, and learn more about the various cultures that live in our community.

And I believe we have someone here to accept the award.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner McGinn moved to adopt the Proclamation and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin                      Aye

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. And I believe we have someone here to accept the award.”

**Ms. Margarita Lafarel-Hunt**, President, Multi-culture Celebration, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I want to thank you all for giving us a proclamation for this week of celebrating multi-culture. Today I also have two guests with me but before they speak, I would like to say a few words if that’s okay. Again, I want to thank the Sedgwick County Commissioners in proclaiming this week as celebrating Multi-culture Week. I especially want to thank some of the County staff, such as Ms. Payton and Ms. Tyler. Also Sheriff Steed and Sedgwick County Fire and EMS Departments and other organizations such as Catholic Charities, Hispanic Network, Wichita Area Chamber and the Wichita Wranglers.

This year, we have added five character traits, such as respect, responsibility, integrity, self-discipline and caring into our theme. We have an opportunity here in Sedgwick County to learn, to understand and appreciate the differences and the similarities of all people. I’m inviting the County employees, the County Commissioners and the community not only to experience the diversity in our community but to celebrate it as well. As for example attending some of the following activities: KPTS will be having an open house today and their open house is from 11 to noon, Patrol North will be having an open house tomorrow from noon to 2, but last but not least please join us at the multi-culture night at the Wranglers. Again, thank you for this proclamation and at this time I would like to introduce Christa Blades from Catholic Charities.”

**Ms. Christa Blades**, Catholic Charities, greeted the Commissioners and said, “When I was asked to participate on behalf of Catholic Charities with Multicultural Week, we were very excited and we had an open house at our Adult Education Center on Monday and the theme that we choose was responsibility and the reason being is this. We believe the success of multiculturalism is two-fold. We at Catholic Charities feel responsible for and are committed to providing services that meet the needs of the diverse populations in our community.

Catholic Charities Adult Education Center, an affordable, high-quality adult education program, is just one of our many programs aimed at helping individuals improve their lives, job opportunities and ability to function successfully in our community. Those who need and desire these services play an equally important role in promoting multiculturalism.

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Through their commitment to education, these individuals will not only better themselves, but will ultimately be in a position to give back to the community. So, thank you to the Commissioners for supporting this week. Thank you.”

**Ms. Lafarel-Hunt** said, “Our last speaker is John Fenwick. He’s International Television Coordinator for KPTS.”

**Mr. John Fenwick**, Instructional Coordinator, KPTS, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’d like to be international but it’s instructional but it’s all right. We at KPTS we want to get involved with Multicultural Week because I think a lot of the things we do in the community and a lot of our programming deals with diversity. And today I wanted to ask you and invite you all to our open house from 11 to noon at 320 West 21<sup>st</sup>. That’s KPTS. And I’m always behind the camera. I’m nervous right now. Man. But it’s going to be a good time. We’re going to have some Wranglers out there. Wilbur T. Wrangler is going to be out there and anyone out there in TV land, as Carolyn calls it, anyone out there is invited to get some tickets for tonight’s game, the Wranglers game at Lawrence Dumont. They’re playing Arkansas Travelers today. So, 11 to noon today, KPTS, Wilbur T. Wrangler, we’ll give away tickets and Wranglers players will be there. Thanks a lot.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Margarita, one moment. Is there going to be any food at any of these events? Well, I mean let’s get to the heart of the matter.”

**Ms. Lafarel-Hunt** said, “I wish. This year we’re going to have the same baseball food there. But next year we’re planning to have a three-day event and we will call it the Multi-culture Food Fest. So, next year we will provide food.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “After three tacos, I speak perfect Spanish. Thank you for all your effort. Next item please.”

### **COMMUNITY ENRICHMENT AWARD**

#### **B. PRESENTATION OF COMMUNITY ENRICHMENT AWARD TO REVEREND TYRONE GORDON.**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “This award is going to be presented by Commissioner Carolyn McGinn

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

and she's coming now down to the podium."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Before I begin, I would like to share that we are blessed with a couple of great pastors in our audience today. Reverend Titus James that gave our prayer today is another pastor that's very involved and active in our community and in fact just rehabbed the old YMCA on North Hillside and moved in a few months ago and it looks great. So, I plan to get down there one of these days. I think they've filled in the swimming pool.

But anyway, today we're here to get a Community Enrichment Award to a very special person who, unfortunately, shares that God has called him to leave our community and I don't think we can compete with that. I'd like to share just a little bit about this man and have him make a few comments as well because what I'm going to share, there's much more to the story about his life.

Since moving to Wichita and becoming the senior pastor of St. Mark's United Methodist Church in 1988, Reverend Tyron Gordon has made many contributions to our community. The congregation at St. Mark's has grown from 350 to over 2,500 members. In addition, under his leadership, St. Mark's has developed a free health clinic, which provides health care to persons with little or no health insurance, staffed by medical volunteers.

St. Mark's has also established a non-profit corporation, the St. Mark Foundation. The mission of this foundation is to bring economic life and stability to our community. Partnering with Communities United Credit Union, the St. Mark Foundation helps low-income families obtain housing. The foundation also works with other community organizations with the purchasing and selling of homes to low-income families.

Besides his work at St. Mark's and the St. Mark Foundation, Reverend Gordon is also very active in other community organizations. Reverend Gordon has served on numerous boards such as the Wichita Center of Hope, Salvation Army Advisory Board, Greater Wichita Foundation Board, Wichita Children's Home Board of Trustees and the Wichita Board of Education.

Reverend Gordon has been honored with several recognitions, including the Brotherhood/Sisterhood Award from the National Conference of Community and Justice and the National Citizen of the Year award from Omega Psi Phi Fraternity. Reverend Gordon, would you please come up here.

On behalf of the Board of County Commissioners and all of the Sedgwick County community, we'd like to present the Sedgwick County Community Enrichment Award to you and wish you the best of luck with your journey down in Dallas. And please share a little bit about that and always know

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

that you are welcome to come back here at home and hope you call Wichita your home. Thank you.”

**Reverend Tyrone Gordon**, Pastor, St. Mark’s United Methodist Church, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Thank you Carolyn and the County Commissioners for this award. I’m honored to receive this. I’m going to miss Wichita and miss the people here. I’m going to Dallas to be the senior pastor of the St. Luke Community United Methodist Church, one of our flagship churches within the United Methodist Church in Dallas. And so, I feel a call to go there and I’m just responding to that call. But I thank you and I thank you for your support and thank you for this award. Thank you.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Reverend Gordon, we had occasion I think a long time ago we worked on a campaign of a certain senator that was trying to run at one time. But I know that you’re getting a calling from God and we’re very sorry to have you leave and I guess that means he works in mysterious ways because we can’t figure out any logical reason why he’d want you to leave Wichita but we’ll just accept his decision as being final.”

**Reverend Gordon** said, “Thank you.”

**Commissioner McGinn** said, “I would like to add a couple of other things. When I first met Reverend Gordon and went to his church, they had just finished a big remodeling project and if you know where St. Mark’s church is, it’s in an area of town that does need a little attention and that type of thing. With many churches that move out to the fringes or further out, their church made a decision to stay put and rebuild right where they’re at and it’s a great facility. They’re a neighbor church to where I go, so I get to take a look at what’s going on over there. And I know the people in Dallas are certainly going to be enriched and blessed. If you’ve had an opportunity to hear Reverend Gordon, one of his sermons, you certainly come out floating just a little bit higher. So, I know that Dallas is going to get a great individual down there. Good news is my brother lives in Dallas, so we’ll be dropping in one of these days. So, thank you for being here and congratulations.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Reverend, I just got to ask, you didn’t make the decision to leave after hearing Carolyn play the guitar, did you? We’ll just wait a couple of seconds until Commissioner McGinn gets back up on the Bench before calling the next item. Okay, Clerk, if you’ll call the next item please.”

### **CITIZEN INQUIRY**

#### **C. REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO**

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

### **PROVIDE AN UPDATE OF EVENTS THAT TOOK PLACE DURING NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD WORKS WEEK.**

#### **POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

**Ms. Lynn Wasinger**, Outreach Specialist, Community Housing Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I came before you several week's ago to invite you . . . excuse me, begged to borrow you for cookies if you would join us in Oaklawn for Neighborhood Works Week. That was June 1<sup>st</sup> through June 8<sup>th</sup>. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to come back and give you an update and show you what all was accomplished in that area. And I am sorry. I forgot the popcorn. I'll have to remember that.

Community Housing Services has enjoyed and encouraged as many partnerships as possible in the Oaklawn area and we feel it is in these partnerships that the magnitude of the success of Neighborhood Works Week lies. The name of our project is Let the Sunshine In and I think you will agree it has, in more ways than one.

Our partnership started with Community Housing Services, Oakview Neighborhood Association, Oaklawn Improvement District, Cottage Grove, Sedgwick County, Sedgwick County Community Policing, Cooper Elementary and U.S.D. 260. Our goal was decided on and work began to accomplish it. It was decided to work on the area around Cooper Elementary and at the corner of Chestnut and Juniper.

On May 31<sup>st</sup>, the first of four events took place. Happy Plant Garden in Derby had designed the area in front of the school. U.S.D. 260 formed up the sidewalk and brought in dirt and got it ready to pour. O.I.D., Oaklawn Improvement District had brought in the mulch. Our Concrete in Derby donated the concrete. Smith Construction in Wichita donated the actual pouring and finishing of the sidewalk. That was accomplished on Friday, May 31<sup>st</sup> and the Golden Agers, the Oakview Golden Agers stood guard over it to make sure it didn't get messed up before it got hardened.

Here you see the partnerships represented, Community Housing Services down on your lower right, Community Housing Services board members, including one of the Oaklawn residents that's on our board, the Cooper Site Council and school staff, the Oaklawn Golden Agers, U.S.D. 260, Sedgwick County and of course our wonderful volunteers.

On Saturday, June 1<sup>st</sup>, the yard work began to have event number 2. We have here on your top left is Sedgwick County master-gardener Liz Hanes who came to help us to make sure we got it in right and knew what we were doing. We found we needed additional dirt from what the district had brought in, so we took up a collection on-site and went out and got some more dirt. And across the street, while they're planting plants, we work on clearing out the overgrowth at the corner of

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Chestnut and Juniper and at five of the different residences around Cooper Elementary. Though you see a tractor being used here right now, most of the work on this corner was done by hand, by volunteers and only the top three to four feet of the one remaining tree was visible when we started. It was quite overgrown. But as you can see, the plants were being planted and we were working.

The project expanded, basically also to include the corner of Chestnut and Cedardale and at the baseball diamonds and a stop sign, as you can see now, a stop sign is visible and the house is also now visible, much to the delight of the resident, who can now tell her visitors where to come, they can see her house. And so, as little clowning around we've done, but we still have the big debate as to which one was actually the clown.

But as you can see, the work continued. And on the bottom right-hand side you can see, after we got the flowerbeds around the flagpoles, we included the sidewalk around the flagpoles and the house straight across is one of them that we worked on and were painting on.

Okay, event number three took place on Thursday, June 6<sup>th</sup>. Volunteers from the Farmers and Lions United Agency and EMC Insurance Companies donated time and money to the events of the week. They brought down 15 people and they arrived not only with 15 able-bodied people, but with funds to help pay for the four power-washers that were used during the day. And here you see two checks being donated by the insurance companies and we were privileged to have workers from as far away as Ark City and six of them came from McPherson to help. It was very wonderful of them.

Okay, since we also had paint bleachers added to our original project, they were deciding on who was going to go in to paint and who was going work around the houses there and they trimmed trees and we had several different locations going on. Not only did they trim trees, but they also power-washed and scraped and caulked some of the houses. And this is the power-washing and caulking process going on. We did six houses to wash. Four were to be painted.

Two of them already had siding on them but we did trim trees and bushes around them.

And event four was taking place on Saturday the 8<sup>th</sup> of June, and that was paint day. And Sherwin Williams donated some paint for us. Quite a bit of paint, thank you very much. And some of the residents provided their own paint. And down here on the bottom left you see us getting organized as to who was going to which houses. Up on the top left is the kind of mixing some of the paint so that they would blend the right colors. And over on the right, we're really getting anxious with the painting here.

And so, with brushes in hand, the fun begins. And this group, top right hand side, we had a group from Pine Valley Christian Church including one of the U.S.D. 269 board members came to help. And as you can see, down in the lower right, we have our own County Commissioner Ben Sciortino. Thank you very much for coming to help. We also had Sedgwick County Housing

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Director Brad Snapp on that picture and also David Bailey came to help from Community Housing Services. On the lower left-hand side is some of our staff and the resident is Marty Smith there. And the gentleman on your far left is Leon Gray from the Neighborhoods' Reinvestment out of Kansas City that came to help on the project."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Did you just go grab a wet paint brush out of somebody's hand and walk around?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "No. I did get more paint on me than I did on the house."

**Ms. Wasinger** said, "We actually have some other pictures where he's got paint on him."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Okay."

**Ms. Wasinger** said, "This picture, on the top left-hand side is three of our younger residents that came from Pine Valley Christian Church to help. The lower left is a young lady that came to help us spruce up the whole corner at Chestnut and Juniper. We're adding a new resident to the area and on the right-hand side is two of our community policing."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "That's Brenda Deitzman."

**Ms. Wasinger** said, "Brenda Deitzman and Marty Mooreland and you'll excuse us, we really, really appreciated, I wanted to put a big thank you to the community policing. They are awesome in not only their support but the amount of work they did. They really suck with it to make sure that house got finished as well as another project in the park. So, you will forgive us if we elevate them, even if it is on a ladder.

And here you see the front of one of the houses that was being stained. It had already been repainted. And on the bottom two pictures is one of the other residences that was power-washed over on Chestnut and the group on the bottom left is the Oakview Neighborhood Association and on the right-hand side is Sedgwick County Community Corrections group and thank them very much. They sent out 8 people and it was wonderful. Three of them even stuck around till the very end to make sure we got that very last house finished up. And they were awesome too.

Yes, this is our before and after. This is the same house, slightly different angle. But the one on the left-hand side is being power-washed and the one on the right is after it's finished. And it did make a big difference. This is also another before and after picture. And this is basically a little yard work added to the house being power-washed and painted. And it looks very nice. This one is directly across the south side of the school.

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Like to thank some of our supporters for the Neighborhoods Work Week. This is a few of them. And as of today, we're still gathering numbers, but as of today we've already had over \$5,179 donated to this project and over 650 man-hours of volunteer time and we're still collecting numbers.

We also have a few more on this page, to thank them very much. And as you can see, we have businesses outside our area as well as inside the area for support and partnering.

And a new look and a sunny new beginning for everyone in the neighborhood, including the two new residents and I thank you very much for your time. Wanted to see if you had any questions.”

**Chairmana Sciortino** said, “I don't see that the lights are on but I have a comment or two to make.

This was another example of a project that wasn't a handout, it was a hand up. The people all came together. The housing I was working on, the lady actually had sufficient funds to buy us some of the primer paint that we needed to help. She was out there scraping and you could see that she was taking pride in the fact that she was actually helping, as opposed to just sit back and have people keep doing things for you where maybe you could, I don't know, after a while build a resentment to be so dependent. These people were taking pride that they were actually doing something to help their home and their neighborhood. And the area around Cooper was especially gratifying to me. Those ladies stayed out there, I don't know if it was all night long, but they were making sure that nobody walked on that sidewalk until it . . . I guess it's cured or whatever to call it about concrete, until it healed. But I was glad to be a small part of it and this is just another example of the entire Sedgwick County family deciding to help a portion of the Sedgwick County family. So, I found it very gratifying.

I don't know if they're going to invite me back. I wasn't a very efficient painter. I'm still finding little areas in what's left of my hair that's now a light color of beige. I think it was beige that we were coloring it. But I tried. So, quality wasn't too but the quantity was there. Does anyone else have anything to say. Thank you very, very much and we were very appreciative to be able to be a part of this.”

**Ms. Wasinger** said, “Thank you very much and yes, we'll invite you back any time.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay, thank you. Next item please, Madam Clerk.”

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**D. LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY COUNCIL ON HOMELESS ADVOCACY'S CONTINUUM OF CARE GRANT APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.**

**Ms. Beth Oaks**, Vice President for Community Planning and Resources, United Way of the Plains, greeted the Commissioners and said, "And I'm here this morning to make a presentation on behalf of the Community Council on Homeless Advocacy, of which I'm also a member. Every year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or HUD, releases a notice of funds available to be used for transitional housing, permanent supportive housing and supportive services to help people who are homeless become self-sufficient and adequately housed. Each major urban area is assigned a pro rath in need share of the total HUD funding available and it's based on population, area served and community need. This year's pro rath in need share for the Wichita/ Sedgwick County community is 2.2 million, roughly.

The Community Council on Homeless Advocacy has been working to prepare and submit this application on behalf of Wichita/ Sedgwick County. The application will be submitted by United Way of the Plains to HUD. The deadline for submitting that is this week, on June 21<sup>st</sup>. The projects that we're proposing have been reviewed and ranked by the community through a series of community meetings. Businesses, banks, homeless service providers, Wichita Police Department and many others have been involved in that process. And the application that we're submitting this year will include six projects, five of which are renewal projects.

Those projects, the new one is a permanent supportive housing for singles and families. The sponsoring agency for that is Inter-Faith Ministries, Lee's Transitional Housing Program and a purchase transitional housing program with a sponsoring agency being the United Methodist Urban Ministry, the Safe Haven, or Tiwachonee, which the sponsoring agency is Inter-Faith Ministries and the BRIDGES Program, the sponsoring agency Wichita Children's Home and then Shelter Plus Care, which the sponsoring agency is the Wichita Housing Authority. Our total request that we will be submitting is \$2,270,129.65. Don't forget that 65 cents.

And what I'm requesting of you today is your support of the application for the benefit of homeless citizens in Sedgwick County and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. I don't see that there's any questions at this time. So, is there any comments that any of the members would like to make here at the Board? If not, I'd entertain a Motion."

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner Winters seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you very much. Clerk, next item please."

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

**E. METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING DEPARTMENT.**

- 1. CASE NUMBER ZON2002-00006 – RESOLUTION REGARDING SEDGWICK COUNTY ZONE CHANGE FROM "SF-20" SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO "LC" LIMITED COMMERCIAL TO "SF-10" SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, GENERALLY LOCATED NORTHEAST OF THE GREENWICH ROAD AND PAWNEE STREET INTERSECTION IN AN UNINCORPORATED SECTION OF SEDGWICK COUNTY. DISTRICT #5.**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Marvin, before you start, I know there's a lot of folks here in the audience that have an interest in this item and I want to assure you that we will allow any of you that wish to speak a time to speak. Marvin, go ahead."

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

### **POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

**Mr. Marvin Krout**, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "One zoning item on the agenda this morning and it concerns the area that's outlined in black tip of the arrow. This is just under an acre in size. It's a portion of an original lot, and I show you the original addition in just a minute. It's on Crest Street, which is north of Pawnee and east of Greenwich in the area that's generally known as the Greenwich Heights area. It's an Improvement District that currently does have City of Wichita water and sewer services. It didn't initially when it was platted and this area was originally platted prior to County zoning. And it has an interesting history.

The area has seen a number of splits of those original lots and so, what you see on the map is a pattern of various lot sizes. There are lots, such as the lots to the north and to the south, on Crest Street of this property that are just under 20,000 square feet. This property is just under 40,000 square feet, just under an acre in size. And basically, what the property owner wants to do is to split this lot. It actually is already split, in terms of there being a split that was recorded just two years after the original addition, there was a split recorded. And so these are two recognized in the deed of record as two separate parcels.

But in 1958, County zoning came to this area and all of the gray area was zoned SF-20. SF-20 means 20,000 square feet minimum. And some properties in this area, such as the lots to the north, were developed on those split lots that were under 20,000 square feet, before the County zoning came into being in 1958. This property remained vacant, and so today it can't be built on under the SF-20 zoning, which is the northern portion of this area. It can't be built on on that, because the lot size is just under 20,000 and also the SF-20 has a 100-foot minimum lot width and the total frontage along Crest Street of this current lot is about 160 feet plus. So, each of these lots would be about 80 feet plus and that couldn't be adjusted. It would require either a Board of Zoning Appeals variance or, in this case, the more appropriate thing to do I think is to request zoning.

You can see that this lot isn't just zoned Single-family. Back in 1958, when zoning was created, Greenwich and Pawnee was one of the corners where 600 foot by 600 foot areas of commercial zoning, Limited Commercial were created. They were created without a lot of regard for what the platting or the development pattern was and so, it kind of spills over Crest Street and just happens to go through this ownership today. Technically, probably, one lot could be built on. Either one house could be built on here or one house could actually be built on the southern portion, because the Limited Commercial zoning does allow a smaller lot size.

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

But in order to get two houses on this lot, it would take a zone change and the zone change request is to the SF-10 category. That's the next lowest category. The SF-20 category was meant for suburban housing, where there was not both public water and public sewer. There might not be public water or sewer. There might be one or the other. The SF-10 category is an urban category where public services are available. It's the lowest density single-family category where public services are available. Allows potentially 10,000 square foot lots. In this case we think it's appropriate, because this area does have public water and public sewer available and the adopted Comprehensive Plan recognizing that, calls this low density urban area, and so if property owners are coming in asking to do infill or projects that split the lots into lots that are under 20,000 square feet, the planning staff has been generally supportive.

There have been other requests though in this area. There was a request several year's ago to reduce lot sizes on another parcel in this area to about 12,000 square feet and that was denied by the County Commission.

The staff did recommend approval of this request because it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because, as you'll see in the slides, we think that the character of the area is a mix of housing, with lots that are this size and lots that are larger. The original 8 lots of the addition, and maybe this is a good time to go to that. This is the lot in question and this property owner wants to divide and be able to build on both of these lots. You can see that if you added up the majority of the lots are larger, are the size of this current lot today. But there are a number of splits and you can see, to the northwest, immediately to the north, other areas on the other side of Crest and south, that there was a pattern of splitting and those houses did come in prior the 1958 zoning I believe. But there is a mix of housing in the area and now there are services that could allow for the lower lot size.

So, we think the character of the area is mixed and this is consistent with the plan that's in effect, encouraging infill housing in an addition that has services. We don't think it will have any impact on services. A few years ago, there was concern about whether the water pressure was sufficient in this area to accommodate smaller lots and maybe these two would be one matter but what if we continue to get a pattern. And the City of Wichita did upgrade water in this area recently and they don't feel that there are any problems with supporting increased density of development in this subdivision area in the future.

The Planning Commission had a hearing back in March and there was a protestor and I don't know

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

if he's here today. Was a protestor to the north and he was opposed to the request because he felt that it was out of character with the general nature of the area. That it wasn't consistent with the density that was predominate of larger lots in this area. And as I say, there has been a history of people resisting any increase in density. I think that there was suggestion that the quality of the housing that would come into the area might be lesser if the lot sizes were lower. We haven't found that correlation to be true and I think there's a tendency now towards smaller lot sizes in general and I don't think necessarily that smaller lots would translate into a lower quality of housing than if you built only one house on this lot but I think that was some of the concern with the proposed rezoning and the development of this case.

The Planning Commission did recommend . . . they voted to approve this case at the time and then, after the zoning hearing, we were contacted by property owners who indicated that they didn't feel that the title company had included their ownership in the list that was the certified list that was provided to us and we used as the mailing list. So, we stepped back and we did a new notification to property owners, including a couple of property owners who the title company couldn't verify were on the list but just as a courtesy we sent them to two owners whose names were given to us. And we had a second hearing of the Planning Commission in May. There was no one who came to the Planning Commission meeting and appeared in opposition at that request. The applicant/ owner was there and spoke in his own behalf. And the Planning Commission, by unanimous vote, again recommended that this zoning case be approved.

Subsequent to that, there were numerous protests, written protest petitions filed. And I'll show you those in a minute. This is the original plat of 8 lots which goes to what's now Crest Street. And so, in effect what's happened is they were divided into east and west halves and now the applicant is intending to divide the east half into two lots that would be 81 feet wide each. And this is actually the split that was filed in 1950, after the original 1948 plat that had the larger lots. This was recorded but it was recorded at a time when you could have put houses on each of those lots, because there wasn't any zoning at the time.

And these are the protest petitions that have been filed within 1,000 feet of the area of request. As you can see, it's substantial. It's a majority of the property owners. Whatever their lot size,

### **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

whether they were small lots or large lots, they've indicated that they do not favor this proposed zoning request to SF-10."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Marvin, before you . . . go back to that, just so I can get a feel for it. Is it the ones in the red that are protesting?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "The ones in the red are protesting, which represents over 77% of all the property net of the street right-of-way in that 1,000 foot area."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Just some slides of the area in question. This is looking from Crest Street to the west. This is an accessory building of the lot that backs up to the property in question. So, this is the south side of that lot that would be intended to be developed into two lots. This is the property to the south, immediately to the south of the request. These are the properties to the north and, basically, these are the 80 plus foot lot widths, similar to what the applicant is asking to be able to develop. This is looking from the property, east across the property, to the lot on the other side, which is a larger lot. Generally, what I think what we've seen out there is that the houses have been placed on a east half or a west half or a north or south half of the lot, with accessory buildings and open space on the other, so there is the potential to split and add density in the future. But it's only occurred to a limited extent. This is looking back to the west and that same accessory building that you saw before in the back of the house. This would be one larger lot behind these two lots that are proposed.

And I'll try to answers any questions that you have at this time. Let me just say that the protests require that there be a vote of the County Commission of four of the membership of five, a three-quarter vote, which is four out of five, in order to override those written protests and approve the zoning request. On the other hand, the MAPC has recommended that you approve this request. So, on your first consideration this morning, if there was a motion to deny this request, it would also have to be upheld by four of the five members in order to override the recommendation of the Planning Commission. The zoning code and the statute says that if you don't achieve four votes, one way or the other, the zoning code says that your third option is to return this case to the Planning Commission for reconsideration.

### **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

That's an option here, since I think the Planning Commission may have not been totally aware of the degree of the neighborhood opposition. And if that were to occur, and then it came back to you a second time, the code says that it would only take a majority of three to override the Planning Commission, even if they recommended approval again, only three votes to override that recommendation and deny the request."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "But it would still take four-fifths to approve, since the protests would still be . . .?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "That still remains, unless those protests are withdrawn over the intervening period."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. I think we're going to open it up here in a second for public comment, but we have a question from Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Marvin, tell me just a little more about your statement that you didn't think the Planning Commission maybe knew the extent of the protest. Would they not have that information prior to voting? I mean, that concerns me that we're seeing a circle of influence that has 77.43% protesting and that maybe wasn't considered by the Planning Commission in their recommendation. That concerns me."

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Mr. Krout** said, "Well, and that . . . this isn't the only time that that might have happened. The state law says that property owners can file protests anytime up to 14 days after the Planning Commission hearing. And so, for the most part and in this case property owners don't file until after the Planning Commission hearing.

Now I would say, in most cases where there is this much opposition, you would find more than one person at two hearings appearing in opposition. So, this was unusual from that regard, that there weren't more people who appeared at the Planning Commission or sent their protests in writing or by e-mail to the Planning Commission in advance of this hearing."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Did these protests come in helter-skelter, one at a time or were they delivered all together by a group? Do you have a sense of that?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "I can't tell you. There may be someone here this morning who can tell you that. They're delivered to the County Clerk's office and then we pick them up after the 14 day period and we record them on the map. So, I'm not sure how they came in this time."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay, that's all the questions I have right now."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Marvin, I don't see that there's any further questions at this time of you. So, I would like to now ask if anyone here in the audience would like to speak for or against this item? Why don't you sort of move towards this area and then, as one speaker finishes, the other can speak. And all we ask is that you please give your name, your address and you're entitled to five minutes, regardless of what side of this issue that you're on and we'll listen and we may have some questions of you. So, whoever would like to go first, feel free to stand up and go first."

**Mr. Clarence J. Smith III**, 2205 S. Crest, Wichita, Ks., said, "First of all, I'd like to give thanks to you this morning for taking the time out to hear our protests. My name is Clarence J. Smith. I live at 2205 South Crest. My residence is on the corner of Bellaire and Crest, north of the piece of property in question.

First of all I'd like to cover a little bit of history on the protests themselves and will answer some of the last questions asked, such as Commissioner Norton's. We have 71 protests here, out of a possible 92. The remainder of those 92 were people that could not be contacted because of their work hours and a certain percentage of them were out of state owners that either rent the property or the property was left homeless, structureless, because of the tornado from 1991.

The street in question is three-tenths of a mile long, so this would establish that a 1,000 feet in our neighborhood is not a very big area. These protests were turned in, the Metropolitan Area Planning

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Commission, they have their meeting, you have 14 days in which to file. The protests were being prepared to turn in before the 14-day limit. After their first meeting, they found out that they had to do a remailing, because some neighbors were missed and it was established by us that they did own their property, according to the County Clerk's Office.

At this time, we did not go down and file. We decided to wait until they had their next meeting and we entered our next 14-day grace period to gather these petitions up because of the size of our neighborhood and people working so many different shifts and everything, it's quite time consuming to go out and gather them.

Myself and four of my neighbors that assisted me with it went door-to-door with these protests. When we had the bundle and decided this is going to be as many as we can acquire at this time, my wife took them to the County Clerk's Office and registered them with them before the last meeting, before the Metropolitan Planning Commission's last meeting on this, they were established with the County Clerk.

On the block that's in question here, there's approximately 20 residents on the entire block and I think there's somewhere around seven of these lots that were informally split back in the 1950s, before zoning laws became in effect in that area. To my knowledge, there's only one or two of those smaller lots who are not included in the signatures of these protests.

On the street Crest there's 14 homes and out of those 14 homes, six of the families of those 14 homes are retired individuals. This is some of our biggest concern of my neighbors in this area. They live on fixed incomes. What is not explained in the paperwork, when it comes out for a zone change from SF-20 to SF-20 in our neighborhood is it just tells you there's a zone request being made. It doesn't say that if you get SF-10s and eventually you're annexed into the City of Wichita and the City of Wichita decides that they want to come in and make improvements, that SF-10 properties can require curbs, sidewalks and enclosed rain drains instead of open ditches. This would greatly effect special assessments, which would effect the income of people living on fixed incomes, such as the retirees in our community.

I dare to say pretty close to half of the people in that entire community out there, not just in the 1,000 feet around this piece of property, are retired individuals."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "What percentage was that again?"

**Mr. Smith** said, "I would say it's pretty close to half, Commissioner. Because if you walk our neighborhood, it's like every other house to every third to fourth house is retired individuals. There are quite a few, because the established residents in our neighborhood have been there for 35 to 40 years. I'm personally a newcomer. I've been there six years, come October. My wife and I purchased the property in '94 I believe it was, after the tornado. We had to remove an old basement

### **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

to build our new home on the property. We went to this neighborhood because of the size of the lots, the open and spacious area. From everything I can gather from people that are outside of the 1,000 that were included in the prior request for SF-10 zoning in our area, it's the consensus of the entire area out there that we don't want to go smaller.

Before, in 1998, I stood before the Commissioners here March the 25<sup>th</sup> of 1998 with this same item and, at that time, we had close to 90 protests that were signed."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "How much . . . Your five minutes is actually up but how much more time did you need? I'd be willing to give you a minute or two if you need it."

**Mr. Smith** said, "A couple of minutes, just to finish up."

**Commissioner Sciortino** said, "Okay. Why don't you wrap it up."

**Mr. Smith** said, "In '98, this was brought before the Commissioners. The sewer is another item that I'd like to cover quickly, if I don't get to cover some other items. One of the questions asked by Commissioner Schroeder of Mr. Weber at the time was when we built Four Mile Creek out there we built it with the idea of carrying the existing homes and looking at certain areas that would be future developments and future housing projects going in. He said can we accommodate all of that, plus the infilling of these old neighborhoods. Mr. Weber's answer to him was, it's not without its limits. That was a concern.

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

We do have neighbors, by the way, that are also concerned with the water pressure. They still don't feel like the water pressure in our area has been improved to any great degree whatsoever. And I think that the seclusion, the privacy that we have of the large lots, we even get the pleasure of watching quail feed in our birdfeeders right outside our backdoor. But if we become like Smithmoor, real crowded just north of us there, I don't think we'll get to see that anymore. And I think it's a special assessment that could be brought on by this going to SF-10, backfilling in our area would greatly effect incomes. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Anyone else that would like to speak for or against this item?"

**Mr. Eldon L. Beck**, 1907 S. Ridgewood, Wichita, Ks., greeted the Commissioners and said, "I own property out on Ellison. It consists of over four and a half acres. I acquired that from my mother-in-law and father-in-law. My father-in-law was a law enforcement officer for 30 years in Sedgwick County and that land has been in the family for about 35 years. It's obvious, if anybody was to gain by having this changed to SF-10 it would be us, my wife and I. We could sell this off and split all this four and a half acres up into SF-10 but that's not our wish. We like our wide open spaces.

And the water pressure is also has not been improved there. And it's my understanding that the sewer capacity out there is already at its limit. And I want to thank you for your time and hope you take this into consideration. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "We will. Thank you very much. Next speaker please."

**Mr. Robert Kandt**, 2224 Clay Lane, Wichita, Ks., said, "I live at 2224 Clay Lane, which is this next street over and down. I've lived there since '78. I moved out there because it's wide open. I liked the spaces. The gentleman . . . The Planning Commission said, you know, these homes are all built on . . . the houses are built to one side, one or the other side, or the front or the back of the lot. Well, of course they were because that's the reason they had to be because they had septic systems. They had to have this other open space for their lateral field and in that area it took a large lateral field because of the simple fact that you couldn't . . . the septic system didn't work good and that's one reason the sewers come in. That's what makes it ideal for these ones that want to rezone. They can take that other area and rezone it.

Most of us that moved out there, we moved out there because of the reason of this open spaces.

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

That's what we liked. You know, the last Commission said what do we want to do. Force these people to go out further yet? I mean, you know you try to force them out of town further. And then, like this other gentleman said, you know, if it's zoned to Single-family 10, the City . . . I'm sure that, within the next couple of years, the city is going to annex that area and they redo these streets and the curbs and everything like that, that's going to be an extra burden, which a lot of these people are suffering now from the burden just of the sewer that we put in a few years ago. And if these extra homes come out there, they're going to have to enlarge this sewer system more. They're going to get a double whammy then, on top of the whammy they already got, you know.

And another thing, this area in question . . . the whole area is Greenwich Heights. Now, the people in the 1,000-foot perimeter were the ones that could give the protests to this. Well, if this is approved, I think it's going to be an open door then to anybody that would want to rezone their lot, if they have a lot, they could rezone it. It would be hard to deny it then and this would even go past this 1,000 foot area, so these people out there that are past that haven't even been given the opportunity to protest, you know. They haven't got a notice, you know. So, you have to realize that if you had 80 to 90% protest in this area, you've probably got that in this other area too, clear out around this circle it had there.

The house right along side of me, the guy lives in Florida. I know he would sign the petition, because I talked to him but it's kind of hard to sign over the telephone. And talking about the retired area of people out there. Well, there's a lot of retired people. Right north of me are retired, across the street from me are retired. This house along side of me, the guys in Florida so it's vacant. The people on the other side are retired, you know. And hopefully, in another year, I plan on being retired. So, I wish you'd deny this request because of the simple fact that it's the will of the people out there, you know and I thank you for your time, thank you for your meeting."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Does anyone else wish to address the Board? Yes, sir. Please come forward."

**Mr. Leonard Christmore**, 2246 S. Greenwich, Wichita, Ks., greeted the Commissioners and said, "This is my property here that you're looking at. The property that we're talking about directly is on the east side of mine. I've lived there. I'm an old timer out there. I think probably the second oldest out there now. I've lived out there since 1952 and I've seen a lot of changes. First moved out there, we were on a rural route, gravel road, had to go up to Harry to get our mail. If I had moved down a half a mile of our house I'd have sand roads and look what we've got now. You can't stop progress. Keep it a going.

And I'm so in favor of having two houses built in there because I know what the man is going to do. He's going to have a 1,200 plus square feet, not counting his basement or his two-car garage he's going to have on each house and the lots are the same size as mine was when ours was built back in

### **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

I think 1951. And I'm in favor of him having . . . okaying this to build two nice houses in there, because sooner or later, if he doesn't get to do it, there's something else going to come in and they'll do it then. So, thank you for your time."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Where about do you live in relationship?"

**Mr. Christmore** said, "This property."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "We're going to put up a map that shows that and maybe you could just point, Mr. Christmore. Dim the lights please, so we can see better a little bit. There, now go back to this . . . go one more. Keep going back."

**Mr. Christmore** said, "My property is from right here, clear over to here, Greenwich Road, clear down to here. This here that's commercial is on my property here."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. So you own that big lot and just part of it is effected."

**Mr. Christmore** said, "Now, my building that you showed there is on an acre of land. Counting the road out in front, it is short an acre and with our house, the house is short of the half acre."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. So if that's your outbuilding there that's just there to the west. Okay, got it."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Did you sign the protest petition?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "No, he's for it."

**Mr. Christmore** said, "No, I did not. I will not sign it. I'd like to see the man build two nice houses."

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

**Mr. Christmore** said, "Let it be known to begin with that I would not sign the petition, because I live right there that close to him and I've seen what the man had done over there. He tore down an old house. Makes it look nice, keeps his grass cut down, everything up in good shape. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. Thank you, sir. Does anyone else like to speak for or against this item? If so, please come forward, your name and address."

**Mr. Mark Eggel**, 2240 S. Crest, Wichita, Ks., said, "I'm the applicant. I live directly across the

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

street from this.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “And your last name again?”

**Mr. Eggel** said, “Eggel, E-G-G-E-L. I’m in favor of this. I believe that two houses would help out the neighborhood, improve it. There’s two houses directly to the north of me.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Why would that improve the neighborhood? Tell us about that.”

**Mr. Eggel** said, “Well, I think it would help out that neighborhood and there’s some housing that could use some competition, being fixed up. There’s some houses, some property on that street that just needs simple yard mowed, pick up trash, cars, so forth and by adding some houses in there that would be nice homes I believe that people would pick up the pace and keep their lots a little more cleanly.

And also I’m doing this because I believe it’s matching the street. I mean, to the north of me there’s two houses. To the south of me, over one lot, there’s two houses and then of course to the west there’s a similar lot split. So, I’m not doing anything out of the ordinary in there. And concerning the sewer and water, I don’t see what the difference would be if I built a home that had four bathrooms as if I built two homes that had two bathrooms a piece. We have the same amount of plumbing. I don’t see how that’s going to effect anything in the neighborhood.

And I heard some concerns about traffic. I couldn’t imagine that any traffic would be picked up because of two homes. There’s very little traffic as is on that street, so it’s not the main street into the neighborhood. I live directly across the street. When I first moved in, I don’t think it . . . Yeah, actually it is on there. There was a dilapidated house on the property across the street that had been used for I don’t know what, so I tore that down and filled it in. I’ve been planning on putting a house over there on that lot but what exists there now is just a garage. You can just sort of see the roof of it, on the property that I live now. It’s an apartment/ garage in there. So, I’m just trying to clean up that part of the street there and it’s still a nice neighborhood and I believe it would even be nicer with some new homes on it.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “Can I ask him a question?”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “You certainly can. Are you finished with your presentation? We do have a question. Commissioner Gwin.”

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “Okay. For clarification then, you live across the street. Is that where you plan to live?”

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Mr. Eggel** said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "And so these are homes that you're going to have built or build yourself to sell?"

**Mr. Eggel** said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Okay. That's all I needed clarification on. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "All right. Is there anything else that you'd like to speak to us about? All right, thank you very much. Is there anyone else here in the audience that would like to speak for or against this item? Okay, I'll reserve comments to the Bench. Commissioners have any further comments? I see we have one from Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Marvin, where are the Wichita city limits presently?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Good question. I think it comes down to about the half mile north of Pawnee, which is just above this map. Greenwich Heights is an improvement district and improvement districts are not subject to annexation by the City of Wichita or any cities in Kansas, except by approval of the County Commission or by the consent of the property owners in that district. So, I think that they do hold the destiny of that annexation pretty well in their hands.

And there's also, just to clarify, I don't think that there's any hard and fast rules about the street standards for any future projects that are in the City of Wichita. In fact, a project I remember with similar sized lots the City annexed at 21<sup>st</sup> and 119<sup>th</sup> Street a few years ago, after it was annexed . . . In fact, one of the reasons for annexing it was to come through with specials under the City to pave the streets and even though the zoning automatically converts to actually SF-5 after annexation, which is an even denser classification, when there's a lot pattern of wide lots and it seems that the ditches are handling the water adequately, there may be . . . it may not be what people are used to with underground drains, but if there are wide lots and there wouldn't be culverts every 40 feet then I think that the City has and did in that case, for instance, do specials without curb and gutter and underground storm drains."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Can you give us a sense of how big the improvement district is?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Yeah, I think it's everything that you see on the map and I think it stretches, on the south side of Pawnee as well and may even be into the section that is west of Greenwich. But it's definitely everything to the north and east of Pawnee and Greenwich and additional area beyond."

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Everything on this map is the improvement district, yet there is more to it. Is there any places that the improvement district butts up to the City of Wichita or is it all unincorporated around it?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "I don't think the property immediately to the north . . . I don't know if any of that property has been annexed."

**Someone in the audience said** "There is one property owner in that area, her land is actually split by the City of Wichita."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Is that to the north?"

**Someone in the audience said** "Her property actually overlaps a few acres from where the city limits sign is to the north of it."

**Mr. Krout** said, "That's further to the east."

**Someone in the audience said**, "We're talking about the lady that lives on Greenwich, just north of Bellaire."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. Educate me a little bit on improvement districts. Do they have a board that governs their improvement district?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Yes, just like the Oaklawn Improvement District."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Right. Okay. Do they have covenants or resolutions that guide future development, all of that, through the improvement district board?"

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Mr. Krout** said, "Improvement districts, they don't have their own land use . . . they don't have land use regulations. I think that they're set up for the purpose of providing and maintaining utilities. They can have some other public service functions, like maybe public safety I believe but it's not intended to be a full municipality that can provide all services. The services are limited by state law. And basically the purpose was to establish public services out here."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. That's all the questions I have for right now."

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

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Thank you. Marvin, could you go back to the map that show the protests, properties that have filed a protest? Yeah, I think that is a little different than ours. But ours in the book is hard to see because it's black and white and sideways. Can you comment on the . . . Mr. Smith was talking about that if this was SF-20 and ended up being annexed into the City someday . . . Of course, if it's an improvement district that would be a tough issue, wouldn't it? But I was concerned about the thought of someone forcing curb and gutter, paved streets or something. Can that really happen without the people actually involved in the special assessments voting on that?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "No. For a residential subdivision like this, the City or the County would only move to make street improvements based on the petition of a majority of the property owners that are in that area. And so, whether or not this stays in the County or goes into the City, it would take a majority of the owners to order that in. As I say, I think the City and County have both been flexible on these larger lot situations at the fringe and doing improvements that aren't full urban improvements."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "All right. Well, I'm a little bit torn by this deal. The thing I do remember now, back in . . . when it was, 1997, when we had a similar case. And the thing I remember is I read the background material and I looked at it. I thought, 'Boy, this ought to be a pretty simple deal'. You know, this looks like a good project. Property owner wants to do a good thing, add a couple of good houses. This looks like a good deal. And now I remember getting into that meeting back in '97 and the residents who live out there come and talk about their environment and where they live and they live in a large lot development and all at once what seems to be so simple turned into a lot more complicated than I thought. And I do appreciate Mr. Smith. I got your e-mail talking about that case and it was what appeared to be at that time and why I remember it, it appeared to be a simple deal. As we walked into the meeting room, heard the people talk, it became much more complicated than I thought."

I'm sitting here, I wish that the Metropolitan Planning Commission had had the opportunity to hear

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

all of the comments from the neighbors out there. But I tell you, I'm kind of a toss up here. I'm not sure which way I think I should go. Thank you."

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

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue of improvement districts and annexation is one that I'll be dealing with in part of my district probably in the near future. As we know, those cannot unilaterally be annexed and can only be annexed if the city files a petition with this board and this board approves it. So, unilateral annexation is not an issue on this case.

The other . . . There's a couple of other things. I'm a lot more confident about the sewer capacity of the Four Mile Creek plant than I was a few years ago. In our negotiations with the City of Wichita, when we sold that plant to them and its services, one of the compelling reasons for that sale was the fact that when improvements would be made to enhance the capacity, all of us who were users of the sewer system throughout the City of Wichita would help to pay and to upgrade that facility. As long as it was in the sewer district of Sedgwick County, only those residents were going to pay for the upgrade. And so I think we had . . . I had some concern about that. We'd been collecting impact fees for years to apply to that upgrade and had been able to return those to folks to minimize their specials and now . . . So, capacity issue is not nearly as big a concern, because I know we have a bigger tax base over which to spread those improvements and the impact on folks who use Four Mile will be negligible compared to what it could have been. So, the issue of sewer capacity is not nearly an issue for me as it was.

I appreciate the issue of wide-open spaces but I do see some other lot splits that occurred before this one. And I also appreciate the gentleman who lives behind the applicant's site discussing improvements and the ways to make things better. This neighborhood took a terrible hit back in '91 and as you watch it, some of those folks have not been able to recover. There are some lots that sit in a kind of sad state. So, overcoming the sewer capacity issue is important for me. Trying to do decent infill housing is important to me because we continue to face the pressures of trying to minimize extending public services beyond their limit. We get beat up about it a lot.

And I believe I'm comforted in this one that the applicant who comes to us also intends to continue to be a neighbor. So, I'm comforted that he's not going to build something that would adversely affect his own property value, but may in fact enhance it. So, I feel differently about this one than I did several years ago. I've been able to overcome a couple of important issues I think that prohibited me from supporting it in the past. But I'd be happy to listen to what my colleagues, the will of the Board might be. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

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

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Marvin, you know I was looking at the protest petitions that were filed May 7<sup>th</sup> and I noticed you guys heard the case and voted on May 9<sup>th</sup>. Is that correct?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "Apparently. I didn't know when they were filed but apparently they were filed before the Planning Commission hearing."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Is there a period of time that it has to be in before the Planning Commission has their . . .?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "No. In fact, they're generally submitted after a Planning Commission hearing but they can be submitted any time before or after, within 14 days of the hearing."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Okay."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Generally, we can't tell the Planning Commission what the level of protests are because there may be one protest that's filed at the time of the Planning Commission hearing and then there'll be 70 more afterwards."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Well, and I certainly can see pros and cons to both of these positions, I guess. The folks that moved out there and had it zoned a certain way and then when all the rules are changing on them, I think there's a valid concern. At the same time, I think that you're kind of doing some infill and improving the area. That's a good thing too. But I guess my biggest concern is that the Planning Commission voted on this without even knowing anything about the protests. And also the concern I have about not everyone was contacted within the period of time we thought. I mean, they finally did."

**Mr. Krout** said, "We did do a re-notice but then no one appeared at the second one."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Early on and so I guess, I don't know what my colleagues want to do. I kind of wonder if this ought to go back to the Planning Commission for re-review but I'll listen to what they have to say about that. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Thank you, Marvin and thank all of you because we sit here and, especially on these type of cases, and we really need as much evidence as we can. And as you're hearing right now, this isn't just for us right now a clear slam dunk, yes or no, because

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

there's a lot of variables that we have to take into consideration. With the magnitude of the property owners' protesting, now I personally have to take a hard look at that because this is your community and consensus of the overall majority of the area is saying that we don't want this.

The other thing that concerns me a little bit, and I can understand the one individual that commented that the whole improvement district considers themselves sort of as one unit, but yet they fall outside the 1,000 foot area and they weren't allowed ability to make a comment. I have always been a strong supporter of property rights. I do like the concept of more efficient use of land. That's something that's consistent with our overall Comprehensive Plan is how can we more efficiently use the land so that we're just not out gobbling up big hunks of undeveloped land. This is primarily in the rural area and in general, I'm supportive of trying to figure out how to more efficiently use the land. And, to me, it makes sense if you have 20 acres and you can put 20 homes on there, as opposed to four homes on there, you're not going to have to eat up more and more farmland or at least it slows it up.

But I'm also concerned, like two of the Commissioners have indicated, that I don't think the Planning Commission had the benefit of knowing the magnitude of the protests and, by what Marvin said, I'm assuming a lot of you didn't have the opportunity to go personally and visit with the Planning Commission and express your concern. I think I would be supportive of letting them have a hard look at understanding exactly what . . . I mean, you talk to pushing close to 80% of the people not wanting this, I think they have a right to know that and to listen firsthand to what those complaints are and then see if maybe they . . . because I think they voted on this 11-0 the first time and 12-0 the second time. I was amazed that they would . . . I assumed they had known about the protests and I was amazed that that vote went that way with this great of a protest. So, I'll submit myself to the will of the Board, but I would be supportive of a Motion maybe to move this back to the Planning Commission for further consideration."

### **MOTION**

Commissioner McGinn moved to return this item back to the Planning Commission for further consideration for reasons cited in the record.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I have a Motion and a Second to refer this back to the Planning Commission. Any further comment?"

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "I'm certainly going to support that but I need . . . I think we should point out to those folks who protested that neighborhood opposition is only one of many factors that

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

has to be considered and it has no more weight than any of the others in the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission's consideration. It is a part of the consideration, but only one of many that must be considered. So, remember that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Commissioner Winters has a comment and then Commissioner Norton and then myself."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "I'm going to support this Motion also. In the ten or so years that I've been a Commissioner, it's rare that we send something back to the Planning Commission. We take their advice and we move on and don't try to hold things up. But I do agree that I think it would be important for them to know the number of property owners protesting. But I think the Planning Commission is going weigh their next opinion, weigh it very heavily and if they think this is a workable deal, then it's going to be an important factor for me. So, thank you."

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

**Commissioner Norton** said, "I'd like to hear from the applicant just a minute. Do you already own the property, Mark?"

**Mr. Eggel** said, "Yes, sir."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. Do you have plans, if this zoning split does not happen, to develop and build one home on that property? Have you thought about that, what your next step is?"

**Mr. Eggel** said, "No. I started this process over about a year ago, and so I've been planning to the whole way. And the only way I was going to put one was on the property that I own across the street and two was going to go on the item we're talking about."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. Have you developed property before?"

**Mr. Eggel** said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. Built homes or just developed?"

**Mr. Eggel** said, "I'm a general contractor."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. I'm sure maybe that will all come out at Planning Commission but I wanted just one more, Commissioner. Thanks."

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “And I just have a question too. So you bought the property knowing that there was a little hiccup in what you would like to do? You didn’t know about the zoning?”

**Mr. Eggel** said, “No. I bought it from the gentleman that lives to the south of the property. He owned both lots. I bought it from him assuming that I could just get a lot split and in doing so and going through the MAPC and talking to them, then I figured out that I had to go through this process because the existing lot splits that are there were done before the zoning happened.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “All right, okay. I do want to echo to everyone that the reason I’m supportive of taking this back to the Planning Commission is that I do think that they have the obligation, candidly, to really listen intently to the evidence that the protestors can submit and then, hopefully . . . I don’t know what the outcome of that would be but once they get that additional evidence in front of them, we’ll take a look at what they decide when, eventually, they ever come back to us. I don’t know how long that will be.”

**Commissioner McGinn** said, “A quick question for Marvin. Since we rarely do send these back, Marvin, does the Planning Commission have an opportunity to review our Minutes before they go into their meeting and make decisions?”

**Mr. Krout** said, “Well make sure that we schedule it so they do have them. We’ve done that sometimes in the past but sometimes, when cases have been sent back, they haven’t been sent back with as much discussion as you’ve had today. So, we’ll do that and even though it’s a large notification list, I think we will send courtesy notices, written notices out to all those owners of the rehearing.”

**Commissioner McGinn** said, “Okay, thank you.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “And I would encourage anyone that has an interest in this, either pro or con, to maybe try to make the effort and as many of you that can be present so that you can verbalize your thoughts and feelings to them too. So, okay. We have a Motion and a Second.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “The Motion again is?”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “The Motion is to send this back. You’re right. We don’t do this very often. Mr. Euson, exactly what should the Motion be?”

**Mr. Richard Euson**, County Counselor, said, “The Motion should be to return this case to the Metropolitan Planning Commission for the reasons cited in the record.”

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay. Commissioner McGinn, are you comfortable with that? And the Second is comfortable with that? All right, call the roll please.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**2. MAPD MONTHLY REPORT.**

**Mr. Krout** said, “Commissioners, I’ll try to be brief and try to cover some things that have happened over the last couple of months actually. Our caseload remains at about the same level as it has in the last year and our revenues are also at about the same level as they were last year. They could have been a little higher but we could talk about that at another session.

The Current Plans Division completed their Old Town amendments and we’ve had two new properties that have been added to the Old Town Overlay. So, we see that as an expanding area because of the expansion of the overlay provisions that you approved a month or so ago. We’ve been working with the Subdivision Committee, Planning Commission and with a home-builders’ group on subdivision amendments and we have a set of subdivision amendments and we thought we would put them on hold while we’re talking about alternative sewers and see whether or not there are any additional needs to revise the subdivision regulations as a result of the policies that you’re in the process of developing. So, we did make progress but that’s currently on hold.

In land use, you should have received a copy of the Annual Development Trends report that shows a lot of activity continuing in this area. A survey of property owners and residents and businesses in the McAdams area has been completed and is being shared with the McAdams Steering Committee. The Midtown Steering Committee held their first meeting and has developed a draft vision for their neighborhood plan. Also, just last night, I haven’t found out about it yet, we held our first Spanish-speaking workshop on a neighborhood plan in the Midtown area and I think we’ll see some interesting results from that.

We’ve been working on a number of environmental reviews in older parts of the City of Wichita. These are required environmental reviews on non-profit housing projects and also there was a grant

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

that is being provided to one non-profit for a proposed grocery store at 13<sup>th</sup> and Grove and we did the environmental review for that project for HUD also. Census information keeps coming out and we are issuing new reports, including a new report a couple of weeks ago that's on the webpage, analyzing additional data.

Also, the census issued the new urbanized area for transportation planning purposes. And as we thought it would, it includes the Andover area. So now the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Planning organization needs to be extended and its representation needs to be extended into Butler County to include some representation by Andover and its growth area. And also, based on new definitions, it also extends in other directions, so that Derby and Mulvane are now . . . which weren't part of the urbanized area. We just had Bel Aire, Valley Center, Kechi, Park City, Haysville were a part of the urbanized area. Now we're including Derby, Haysville, Andover, probably Goddard as well and also Maize. Additional communities that are part of the urbanized area which will now be eligible for the urban federal funds, as opposed to the rural federal funds where Dave has been working with them in the past. And so, it means more competition for that money and it means some kind of reorganization that we need to be planning to try to redefine the organization for making those decisions on the disbursement of federal funds and we'll be talking to you about that in the upcoming months. We're trying to get some clarifications on some policies right now from the federal government and what our options are.

Railroad corridors, over the last month or two, have been talked about a lot. The City of Wichita did take some actions. They effect properties that are out in the unincorporated area, with regard to three railroads: the Burlington Northern, Santa Fe, which we expect out in the east side, which we expect to be abandoned in the near future. The City did indicate its interest in rail banking from the Butler County line to I-135 but not into the industrial area to the west of that, where we have some businesses who want to expand into that rail corridor itself. And out in the CKR, the west line that parallels Kellogg.

The City of Wichita officially indicated its interest in extending the rail banking. It had already approved out from 119<sup>th</sup> Street to 167<sup>th</sup> Street, which would mean coming back to the County and trying to do an agreement to transfer the one mile that you had previously rail banked so they would be responsible for all of that eventually. And then, on the Union Pacific, which was not rail banked but is in Delano and the Midtown area. They indicated their interest in trying to piece back together a greenway plan, based on that right-of-way, which is largely vacant. It can become an asset and an amenity for each of those neighborhoods. And devoted some money to land acquisition to help make that happen.

In transportation, beyond that, we've been working with City Public Works and County Public Works on a proposed access management policy and I think that we'll have a meeting scheduled shortly with the County Commission to go over that. The policy has been revised and refined to try

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

to address everybody's needs and I think there is generally a consensus now on what those guidelines should be and that will make the subdivision process smoother, I think, in some cases in the future.

We applied for a two and a half million-dollar grant. I found out the availability, potentially, for this money to look at the possibility of federal funding for an emergency operations and traffic management center. And because it's strongly related to homeland security, which is one of the big things these days for transportation funding, we think that there's some good prospects and we should hear, hopefully in fall, about where that grant proposal goes.

We did receive a million dollars to do planning and design work for a south area transportation plan, which would look at the southeast and southwest quadrants of town and the possible need for completing the belt of highways around Wichita and through Sedgwick County. At some point in the future, and at least trying to protect the right-of-way like we've done on the northwest bypass. In the meantime, over at Kellogg and K-96 where we would see it continuing, there is development pressure right now. So, we're trying to get clarification from the federal government on what we need to do. We think we can avoid maybe any local match to that million dollars and be able to get that study off the ground. There's a lot of consultants interested in working on that already.

We also did do some work in planning awareness. We were out there at Earth Day with 600 kids, taking them through, the middle school kids through a class and also, out at Horace Mann, we took 3<sup>rd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> graders, a few hundred, through an exercise on how they envision the Midtown neighborhood to look when they become adults. And we got some interesting responses from them that we can incorporate, to a certain extent, in the plan and tell their parents all about.

And I've also spent a little bit of time worrying about our department's budget over the past couple of months and we'll probably be talking about that shortly. Okay. Any other questions?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I think we have some questions for you. Commissioner Winters."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "I just had one comment maybe and a little bit of a question. You talked about expanding the urban federal funds and the areas where they could be applied. Will there be an increase in federal funds with the increase in these other communities into this mix?"

**Mr. Krout** said, "In the short term, we're expecting a small increase, probably not proportional to the increase in the population. And the reason for the increase would be due to the fact that all of the metro areas in Kansas were similarly identified and our population grew more than, I think more than Topeka's for sure and maybe a little bit more than Lawrence's and because of that we're expecting a little bit more money of the allocation that goes to the four, based on population, than

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

before. But the numbers that come to the State remain pretty much the same.

Now in congress, over the next year or so, we're expecting a reauthorization of the federal program that's now call T-21, which is the second version of a program that started in the '90s and it's anyone's guess as to whether or not there will be more money in that program than there is currently in this program."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well, I would hope that, as you move forward, I think we've done a pretty good job with David Spears and our Public Works and the City of Wichita's Public Works and your transportation planners in figuring out how we're going to handle that federal money and I would hope that we could keep that balance somehow in perspective, particularly if the amount of communities is going to be increased. I can see the potential there for just needing to make sure how that's going to work. And I'd think we'd have a great deal of interest in being involved in those planning processes."

**Mr. Krout** said, "And I think that two of the key issues are, number one, trying to develop a . . . As most communities with multiple jurisdictions and a lot of competition for funds, like say Mark out in the Kansas City area have, is a pretty systematic way of ranking and evaluating projects against each other on a objective set of criteria and the other is how do you set up the organization and the representation of the people who are actually going to be doing the voting and making those decisions."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "All right. Thank you. That's all I have."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Marvin, would you once again tell us the communities that are now going to be folded into this."

**Mr. Krout** said, "The new communities."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Yeah. I thought I heard Derby, Mulvane, Goddard."

**Mr. Krout** said, "Derby, Mulvane, Andover, Maize and Goddard is not part of the federal urbanized area but we think, from a planning standpoint, the fact that they're a quarter . . . Wichita and Goddard are a quarter mile from each other and one of the fastest growing areas of the County, that it makes sense to include them. So, Goddard is an option."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. Well, I agree that that's going to sort of change the mapping and the scope of the project because there's going to be a lot more people that we have to consider when figuring out how to split this pie up. So, I think there's going to be a lot of discussion and

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

what have you on it. So, that will be very interesting to see how that shakes out.”

**Mr. Krout** said, “And the federal government says specifically that you can’t use a population method of allocating those dollars. It has to be based on merit.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “And you indicated that there would be a different change of the people that would have a voice in deciding who gets what?”

**Mr. Krout** said, “Whole range of alternatives, from adding one or two new members to the Planning Commission when these transportation issues come up, to a whole new type of organization. The federal government would like to see elected officials in the position of making those kinds of decisions and typically, in a community with multiple jurisdictions, like Mark, where you have a council of governments, you have elected representatives of the different communities who are making those transportation planning decisions.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay. Well, it’s going to be very interesting to see how that shakes up. All right, I don’t see that we have any further comment right now.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Marvin. Next item please. Let me just ask a question here. Commissioners, is there any pressing need for a recess, or do you want to continue?"

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "I'd like to go, since she only has like a half an hour left."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. Let's move because we may want to take an Off Agenda item while Carolyn is still here, but I would ideally like to do it when the presenter is going to be up doing her presentation but let's see how we can move along on this. Next item please."

### **F. FUNDING COMMITMENT FOR A NATIONAL GUARD HOMELAND DEFENSE READINESS CENTER.**

**Mr. Andy Schlapp**, Project Manager, County Manager's Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Today you have before you a funding issue for the Homeland Security Readiness Center. Just to give you a little bit of background, a few years ago the National guard here in town was looking for a new armory. At that same time, we were also looking at both Wichita Police and Sheriff looking at having some training opportunities, along with both the Sedgwick County and Wichita Fire Departments. Because of the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, that became more of a pressing issue. There would be less time for planning and more time that we need to have a place where we can actively train, so that when something happens we're ready to react. We don't have time to get books out and have the time for planning that we had before.

Because of that, this new armory took on a whole new dimension and the idea of having a joint readiness center, where everyone comes together and trains, and because of that builds the capacity of our community to respond to disasters better that came forward. During that process, it became very difficult, because you deal with the federal government, the state government and local governments. We really tried to single-focus the first step and the first step is to have the new armory built, the Homeland Readiness Defense Center. And what we need to do is provide 25% of the total project and the City and the County are going to split that. And our portion would be 1.7 million dollars.

Today, what we need to do, for them to get on the budget in January of '03, is they need to have 35% design done. So what we're asking today is that you allocate \$250,000 so they can get that design done so they can submit the plan to the federal government for a review to be put in the federal budget.

So, again, I would ask that we approve the project and authorize the financial commitment of \$250,000 to the National Guard for their 35% design of the Homeland Defense Readiness Center."

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay, thank you. We do have some questions. Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well, I'm going to be very supportive of this. I think the time is right for this. I think this is a project where it shows great collaboration from many levels of government. And as we look at how we're changing in America and even in Sedgwick County, first responders are going to have to be attached together because if you're going to protect and mitigate disasters, whether they be manmade or natural, those people working in orchestration and being trained together on protocols is going to be extremely important and that's what this National Guard Homeland Defense Readiness Center can become."

We have to get through the first phase today, which is moving ahead on the National Guard Armory but past that we need to be thinking outside the box of how we can bring our organizations in the fold and building a density there that will supply good training and protocol administration to not only Sedgwick County but the whole state and maybe even in a regional center. So, I'm going to be very supportive. I'm ready to make a Motion but I know that maybe someone else has comments."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. We do have some comments. Commissioner McGinn."

**Commissioner McGinn** said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Commissioner Norton and I want to thank him for all the work that he's done. He's kind of been one of the lead guys on this to have us take a look at this. I think . . . I too think this is very important, especially for our community. I've never understood why we're not the hub for airlines here in Wichita, Kansas. We sit right in the middle of the United States and I think that this is a perfect location for a Homeland Defense Readiness Center, not only because of September 11<sup>th</sup>, but because there are some other efficiency that could happen and occur with all levels of government, federal, state and local government, especially with our Emergency Management and all the things we do here at Sedgwick County government. I see this as an efficiency gained for our community and for our state and for the midsections of the United States. And I think this is going to be a tremendous asset to our community. So, I'm certainly going to support this. Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. I have a couple of questions here. First of all, in the letter that County Manager Buchanan wrote, I want to make sure there's no confusion here, the bottom . . . it says that we're making available no more than 1.7 million. The last paragraph says the County will make no more than 1.45, that's means after we've given them the 250. But then the second sentence says, 'this will be 12.5% of the total project, or 50% of the local match'. Does that mean if it comes up higher than that, then we're obligated to spend more? I know the no more. I'm pretty

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

understanding of what that means. But that second sentence kind of indicated that if the local match went more than that, then we'd go 50% of the local match. I was confused why that was in there."

**Mr. Schlapp** said, "No. Again, that was . . . and again, sorry for it being a confusion. It was meant to clarify that there has to be a 25% local match and ours will be twelve and a half percent of that."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I got it. Okay. And Mr. Euson, just a housekeeping thing here. Is what we're doing, as far as legally, we're doing something that's legal and everything? You're comfortable that what we're doing is legal?"

**Mr. Richard Euson**, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes, so long as your action is to only obligate you to spend the amount certified, which is the \$250,000."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. Well, I'm certainly going to be supportive of this item. But if there's no other questions, what's the will of the Board?"

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the funding commitment for the National Guard Armory/ Homeland Defense Readiness Center as presented by Andy Schlapp.

Commissioner McGinn seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Is there any further comments? I have a comment from Commissioner Winters."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Again, just for clarification for the record, that today we're taking a funding commitment in the amount of \$250,000."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "And that's the only thing that we're committing to. All right. Any other comments? Clerk, call the roll."

### **VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin                      Aye

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**G. RESOLUTION IMPLEMENTING AND ESTABLISHING A SCHEDULE OF SOLID WASTE FEES.**

**Mr. Schlapp** said, "Today, I bring before you the Solid Waste fee. We must set and adopt the Solid Waste fee for the next year, according to State law, by July 1<sup>st</sup>. This is the fourth time that someone has come before you with this information.

Just to kind of give you a little bit of background on it, the actual dollar figure this year will increase about \$125,000 but the residential rate each customer will be paying less. In '02 the fee was \$5.42. The fee for '03 will be \$4.99. That's about a 9% reduction. The reason for that is that while there are less homes right now with trash service than there were the previous year, we have other sources of revenue, with the transfer station opening and C & D landfills. So, with that other revenue then there were other sources for that money. So the Solid Waste fee was able to be reduced.

On the commercial side, the base rate went down again, because there was an increase in the amount of businesses in our community. So they're seeing, again, the dollar figure is a little bit more complicated because there's six or seven different steps that you go into. But they're going to see, from the base rate, about a reduction of 12.5%. And I would ask that you adopt the resolution."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I think we have some questions and if one particular question isn't asked, I'm going to ask it but I'll wait and see. Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Certainly I'll be supportive of this, because the rates are going down but I would like a little information on the comment that residential users has diminished."

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Mr. Schlapp** said, “And I don’t know what the total numbers are from last year to this year. That was the information and I can’t answer that today but that was one of the factors that was brought into it is that . . . And maybe it’s the total number of houses. I’m not quite sure what that number is. Is that that number decreased but the other revenue sources came in and there was able to be a reduction. That there was not an increase in the number of households, residential households, as compared to last year.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “It would be interesting to get that information. We don’t need to debate it today, if you would get that to us in a memo form just to understand what that is.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Well, that was definitely my question. That was the question I was going to ask and I think we would also . . . because it just doesn’t sound, from an outsider looking in, that doesn’t sound very logical but that would be great to have that information. Any further comments on this item?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Any further comment? I’ll just make one general one. This is a nice trend and it would be nice if we could all of the sudden find other ways that would reduce costs to the citizens. We might support that effort. All right, thank you. Call the roll please.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**H. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND PROVIDING FOR CONTINUATION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY MORTGAGE LOAN PROGRAM; AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE BY SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS AND SHAWNEE COUNTY, KANSAS OF SINGLE-FAMILY MORTGAGE REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS (SINGLE-FAMILY MORTGAGE LOAN PROGRAM), DRAW DOWN SERIES 2002A, IN THE AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF NOT TO EXCEED \$50,000,000.**

**Mr. Brad Snapp**, Housing Director, Housing Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, “That was quite a mouthful to say. The draw-down program is used in conjunction with the single family mortgage revenue bond program and that as people, as homebuyers repay their loans or sell their homes or refinance, the money goes to the trustee. We issue bonds to cover that money and then put the money that we’ve issued that we take the money out into guaranteed investment accounts so that we can recycle it the next time we have a bond issue. So we’re actually able to augment the amount of dollars that we have from the state and private activity bonds with this recycled money.

We ask for reauthorization or a new resolution on the draw-down about every 18 months. So, I just ask that you . . . If you have any questions, I’ll try to answer them. If I can’t, Chuck Bouilly is here from George K. Baum and he can help me.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you, Brad. Any questions of Brad on this item? Seeing none, what’s the will of the Board?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Commissioner Winters** said, "I wish we could have asked Chuck Bouilly and Joe Norton a question or two but we do appreciate their being here if there had have been . . ."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Did you have a question that you wanted to ask?"

**Commissioner Winters** said, "No, I just wished we could have found one. Thank you for being here."

### **I. DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES.**

#### **1. REVISED NOTIFICATION OF GRANT AWARD FOR THE SENIOR CARE ACT PROGRAM, TO BE SUBMITTED TO KANSAS DEPARTMENT ON AGING (KDOA).**

**Ms. Annette Graham**, Director, Department on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This is the revised notice of grant application, notice of grant award which reflects changes in the Senior Care Act program. The revisions must be submitted to the Kansas Department on Aging. This is a housekeeping revision, which just outlines how the funds were actually spent for 2002 year, which ends June 30<sup>th</sup> and corrects any changes in spending.

This program is a program of the Area Agency on Aging, which has provided services in Sedgwick, Butler and Harvey Counties. It requires a 2 to 1 match that is our county mill levy, Butler and Harvey also contribute mill levy for service dollars in their own area. So, this is just the revision, which is required and we request that you approve the fiscal year 2002 NGA for 2002."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Annette. Any comments or questions to Annette on this item? I don't see any, so what's the will of the Board please?"

### **MOTION**

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Commissioner Winters moved to approve the revised Notification of Grant Award and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**2. AGREEMENT WITH KDOA FOR CENTRAL PLAINS AREA AGENCY ON AGING (CPAAA) TO PROVIDE IN-HOME SERVICES TO ELIGIBLE OLDER RESIDENTS.**

**Ms. Graham** said, "This is the Senior Care Act contract for fiscal year 2003. We enter into the service provider agreement with the Kansas Department on Aging and this contract outlines and details how the services will be provided and how the program will be administered. This is a service that provides in-home services for residents of our area age 60 years and older who have functional limitations which impede their ability to maintain their living independently and to carry out their activities of daily living in their homes.

The services provided are case management, homemaker services, personal care, respite care, personal emergency response system and installation, respite care and provides for specific purchases that will assist the clients to remain in their homes. These services are offered in Butler, Harvey and Sedgwick County through a network of providers who offer a variety of services. We've developed a program that enables clients to live in their own homes and to choose providers of their choice.

Like I said before, this requires a 2 to 1 match. In Sedgwick County, we provide \$57,327 of mill levy match and Butler County provides \$7,500 and Harvey County provides \$2,000 for the service amounts in their area. The total budget for this is \$1,427,524 for the total program. We would request that you approve the fiscal year 2003 provider agreement contract and authorize the Chair to sign."

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you, Annette. Any questions of Annette on this item? I don’t see any.”

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Next item.”

**3. AGREEMENT WITH KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES (SRS) FOR CAAA TO PERFORM NURSING HOME PRE-ASSESSMENTS.**

**Ms. Graham** said, “I need to make a correction to the agenda. This is an agreement with the Kansas Department on Aging rather than the SRS agency. This is for the fiscal year 2003 client assessment referral evaluation. We have operated this program, referred to as CARE, since January 1<sup>st</sup> of 1985. Under this program, we are responsible for performing nursing home pre-assessments in Sedgwick, Harvey and Butler Counties in accordance with the Kansas Department on Aging agreement and state and federal laws.

This agreement establishes the rate that the Area Agency on Aging will be reimbursed for each assessment, which covers the program expenses for the program in the tri-county area. The program is fully funded through the state agency and we are reimbursed at a unit cost per

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

assessment. There are no financial obligations for the County. And the total amount of the budget for last year was \$221,921 and we performed 2,378 assessments for the CARE level one. This year does allow for a 2.7% increase in the reimbursement rate. I would request that you approve the CARE service provider agreement and authorize the Chair to sign. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Annette. Any questions of Annette on this item? What's the will of the Board please."

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner McGinn seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**4. CPAAA FISCAL YEAR 2002 AREA PLAN REVISION AND APPLICATION FOR GRANT AWARD TO KDOA.**

**Ms. Graham** said, "Each year the Area Agency on Aging submits an area plan to the Kansas Department on Aging which details how the agency plans to spend fiscal dollars in the federal fiscal years, which is October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2001 through September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2002. This area plan revision is

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

submitted to change the plans for reasons such as decrease in funding, changes in the way a program is funded or just to show how the dollars were actually spent.

This revision must be submitted to the Kansas Department on Aging and once again it is a housekeeping revision, just to show the details of how the funds were actually spent and corrects any changes in line items that would result in the loss of federal funding, such as the total unspent federal funds being over 5%.

The Board of County Commissioners has approved the Central Plains Area Agency on Aging original area plan for fiscal year 2002. The area plan was reviewed by the Butler and Harvey County commissioners and the area plan revisions were approved. The Central Plains Aging Advisory Council also has approved the revision and basically a summary of the revision, with some changes in the administrative funding, moving some funding around based on actual provision of services to match the administration to the programs where the funds were spent. Some changes in the service provisions of supportive services of attendant care, homemaker and respite care we moved some money around to reflect the actual usage of those dollars. So, just moving around within those three areas.

Under congregate meals, we had some reallocated funding for that program so we increased that budget line item. For the home-delivered meals, there were some changes between providers to reflect provision of services in our area. Under our title 3D disease prevention and health promotion programs, we shifted some funds at the request of the vendors, due to the way the services were being provided. They were providing more home injury screenings rather than home injury education, so we moved funds around within those two programs. Under our 3D medication management, once again we were moving funds around based on the actual usage of the services. We had more service provision by one agency than the other, so we just moved some of those funds around.

And under our caregiver services needed to change some of our funding amounts that wasn't included in the original amount. So, these are the revisions, that's the basis for the revisions. We would request that you approve the revisions and authorize the Chair to sign. Be happy to answer any questions."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay, thank you. I don't see that we have any. So, what is the will of the Board please?"

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Area Plan Revision; and authorize the Chairman to sign the Application and other related documents necessary to complete the grant process, including the notification of grant award.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you very much. Commissioners, I think this would be an appropriate time that we take a look at an Off Agenda item that we were presented and I would entertain a Motion to do that."

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to take an Off Agenda item.

Commissioner Winters seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I have a Motion and a Second to take up an Off Agenda item, which is the agreement with Unified School District number 259 for COMCARE to provide services for the Wraparound Wichita project and I believe we have Marilyn Cook to visit this."

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

### OFF AGENDA ITEM

**Ms. Marilyn Cook**, Director, Comprehensive Community Care, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity for this Off Agenda item. This basically is a grant award document that provides the terms and conditions and funding for one full-time clinician for project Wraparound Wichita, which is the violence prevention program that we've been doing with U.S.D. 259 since 1999.

The program is serving a total of 30 children, 15 of them at Stanley, 15 at Lincoln Elementary in Wichita. And the clinician involved in this service provides not only some direct care, but also consultation and assistance to teachers in these schools and works with child study teams to monitor the progress of these children in the schools.

With this agreement, U.S.D. 259 provides COMCARE with \$50,177 to pay for the salary and the benefits of this individual. So we are requesting that you approve the agreement and authorize the Chair to sign."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you Marilyn. Commissioners, any questions of Marilyn on this item?"

### MOTION

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

Commissioner McGinn seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Clerk call the roll. Excuse me, I didn't see that."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Marilyn, I guess we would say that this is still then another move in strengthening our working relationship with the school district."

**Ms. Cook** said, "Well, and it's been an ongoing relationship with them. But yes, and we've been doing this since 1999 and we're looking forward to next year as well."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Okay, thank you."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Who are the other collaborative partners? Is CIS involved in this also?"

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Ms. Cook** said, "CIS has been very much involved in this project with us."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. That's all I had."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Any other comments, Commissioners? Okay, what's the will of the Board please? We already had the Motion and Second, so why don't you call the roll for us."

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**5. AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT WITH SRS, DIVISION OF HEALTH CARE POLICY, PROVIDING COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR PSYCHIATRY RESIDENTS.**

**Ms. Cook** said, "This item involves the Wichita Center for Graduate Medical Education or WCGME. And it provides cooperative educational opportunities for psychiatric residents in this community with the University of Kansas School of Medicine, the Wichita campus.

Each year, COMCARE has four to five residents and what this . . . normally fourth year residents, by the way. And what this contract or the amendment does is adds one month elective for one of the residents that have been working with us, Dr. Shandra. She worked at our crisis program, 40 hours a week, for the month of May and divided her time between our crisis program and our addiction treatment program. So, we are requesting that you approve this amendment."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Any comments or questions of Marilyn on this item?"

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Aye
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Mr. Chair, may I ask a question?”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “You certainly may.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “We voted on the Off Agenda item but did we really have a Motion for the item or just a Motion to put it on the Agenda? I wanted to be sure.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “We had a Motion. Because I interrupted the vote call on the Motion.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Okay. After I got to thinking about it, I thought, ‘Well, did we really have a Motion?’ Okay, good.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Okay, good. Next item.”

**Commissioner McGinn left at 11:15 a.m.**

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

### 6. ADDITION OF 17 CASE MANAGER POSITIONS, RANGE 16, AND 3 TEAM LEADER POSITIONS, RANGE 18, TO THE COMCARE STAFFING TABLE.

#### POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

**Ms. Cook** said, "Commissioners, this item . . . I put a couple of slides together to maybe describe this a little bit more visually for you. We are coming to you requesting some additional positions in our children's program to help serve the children with mental health needs who are in foster care services in Sedgwick County. Basically, just as a brief history, effective October 1<sup>st</sup> of last year the medical card was opened or what the state is calling unblocked for children in foster care that met two specific criteria. One of those were they were children that had a serious emotional disturbance, as was found in our diagnostic manuals and by our assessment and in need of community-based services. Prior to that time, any mental health services or any services or care that were needed by these children were handled by the privatized contractors and the state recognized that a lot of these children's physical needs were being met under that privatized rate but not necessarily the mental health needs.

So we met, we had a statewide effort and we met locally with and negotiated a local plan. In fact, we're the first one in the state to have a local plan and then everyone copied ours. But we met with SRS and United Methodist Youthville and COMCARE and some of our business partners to look at how we would do this in this area, since there were such a large number of children in foster care in our area.

We agreed, as our part as community health center involved, along with one of our affiliates, Family Consultation Services, to open up or what we call do an intake on 15 foster care children per week, which is a lot of children per week. And United Methodist Youthville is responsible for over 1,100 children in Sedgwick County that are in foster care and they're in three different kind of phases of that program. Ninety of them are already open to our system.

We started out fairly slowly and were pretty confident with what we were doing and then, very recently, we have received a rush of new cases to be opened. We had still promised the 15 a week and we are certainly reaching that. We have done that by overburdening some of the case managers that we have on our staff in order to be able to respond in a timely way and there certain are agreements, or parts of the agreement, that have access standards in them and we've been able to meet them so far.

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

The state maximum for a case manager caseload is 15 on the children side. The adult side is larger but it is optimal to have only 10 to 12 children on your caseload to be able to have the amount of time to contact parents and family and other collaterals. So, we are anticipating for a while here to be adding one full caseload a week to a case manager's schedule.

The good news is that all of these children have a medical card and the rates for case managers and the two specific services that they provide increased 57% and so the compensation is good on these children and all of them do have compensation. So, we are requesting 20 case managers to serve these children who have really very complex lives. Of that 20, three of them would be team leaders, which is a range 18. The other 17 would be range 16 case managers.

Also wanted to just make you aware of the fact that there is an interim committee, as a result of our last . . . a proviso that was added at our last legislative session, where an interim committee will convene this summer to focus on the number of children's issues and one of those is going to be the responsiveness of the whole state, community mental health centers in response to children in foster care and we are very proud of our track record to this point and I think, with the addition of these case managers, we'll be able to demonstrate to them that Sedgwick County has come up to the plate and really done our share of this.

We're committed to this population. We've been successful, over this past 10 years since mental health reform, in bringing home a lot of children and helping them and allowing them, in that process, to grow up in our community. And I'd like to add a reminder why we do this. I'd be happy to stand for any questions you might have."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. We do have some questions of you. Commissioner Gwin."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Thank you. Marilyn, my compliments to the children's program because it's been very successful but certainly challenged to meet the need. The need obviously that you indicated is critical. I guess the issue behind that is how quickly can we get these case managers hired and available to do their job?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "Well, we're hoping very quickly. We had many . . . well over 100 applications when we started another new initiative recently, the co-location program in the schools. And so we have well over 100 individuals' applications ready to go. So it's a matter of reviewing those, selecting the ones that looked to be the best fit and get very busy on the interview process for that. We feel a sense of urgency on it. There's no question about that."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Okay. Well, I appreciate that. It's certainly obvious. All right, thank

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

you. That's it, Mr. Chairman, for me."

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

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Well, I think it's certainly gratifying that we're taking the lead in this. Foster care has been in a state of flux and certainly Youthville has had their set of issues. Did Youthville not try to provide their own mental health services for a while?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "They continue to provide some of their own services. The difference being now that the card is unblocked it really is costing them money to provide that service, where the state will pay for it if the community mental health center does that for them. So, they will continue to see, and are continuing to see, in a downscaled way some children who have mental health needs who are not fitting those two criteria. Any of the children that have a SED diagnosis or a need of community based services or wrap around services they're referring to us."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Certainly that will help the drain that Youthville had of their money pool, will it not? Isn't that part of what really hurt them monetarily?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "Yes, it should help tremendously."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay. What is the potential? Is this going to continue to grow?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "Well, you know we've look at that. We've been planning for this for almost a year and it just seems to be a moving target to us in some ways. Part of that is because there are three layers or categories of children to be served. One of those are the children that are being paid to be kept in foster care, which is the largest group, a little over 800 children in that category according to a recent conversation with Shelly Duncan. Then there are some other children who have gone through that, have been reintegrated home and then there's some problems and some of those children also need services. Again, very few of them probably will meet the two criteria that we have but there is a possibility of that. And then there's a third category of children in the foster care system that are a part of the continuation plan. All of the foster care providers are responsible for outcomes and maintenance of these children for a year after they are placed home or in a permanent setting. And so that's another potential for some kids.

We originally estimated around 300 but that changes, based on the movement of children in the state and where they end up living, ultimately."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Does it appear that this strategic planning group that's going to be put together will start to understand and plan for the next two, three years what this is going to look

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

like?”

**Ms. Cook** said, “Absolutely. And we do that now. In fact, we have . . . We meet once a month, as a formal group, all of us and kind of rotate the location of that. But in addition to that, our staff who work directly are on the phone constantly with one another, delivering children back and forth, delivering paperwork, progress reports. So we have almost daily contact with them but, formally, we do that with them once a month. And as numbers come through and we get a better understanding of where children will settle, it becomes easier to plan.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “I guess where I’m going with this is are you going to be back to us in 6 months going, “Wow, now there’s twice as much need’, now that we’re really providing great services and foster care is getting fixed, it’s going to create more density of kids coming into these kind of programs. Are going to need twice as many?”

**Ms. Cook** said, “We aren’t anticipating that for this, no. We feel this is our best shot, our best estimate, given what information we have that this should do it.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Okay. Which leads me to is there a sunset on some of these case workers? Is it a year, two years or are they going to be case workers from now till forever? What does that look like?”

**Ms. Cook** said, “The case workers that we’re bringing into the system for this? That’s an interesting question. What we would do . . . We’re also experiencing increase in other referral sources. If there is not sufficient caseloads for them, then we would go through a downsizing process is what we would do.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Okay. My last question is what is the percent of Sedgwick County kids that are in this? I mean, there are some kids brought from other parts of the state, are they not or are these all Sedgwick County?”

**Ms. Cook** said, “No, these are Sedgwick County kids. We have an awful lot of kids from Sedgwick County that are placed in foster care homes elsewhere that eventually come back but these are Sedgwick County kids only.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Okay. That’s all I’ve got. I’m ready.”

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

**Commissioner Winters** said, “Well, the only thing I was going to say and Marilyn this may not be

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

right, but in response to Tim, I mean it's not every child in foster care that is able to participate. It's only those that have serious emotional disturbances."

**Ms. Cook** said, "Right and are in need of community based services, both of those together."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "But once you would have a total number of kids in foster care, I think that percentage would probably stay about the same and wouldn't be . . . I mean, you have some come in, some go out. So, I would think, once you get the right balance, that then you would have the whole spectrum covered."

**Ms. Cook** said, "The trend is going down for kids entering foster care in our community. However, SRS did lose some of their funding for our Project 275, which was preventing children from getting into the foster care system. So we're continuing our participation in that and involvement in that but, hopefully, we're going to be able to maintain that lowered number. But children are still entering the system from all venues."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well, that might be a good statistic in a couple of years to show our state legislators that that's really a program that worked and in a prevention of keeping kids out of foster care and hopefully could get that funding back, if the numbers go the wrong way."

**Ms. Cook** said, "It would be wonderful."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay, thank you. I don't see that there's any other questions."

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the additions to the COMCARE Staffing Table.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Absent
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Next item please. Thank you, Marilyn."

**J. ADDITION OF ONE PART-TIME PATHOLOGIST POSITION, PER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT, TO THE FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTER STAFFING TABLE.**

**Mr. Bob Lamkey**, Public Safety Director, Manager's Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Clearly, Dr. Dudley is not here today. I'm Bob Lamkey, your Public Safety Director, standing in for her and I will do as good a job as I can. As you may remember, as part of the 2002 budget, \$50,000 was identified in the public safety contingency to provide for several things. One, contingency relief for a staff pathologist if an incident arose where adequate coverage was not available, accident or injury. We had an experience in 2001 in which one of our pathologists had to work an extended period of time as a consequence of one of those.

Two, the resources to manage increasing workloads, growth, and Dr. Dudley and the staff at the Forensic Science Center have been successful in that endeavor. We've seen some growth. And three, for controls and managing the caseload for the pathologist to stay in close compliance with the National Association of Medical Examiners accreditation standards. As you may recall, the Center was accredited by name with zero deficiencies. A minor deficiency, and really where their standard says that a staff pathologists should perform about 250 autopsies a year. More than that, you get a minor deficiency and 400 per staff pathologist will result in revocation or accreditation.

As we looked at our organizational capacity, it became very clear that the deputy's capacity to deliver service in a timely manner to our customers was about 300 cases per year. Dr. Dudley, as Director of the Forensic Science Center, has other duties, other than operating as a staff pathologist. She is responsible for the administrative business and really has necessary professional associations in this process. And so, on looking at the capacity, we felt that she should plan on doing about 175 autopsies a year, in addition to other work.

In 2000, we performed 487. In 2001, it was 535. In 2002, it we look like we're going to do about 550 and with business opportunities that are out there from other counties, we can do 600 in 2003. So, the addition of a part-time pathologist working ten days a week [sic], covering two weekends, will assist in reducing that current workload and help stabilize the pathology department and share some of the on-call and weekend schedule hours.

## **Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

As we looked at the alternatives for meeting this need, in the past we have had contract pathologists, that is we pay them on a service contract for their services. If you look at what we paid two years ago and consider that a pathologist would do about one and a half cases a day, hiring a pathologist on a contract basis for 10 days, would about \$13,400 a month. In looking at managing that person's time, we felt it would be better to have a part-time position.

In looking at this in an annualized basis, we would propose an annual salary of \$500,000 . . . Not \$500,000, of \$50,000. Made the Manager vince there. Just checking to see if he was paying attention. Of \$50,000 plus benefits for 63,342. However, we're looking at filling this position initially from July onward and looking at that process, it comes out to be just about \$32,000. At this time, we're requesting you fund the position for the remainder of 2002, utilizing the funds that were set aside and continued funding for this position is being addressed through the 2003 budget process. It is my recommendation and Dr. Dudley's recommendation that you approve the addition to the Regional Forensic Science Center staffing table. And as an addendum, we should be coming to you, if this is approved, within a month or so with a contract for a part-time pathologist. I stand ready for any questions."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "I'll step in. I really don't have any questions, although I'm going to be very supportive of this. I think the important thing is that we take the load off of our present staff and that we realize that with this great facility we've got, we have a huge potential to be entrepreneurial and to sell the services to other counties. We continue to add density to the fold, as far as that, and we need to make sure that we have the potential to build that and not overextend the staff that we've got right now. So, I'm being very supportive of this presentation."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. I just need a question, Mr. Buchanan. I may have read this wrong, but when the Forensic Center made their presentation to us about the 2003 budget, was this supplemental in there and wasn't it denied?"

**Mr. William P. Buchanan**, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Chairman Sciortino, the Finance Department and Budget folks looked at this budget process with a very critical eye and so I think most all the supplementals were denied at this point. We've examined this one very carefully and this one, by approving it today, it's in all likelihood . . . Not in all likelihood, this one will be recommended as part of the budget for 2003. But we have examined it. I have had conversations with Finance folks and with the people at the . . . Bob Lamkey and the Forensic Science folks about this position and I recommend it."

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay, thank you. Commissioners, the reason I was asking that, I thought maybe if they knew . . . had some other reasons why they didn’t think this was right, that that would be an opportune time for her to hear it but I’m very gratified to see that they’re going to approve that. All right. I don’t see that there’s any other question. What’s the will of the Board on this item please?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to approve the addition to the Forensic Science Center Staffing Table.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Absent
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Thank you, Bob. You did a very good job filling in for Dr. Dudley. Next item.”

**K. PUBLIC WORKS. .**

- 1. MODIFICATION OF PLANS AND CONSTRUCTION, REQUEST NUMBER ONE AND FINAL, ON SEDGWICK COUNTY PROJECT NO. 628-E ½ 10, W ½ 11; 39<sup>TH</sup> STREET SOUTH (MACARTHUR) BRIDGES AT LAKE AFTON. CIP# R-233. DISTRICT #3.**

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

**Mr. David Spears**, Director/County Engineer, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Item K-1 is a modification of plans and construction, request number one and final, for Sedgwick County bridge projects and MacArthur Road relocation at Lake Afton designated as R-233 in the Capital Improvement Program. This project has been completed and is ready to be finalized. There will be a net increase of \$27,586.60 due to variations in plan quantities from actual field measurements. Two of the items changed were the gate at the east entrance and also paving of a parking lot at Shelter number 1. I recommend that you approve the modification and authorize the Chairman to sign.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Any questions of David on this item? If not, what’s the will of the Board?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Modification of Plans and Construction and authorize the Chair to sign.

Commissioner Winters seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Absent
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Next item.”

- 2. MODIFICATION OF PLANS AND CONSTRUCTION, REQUEST NUMBER THREE AND FINAL, ON SEDGWICK COUNTY PROJECT NO. 807-K, L, N ½ M; MAIZE ROAD FROM THE NORTH CITY LIMITS OF WICHITA TO 45<sup>TH</sup> STREET NORTH. CIP# R-246. DISTRICTS #3 AND #4.**

**Mr. Spears** said, “Similar to the previous item, it’s also a modification of plans and construction, request number three and final, for the road improvement project on Maize Road from the Wichita city limits to 45<sup>th</sup> Street North, designated as R-246 in the Capital Improvement Program. This

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

project has also been completed and is ready to be finalized out. There will be a net increase of \$1,352 due to variations in plan quantities from actual field measurements. And that's pretty good, considering that that's a 3.7 million dollar project and I recommend that you approve the modification and authorize the Chairman to sign."

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

**MOTION**

Commissioner Winters moved to approve the Modification of Plans and Construction and authorize the Chair to sign.

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Absent
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**L. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 13, 2002.**

**Mr. Jerry Phipps**, Purchasing Agent, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "You have the Minutes of the June 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts and there are two items for consideration.

**1) POLICE SEDANS- FLEET MANAGEMENT  
FUNDING: VEHICLE ACQUISITION**

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

Item one is police sedans for the Fleet Management and it was recommended to accept the low bid, including trade-ins, from Haven Ford for \$126,904.

### 2) **A & E EXPAND MAIN ENTRANCE OF COURTHOUSE- FACILITY PROJECTS FUNDING: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Item two, A & E expansion of the main entrance of courthouse through Facility Projects. It was recommended to accept the proposal of McCluggage, Van Sickle and Perry of \$52,500.

I'd be happy to take questions and recommend the approval of the Minutes of the Board of Bids and Contracts."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. I don't see that there's any questions. Just a comment on this Board because I'm going to be supportive of this but you know we are kind of in the throws of what are we going to do and what have you. We don't know what 2003 is and there may have to be a shifting of priorities and funding, putting back so that there may be essential services we have to fund. So I just want to let all of us know that that's something that we may have to consider. The opportune time to put things on hold is before you get so deep into the project that you can't quit it and make any sense. Now, a design is something that can sit and doesn't necessarily mean you have to implement it at the right time, because I'm not going to breath easier until we see that final shoe drop from the state to see exactly where we're going to be. We are now going to have to start realistically figuring out what we're going to do with the Kansas Coliseum. That certainly wasn't on our radar screen for next year. So, there may have to be some reprioritizing. So, that's just a general comment. So, Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Just a comment that the Randall Steiner architect bid was obviously the low bid. They did some further investigation and it's a small firm. I did encourage, as this was brought forward to me, that we continue to look at small architects and new start-up architects for maybe smaller projects to get them in the fold. But a major project like this, a big project where they might have the capacity, obviously there are other things that come into play besides low bid but that we encourage start-up architects, single architects to be involved in the process and that we would look for smaller projects for them to build their capacity. Just a comment."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay."

### **MOTION**

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

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

Commissioner Gwin seconded the Motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Absent
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**M. CONSENT AGENDA.**

- 1. 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>
V99035	\$65.00	\$193.00

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

V010105	\$485.00	\$323.00
V01064	\$590.00	\$476.00
V01064	\$290.00	\$463.00
V2020	\$625.00	\$625.00
V20102	\$340.00	\$365.00
V01076	\$330.00	\$325.00
V010116	\$271.00	\$301.00
V94049	\$200.00	\$178.00
V2045	\$167.00	\$169.00
V010106	\$268.00	\$301.00
V72016	\$193.00	\$270.00
V010110	\$560.00	\$560.00
V010111	\$675.00	\$700.00
V010105	\$323.00	\$323.00
V2048	\$240.00	\$246.00
V2045	\$256.00	\$206.00
V99039	\$289.00	\$255.00
V010103	\$375.00	\$225.00

**2. Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment Contracts.**

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Rent Subsidy</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Landlord</u>
V020030	\$262.00		Sunflower Apts.
V020031	\$332.00	2	Village Green Apts.
V020033	\$257.00	4	Valley View Apts.
V020034	\$635.00	5	Springcreek Apts.
V020035	\$232.00	4	Sunflower Gardens Apts.
V020036	\$460.00	3	Residential Management LLC
V020026	\$305.00	4	Valley View Apts.
V020039	\$539.00	5	William Favreau

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

3. **Resolution authorizing disposal by destruction of various Health Department records dated 1972 – 1997.**
4. **Line Item Changes for the Juvenile Intensive Supervision and Juvenile Case Management programs, to be submitted to the State Juvenile Justice Authority.**
5. **Grant Award of \$805.92 from Kansas Division of Emergency Management for reimbursement of training costs.**
6. **Order dated June 12, 2002 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
7. **Payroll Check Registers of June 7 and June 14, 2002.**
8. **General Bills Check Register(s) for the week of June 12 – 18, 2002.**

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “Commissioners, you have the Consent Agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Gwin moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Norton seconded the Motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “And then I have a comment from Commissioner Norton on the Consent Agenda.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Just a quick comment. Item number three is the destruction of various Health Department records dated 1972 to 1997. Anytime we destroy records, I think it needs to be brought forward just to make sure that, in the public record, that we’ve gone in, looked at our policies and are cleaning up some records. Mr. Manager.”

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “If it would please the Commission, we have a couple of people on staff who are trained and educated and reviewed the state laws very carefully about what records are being destroyed. They have reviewed these. Some of the information has gone . . . much of the information has gone through the attorney’s office. Jennifer Magana has reviewed some of it to check and we’re satisfied that we’re absolutely following the intent not only of the letter of the law

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

but the intent of the law.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “What caught my attention was the 1972 to 1997 is a huge time period.”

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “I would remind the Commission that we’ve only been in charge of that department since January.”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Okay. Thank you, though.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Mr. Euson, you concur with the Manager’s comments that we’re following the intent and spirit of the law?”

**Mr. Euson** said, “Yes, I do.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Okay, no further comments. Clerk, call the roll.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Betsy Gwin	Aye
Commissioner Tim Norton	Aye
Commissioner Thomas Winters	Aye
Commissioner Carolyn McGinn	Absent
Chairman Ben Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Is there anything else to come before this Board?”

**N. OTHER**

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “I have a recap and some previous and coming ups. Real quickly, last Friday I attended the 57<sup>th</sup> Annual Kansas State Council of Firefighters and brought greetings on your behalf to that group of gentlemen. Also was reminded of the importance of firefighters, as they asked me a question about my father’s fire, which I got teared up. I’m gonna have to quit that. Told them not to ask me questions that would make me cry anymore.

Then later on that day, I went to the dedication of the Kansas Fallen Firefighters’ Memorial on South Broadway by the Kansas Firefighters’ Museum and then up to Station 37 to share lunch with some of the firefighters who had come from throughout the state for that dedication. It was a lovely morning and a very nice event. I’d encourage folks to go down and visit that museum and also the memorial. It’s very touching.

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

On the coming ups, this is tomorrow night, the Museums a la Carte benefits Exploration Place, Botanica, the Wichita Art Museum, Old Cowtown Museum and the Society of Decorative Painters. Goes from 5:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. I'm not sure about ticket availability but I suppose folks could call 264-0448 and see if they can still get tickets. At this point, of course, obviously not going to mail them. If you're able to get them, you'll pick them up at Exploration Place. Should be a lot of fun.

The 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Kechi Fair is this weekend and I will yet again be in attendance. They start with some family fun night and the carnival on Friday evening. The big day is Saturday, with the pancake and sausage breakfast, Ben, at the United Methodist Church, followed promptly by the parade at 10:00. Sedgwick County will have a booth. We'll have a lot of presence there. Our firefighters are going to be there demonstrating heavy rescue and some repelling techniques. EMS folks are always there and in the parade. Kard Art Glass, one of the premier businesses in Kechi, will be open for demonstrations. Now, Tim, the riding lawnmower road rally will be held at noon behind city hall for riding lawnmower competitions. I don't know, maybe . . ."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "So you're intimating that everybody in district two likes motors and lawnmowers and heavy equipment."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Yes. I think you'd be good in that or the cow patty bingo. I'm not sure where you should participate."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "It's not a cow patty tossing contest?"

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "No, it's bingo and turtle races but you have to bring your own turtle. Anyway, it's a great party. The people in Kechi throw a great fair and I encourage you to come out and spend some time with us.

Saturday and Sunday are celebrity days at Old Cowtown Museum. Ben, were you going to go?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I'm going to be reading stories to the children at 10:00 Saturday morning. If you don't want to get sick, why don't you come around 11 or 12."

**Commissioner Gwin** said, "Okay, and I'll be there Sunday from noon to 2 but I don't know in what capacity yet. They have to assign me a role I think."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "A dance hall girl."

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

**Commissioner Gwin** said, “Maybe so. And then just a reminder to for those folks out there who are cancer survivors. June the 28<sup>th</sup> is the Relay for Life at the Sedgwick County Zoo, 7 p.m. is when we start. The first lap is reserved for survivors. So, if you’re a survivor and you’re not yet signed up, call the American Cancer Society at 265-3400 and come and join us and take that survivor’s lap. That’s pretty special. That’s it.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay. Well, I don’t see anybody else’s light on, so I’ll talk about what I did. Last week was very, very busy. Friday I think I hit the decks running early. I was out at McConnell Air Force Base for the change of command ceremony and mixed emotions about Ron Ladnier leaving but very excited about Michelle Johnson coming on board, mainly because she is a much better golfer than Ron was. So hopefully I’ll have an opportunity to play with her there.

Following that, I went to the memorial service that we held for Sergeant Maugans down in Derby and that was touching. I mean, we had Senator Dole was there, Senator Brownback was there, Representative Tihart was there. They brought the ambassador from the Philippines down there. It was a very . . . I don’t know how there could have not been a dry eye, because they did something called a roll call and this master sergeant started calling out the names of the military that were there and they would say ‘present, sir’ or ‘here, sir’ and then they called out Sergeant Maugans name and there was dead silence. He called it again, dead silence. He called it again in a loud voice, dead silence and then Taps played. And I mean, it was awesome. And it was a good way that that community . . . and I applaud Mayor Standrich and his board of city council people and Mark Schroeder. They put it all on. They thought of the idea and it was well received by the community. Following that, I went over to the senior center, where I have my part-time office, and Connie Hubbell, the Secretary of Aging was there. And she just flat out said that was the finest senior center she’s seen in all of her going around the state. So, that was great.

And then, later on in the weekend, I stood in in your place up at the dedication of the Hindu Temple of Wichita. And it was different. That was . . . It was different. They were very appreciative that people of other faiths would even consider them enough neighbors to come out and join them with that but they put something on my forehead and then I had to have flowers on me and then there was a sprinkling of some certain type of perfume to purify you to go into the temple. Had to take my shoes and socks off. Luckily, I did think of taking a shower prior to going out there. And then came the good part. They had like a . . . I guess you would call it communion but their communion consists of two pistachio nuts and a little piece of coconut. It was kind of different and then came the big dinner, which I really liked and it was a two-ear perspiration dinner, because they put a lot of curry stuff on that. But I enjoyed it and it was very nice and I think it’s only in America can you have . . . You know, a couple of weeks before that we dedicated the Buddhist temple. Where you can have a Muslim, a Hindu, a Buddhist, Christians, Catholics, Jews all living together in harmony, good neighbors and tolerant of each others desire to serve their God of their understanding in their manner. And that’s what makes this country great.

## Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002

So, I had a very busy weekend and I enjoyed it and this weekend we have the thing at Cowtown and then, in two weeks, I hesitate to say this because I don't want you to really think you have to, but I'm doing to be on a dunk tank in Mulvane. They're doing a community . . . It's going to be on the 30<sup>th</sup> but the whole community is coming together to help this one young man that's got a brain tumor and I understand that a lot of people in my district, they come all wet anyway. This will give them a chance to prove it and if you'd like to come down and see if you can dunk me, feel free. And I'll let you know more about that later. That's all I have. Commissioner Winters."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well, I just thought of one other thing. Just wanted to mentioned, I'm not sure if at the beginning of our show Kristi ran through a lot of events going on this coming weekend. I'm not sure I heard her mention Olympic Skaters On Ice but they're Friday night, again at the Coliseum. It's been a very hot ticket so I'm not sure of ticket availability. But if you really want to see a quality show at the Kansas Coliseum, John Nath and his group have brought a great show of the Olympic skaters. So, Friday night out at the Coliseum I think is going to be a great night. People are interested, they might want to call the Coliseum to see if there's tickets left, but I know it's been a very hot ticket."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay, and now last but definitely not least, the lawnmower riding king of Kansas, Tim Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "I just have two things. Last Friday, I had the opportunity to teach a communications class for our continued education program and we had City of Wichita and Sedgwick County employees there, almost 35, and I've got to tell you, government is in good hands with these folks. They were very attentive. One of the best classes I've taught in forever and it was a great opportunity for me to connect with some people that deliver services and maybe give them some of my expertise out of the business community to help them along in their jobs. But that was a great class to teach.

And then finally, last Wednesday I hosted a luncheon for some scholarship winners. Every year I give some scholarships away. I did that as the mayor of Haysville and I continue as a Commissioner and I had a young man from South High School, Luke Grover, a young lady from Campus High School, Megan Lewis, and Rachael Jacobs from West High School that I was able to give \$1,000 scholarships to get their careers started, their school careers started. Two W.S.U. students and a K.U. student, pre-med, law and accounting. So, I'm very proud of the three kids that are going to move forward. I had given away 14 scholarships as mayor of Haysville and I'm proud to continue that tradition with some kids out of my district from the three high schools. Wonderful kids and had a chance to meet with their parents and their principals over lunch with my wife and

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

am proud to support them in their continuing education. And that's all I've got."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Well, I commend you on that because I was . . . when you first told me about that I couldn't believe that you would do that on your own, but I will just remind you, there are three of us running for reelection and we could figure out some kind of scholarship that you'd want . . . Where do we apply for these? No comment, okay."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "If you go down to the Greyhound bus station and write it on the wall, I'll try to get that information."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Anything else to come before this Board? If not, this meeting is now adjourned."

**O. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

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

---

**BEN SCIORTINO**, Chairman  
Fifth District

---

**BETSY GWIN**, Chair Pro Tem  
First District

---

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

---

**THOMAS G. WINTERS**, Commissioner

**Regular Meeting, June 19, 2002**

Third District

---

**CAROLYN MC GINN**, Commissioner  
Fourth District

ATTEST:

---

**Don Brace**, County Clerk

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_, 2002